

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 2763

Wednesday, February 7, 2017, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Chamber

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

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Adams	Millikin	Foster	Hulse, COT
Covey	Reeds	Hoyt	Ling, COT
Dix		Miller	VanValkenburgh, Legal
Doctor		Sawyer	Warrick, COT
Fretz		Ulmer	
Krug		Wilkerson	
Ritchey			
Shivel			
Walker			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Friday, February 2, 2018 at 8:30 a.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 1:33 p.m.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report: Mr. Covey welcomed new Commissioner Joshua Ritchey.

Director's Report: Ms. Miller reported on City Council and Board of County Commission items and actions taken and other special projects. Ms. Miller stated the TMAPC receipts for the month of December 2017 were consistent with last year's receipts. Ms. Miller welcomed Joshua Ritchie to the Planning Commission and reported that Michael Covey and John Shivel had been reappointed for another term.

* * * * *

1. **Minutes:**

Approval of the minutes of January 17, 2018 Meeting No. 2762

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, the TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Millikin, Reeds, "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of January 17, 2018 Meeting No. 2762.

2. **Minutes:**

Approval of corrected minutes of December 6, 2017 Meeting No. 2759

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, the TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Millikin, Reeds, "absent") to **APPROVE** the corrected minutes of the meeting of December 6, 2017 Meeting No. 2759.

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-979** (Lot-Combination) (CD 4) – Location: Southwest corner of West Archer Street and North Elwood Avenue
4. **LS-21104** (Lot-Split) (CD 3) – Location: East of the northeast corner of North Garnett Road and East Admiral Place
5. **NP 36** (CD 1) Final Plat, Location: Southwest corner of North Lewis Avenue and East 36th Street North
6. **71 Jackson Storage** (CD 2) Final Plat, Location: Southeast corner of West 71st Street South and South Jackson Avenue
7. **Eastside Market III** (CD 7) Final Plat, Location: Northeast corner of East 71st Street South and Highway 169
8. **Lewis Professional Center** (CD 9) Final Plat, Location: Northwest corner of South Lewis Avenue and Interstate 44
9. **Pecan Valley Business Center** (CD 3) Final Plat, Location: South of the southeast corner of East Pine Street North and North Garnett Road

10. **Gleneagles** (CD 7) Amendment to Deed of Dedication, Location: West of the southwest corner of East 61st Street South and South Mingo Road
11. **Guier Woods IV** (CD 2) Correction of Plat, Location: West of South Harvard Avenue at East 75th Place South
12. **Z-7140-SP-1e Bailey Miles** (CD 2) Location: Southeast corner of South Phoenix Avenue at West 85st Street South requesting a **Corridor Minor Amendment** to reduce the required side yard setback

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: Z-7140-SP-1e Minor Amendment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Amendment Request: Modify the Corridor Plan to reduce the required side yard setback.

Currently, the required side yard setback (abutting a private street) is 15 feet. The applicant is requesting to reduce the setback in order for the proposed residence to extend approximately 2 ½ feet into the side yard setback.

The requested reduction of side yard setback would not be incompatible with the character of the neighborhood, however the reduction should be limited to a 3 foot reduction (12 ft side yard setback) and within the western 50 ft of the lot. This would allow the proposed encroachment without the effect of having the setback for the entire length of the W. 85th St frontage reduced as well.

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 request should be limited to a 12 ft setback, within the western 50 ft of the subject lot.

- 2) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the Corridor Development Plan.
- 3) All remaining development standards defined in Z-7140-SP-1 and subsequent minor amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment request to reduce the required side yard setback.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Millikin, Reeds, “absent”) to **APPROVE** Items 3 through 12 per staff recommendation.

Legal Description for: Z-7140-SP-1e

Lot 3, Block 7 Hyde Park at Tulsa Hills

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

13. **LS-21103** (Lot-Split) (CD 2) – Location: North of the northwest corner of West 78th Street South and South Xenophon Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Lot-split proposal is to split an existing RS-3 (Residential Single-family) tract into two tracts. The minimum lot area and lot area per dwelling unit for an RS-3 zoned lot is 6,900 SF. The lot-split survey shows that Tract A will be ±21,780 SF and Tract B will be ±24,732.5 SF. Both tracts will exceed the Bulk and Area requirements of the current RS-3 zoning district.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on January 18, 2018 and had the following comment. Development Services has stated that a sanitary sewer main extension will be required ~~unless a septic system is installed per DEQ standards~~. This parcel is not within the City of Tulsa Regulatory floodplain.

The proposed lot-split lies within the boundaries of the West Highlands/Tulsa Hills Small Area Plan. The small area plan designates this lot as an *Existing*

Neighborhood and Area of Stability. During the implementation process, stakeholders expressed concern about the effects of building density and maintaining the rural residential character of the planning area. As a result, the finalized small area plan contains the recommendations outlined below;

- **3.7** Zoning west of Union Avenue, in areas with Existing Neighborhood land use, should strongly support residential, single-family uses. Support changes to new “rural-residential” zoning use (see measure 4.6), to address configuration issues related to lot splits.
- **4.6** Revise zoning code to include a “rural-residential” district which allows a limited number of livestock and horses as a use by right, and has larger minimum lot sizes. This can be done by either amending an existing district, or creating a new one.

The planning area could benefit from a more in-depth analysis of the current zoning designations. An amendment to the zoning code to create a “rural-residential” district would support the goals of the small area plan. In this situation, both newly created tracts would far exceed the current RS-3 zoned districts minimum lot size requirements. The proposed Lot-split would not have an adverse effect on the surrounding properties and staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the lot-split and the waiver of the Subdivision Regulations that no lot have more than three side lot lines.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff’s recommendation.

Applicant’s Comments:

Timothy Wells 3110 South Schegal Road, Cushing, OK 74023

Applicant stated he bought the property 10 years ago to build a house and now would like to split the lot to build an additional home.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Tyler Black 7710 South Xenophon Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74132

Mr. Black stated his property was adjacent to the subject property. Mr. Black stated he was lived in the area for 16 years and objects to this lot split because all the water from the hills in this area flows onto the area where the applicant proposes to build one of these houses. Mr. Black stated the previous property that the applicant received a lot split broke the neighborhood covenant. Mr. Black stated the neighbors in the area agreed to maintain 2.5 acre lots to keep the rural feel of the area. Mr. Black stated the applicant is already moving dirt on the property before the lot split has been approved. Mr. Black stated the neighborhood is beautiful and the lot splits will ruin the rural feel of the area.

Linda Black 7710 South Xenophon Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74132

Ms. Black stated when she moved into this neighborhood the understanding was 2.5 acres per lot. Ms. Black stated the applicant split the lower lot which is a

swampy area that he has been filling in with dirt. Ms. Black stated the lower area is for sale. Ms. Black stated her understanding of the current application is the applicant is going to put two houses with a long driveway. Ms. Black stated when the apartments were built on Union Avenue the sewer line was tied in to the City line but when turning on to Xenophon Avenue that would all have to be septic systems and Ms. Black is unsure how that will work. Ms. Black stated the residents moved here to have acreage and she wants to keep it country.

Staff stated as a part of the approval the applicant would have to have a sanitary mainline extension.

Jana Davis PO Box 702773 Tulsa, OK 74170

Ms. Davis stated she has lived in the area for more than 45 years. Ms. Davis stated when residents moved here in the 1960's and 1970's the area was unplatted and a lot of those residents are still there today. Ms. Davis stated a Small Area Plan was done in this area and residents at that time stated this area should be rural. Ms. Davis stated she feels that the City is not listening to the residents. She stated over the years owners have been quietly been splitting their lots from 2.5 acres to 1.25 acres and the neighbors are not notified about this and doesn't get a say in the matter. Ms. Davis stated the applicant is not from this neighborhood he is from Cushing, he is a foreigner and he has already split up lots and degraded the neighborhood. Ms. Davis stated the neighborhood wants to stay 2.5 to 7 acres. Ms. Davis stated in the 1970's the City changed the zoning to RS-3 without talking to the residents in the area. Ms. Davis said staff is saying he can have the lot split because it is RS-3 zoning but the neighbors don't want that, they want it to stay rural and Commissioners need to listen to that.

Allan Breedlove 8119 South 33rd West Avenue Tulsa, OK 74132

Mr. Breedlove stated he is opposed to this application because this area is very rural. Mr. Breedlove stated he has lived in the area for 25 years and would encourage each one of the Commissioners to drive this area and look at the terrain of the subject lot. Mr. Breedlove stated he has not talked to anyone who is in favor of these lot splits.

Tish Dingmon 2828 West 81st Street, Tulsa, OK 74132

Ms. Dingmon stated she keeps hearing people refer to West Highlands and wants Commissioners to know West Highlands is north of this area. Ms. Dingmon stated the subject area is called Harbor Hills and she doesn't know why that name is not being used instead of West Highlands. Ms. Dingmon stated the West Highland area is a neighborhood of subdivisions where the houses are on top of one another and the residents in this area don't want that.

Kathy Menger 7805 South Xenophon Avenue Tulsa, OK 74132

Ms. Menger stated she is adjacent to the subject property. Ms. Menger stated she was here in 2014 applying for a lot split and was told that she couldn't do that

without tying into the City sewer. Ms. Menger stated she was here to find out if that was still a requirement. Ms. Menger stated and that has been answered.

Jody Cole 2440 West 81st Street Tulsa, OK 74132

Mr. Cole stated he would recommend the applicant put together a real submittal identifying the property boundaries they are anticipating splitting so you can see the rear, side and front yard setbacks look like. Mr. Cole stated then look at the water shed that comes off the hill and splits across the subject property, this will be a challenge to build on. Mr. Cole stated the residents in this area are very protective of the ideal that they have of living in this area.

Staff stated the applicant was required to submit a survey.

Jane Duenner 2320 West 92nd Street Tulsa, OK 74132

Ms. Duenner stated she is opposed to the lot split and moved to this area because of the rural nature of the properties. Ms. Duenner stated this district has more section 8 apartments than any other district. Ms. Duenner stated the residents are not against development they just believe existing property owners should have a say in what comes into their neighborhood. Ms. Duenner encourages the City to listen to existing home owners and not let developers to take advantage of the situation just because the City is desperate for tax dollars.

Harry Wolahun 3065 West 78th Street Tulsa, OK 74132

Mr. Wolahun stated he lives on the corner of 78th and 33rd West Avenue. Mr. Wolahun stated he is opposed this application. He stated this applicant has already split two lots that abut 78th Street. Mr. Wolahun stated he understood the lot splits had to connect to the City sewer system and they are currently using the anaerobic system. Mr. Wolahun stated since Tulsa Hills was built there has been a land grab in this area. Everyone wants to make a buck by splitting up the land.

Chris Hoffman 7924 South 28th West Avenue Tulsa, OK 74132

Mr. Hoffman stated he moved to this area about 7 years ago and have noticed several lot splits. Mr. Hoffman stated these lot splits are destroying the feel of the neighborhood for a quick buck and he is against the lot splits. Mr. Hoffman stated this area is a beautiful place to live and he moved out there for the space.

The applicant stated he bought the property in 2007 and has held on to it a long time and designed plans for his home to encompass the view. The applicant stated it is an odd shaped lot so that there can be trees done both sides of the long drive with a gate on Xenophon. The applicant stated he is a designer and he is Tulsa's only certified water shape designer. There is only 55 of those in the world. The stated he believes there is a lack of knowledge of what is being proposed. He stated there will be one new house on a .57-acre lot, the minimum requirement for a septic is .50 acre and the applicant exceeds that so there is no need for City sewer. Mr. Hoffman stated he is 950 feet from City sewer.

Staff stated the ordinance states regardless of the amount of feet away from City sewer if you are adjacent to a property that is on the city public sewer line you are required to extend that public sewer to your lot if you wish to develop it.

Mr. Covey stated so he would be required to connect to the sewer before he is allowed file deeds.

Staff stated the deeds are not released to file at the county until that service has been accomplished.

Mr. Dix asked where the sewer located.

Staff stated they were unsure.

Mr. Dix asked staff if the applicant would be allowed to install a septic system.

Staff stated he would not, he would be required to connect to the sanitary sewer system.

Mr. Dix asked staff how this area was designated RS-3.

Ms. Miller stated this zoning has been in place since 1970 when city wide zoning was done for a large part of the city.

Mr. Dix asked staff if the previous lot split immediately to the south of the subject property was done through the same process.

Staff answered if a lot split does not have to seek any waivers of the subdivision regulations, which in this case those lots would not there is no notice sent out for the split. Staff stated if the property meets the bulk and area of the underlying zoning and all the subdivision regulations you are permitted by right to split the property without notice to the neighborhood. Staff stated RS-3 permits by right a 6900-square foot lot if it meets all the other requirements. Staff stated the reason the subject lot is on the public hearing is he is not doing a square or rectangle lot and because it is odd shaped they are asking for a waiver of the lot line provision in the subdivision regulations prompting notice and a public hearing. If the applicant is not asking for a waiver there would be no notice and therefore neighbors would not be notified such as in the previous lot split.

Mr. Dix asked what structures were on the property.

The applicant stated there is a 1600 square foot house and a garage.

Mr. Covey asked staff what the small area plan called for in this area. Mr. Covey stated people who participate in the small area plans always show up and stated

we don't want apartment we want single family homes and this is single family homes.

Staff answered during the process of the small area plan neighbors had expressed the desire for no lot splits but that is not something that can be put in a small area plan but the recommendations that came out of the plan had to do with supporting a new residential zoning category. Staff stated the City Councilor for this District has spoken with staff about starting this process.

Mr. Covey stated what he is hearing the residents say is they don't want 1 acre lots they want much larger lots such as 5 acre lots.

Staff stated they can apply for rezoning their lots to AG.

Mr. Covey stated so the options are to get everyone to rezone their property and they could enter a private covenant.

Mr. Dix stated he didn't know you could have RS-3 zoning and split your lot with no platting requirement.

Staff stated "yes", it was a city initiated zoning so there is no platting requirement.

Mr. Dix stated what he is hearing is Planning Commission has no choice to but to approve this application.

Ms. VanValkenburgh stated if it met all the subdivision regulations you wouldn't have a choice but it's before Planning Commission because of the modification of the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Dix asked if the subject property was AG the applicant could not split it.

Staff answered "right", he would need a 2-acre minimum lot.

Mr. Dix stated in his neighborhood all the lots are 2.5 acre and he believes neighbors deserve that protection from smaller lots.

Mr. Fretz stated he would like to put this off a few meetings to look at the proposed regulations to see if it meets those requirements.

Ms. VanValkenburgh stated she would like to call the Commission's attention to the standards for modification of the Subdivision Regulations in the current code. In 1.10 number 1 states:

"These Regulations shall be modified by the Planning Commission where unusual topographical or other exceptional conditions require the same. The Planning Commission may modify these Regulations when the purpose of these

Regulations may be served to the same extent by an alternative proposal. The Planning Commission shall not approve a modification where the granting of the modification will be detrimental to the public safety health, or welfare, or be injurious to other property or improvements, or where the same will impair the spirit, purposes, and intent of any governing zoning code or the Comprehensive Plan”.

Ms. VanValkenburgh stated she didn't know how the Commissioner's would interpret that and apply it to this situation that would be up to each Commissioner.

Ms. Krug stated in the letter from Tyler Black there was a reference to a neighborhood covenant and if that was in place then the lot split would not be allowed. Ms. Krug stated she understood the neighborhood had to enforce that privately.

Mr. Covey asked staff why they recommended approval.

Staff answered because it lot is currently RS-3 and it exceeded the minimum lot size and staff acknowledged that there needs to be a revision of the Zoning Code to address rural residential but now it exceeded the RS-3 requirements.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **6-3-0** (Adams, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Walker, “aye”; Covey, Ritchey, Shivel, “nays”; none “abstaining”; Millikin, Reeds, “absent”) to **DENY** Lot Split LS-21103.

* * * * *

14. **Z-7403 Plat Waiver** (CD 4) Location: Southeast corner of East 17th Place South and South Lewis Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The platting requirement for this property is being triggered by a rezoning request (Z-7403) with an optional development plan. The rezoning request was to take the property from RS-3 to OL with an optional development plan to permit an office use within an existing structure on the site. The rezoning application was recommended for approval by TMAPC on August 16, 2017 and was given a final approval by the Tulsa City Council on October 25, 2017.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on January 18, 2018 and the following items were determined:

1. The property was previously platted as part of the Lewiston Gardens subdivision.
2. All required right-of-way has been dedicated and is in place.
3. Necessary easements and utilities are all in place and no additional easements will be needed at this time.
4. No further subdivision of the lots is proposed at this time.

Staff recommends **approval** of the plat waiver with the following condition:

- o Applicant must record approved development standards for Z-7403 Optional Development Plan with the Tulsa County Clerk's office.

The applicant indicated her agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Millikin, Reeds, "absent") to **APPROVE** Z-7403 Plat Waiver per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

15. **PUD-268-C Plat Waiver** (CD 7) Location: West of the southwest corner of East 91st Street South and South Mingo Road

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The platting requirement for this property is being triggered by a rezoning and major amendment approval to a PUD. Both requests were approved in July of 2002, but the property was never developed. The requests permitted office uses on the property as well as an electrical substation.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on January 18, 2018 and the following items were determined:

1. The property is unplatted and will require the filing of an ALTA survey per the Subdivision Regulations
2. All required right-of-way has been dedicated and is in place.
3. Necessary easements and utilities are all in place and no additional easements will be needed at this time.
4. A lot split was approved (LS-21055) to create two tracts for development.

Staff recommends **approval** of the plat waiver with the following condition:

- Applicant must record approved development standards for PUD-268-C with the Tulsa County Clerk’s office.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff’s recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Millikin, Reeds, “absent”) to **APPROVE** PUD-268-C Plat Waiver per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

16. Consider adoption of new **Subdivision and Development Regulations**.
(Continued from December 6, 2017)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

A. Background

The current Subdivision Regulations for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area were adopted in 1978 and last amended in 2005. The existing Subdivision Regulations do not provide adequate tools to deal with modern development scenarios or implement the vision as expressed in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan update – *PLANiTULSA*. Also, new Subdivision and Development Regulations will serve as a more appropriate companion to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code, which came into effect in January 2016.

The City of Tulsa engaged a project working group consisting of industry professionals and subject matter experts led by Duncan Associates to complete an update to the existing Subdivision Regulations, now called the Subdivision and Development Regulations. The proposed Subdivision and Development Regulations address the quality of the physical development guided by the City's comprehensive plan (*PLANiTULSA*). These regulations ensure transportation circulation and connectivity, public access, and the availability of public services to each lot created within the City of Tulsa and unincorporated parts of Tulsa County.

The process to update the Subdivision Regulations began in May 2016. The technical and working groups have meet individually and jointly on multiple occasions, reviewing drafts and providing input. The TMAPC has held three work sessions (April 19, 2017, August 2, 2017 and November 11, 2017) to discuss key issues that were identified. As a final step before

the Planning Commission public hearing, TMAPC staff reviewed the draft for consistency with the City of Tulsa's Comprehensive Plan. Concurrent with the adoption of the new Subdivision and Development Regulations are proposed code amendments, both for the City of Tulsa Zoning Code and the Tulsa County Zoning Code. These changes are necessary to reflect the change in platting requirements that are proposed as part of the update process.

B. Comprehensive Plan Conformance

1) City of Tulsa

Subdivision regulations are intended to address the quality of physical development in accordance with the comprehensive plan. The proposed new Subdivision and Development Regulations will help to implement the following City of Tulsa Comprehensive Plan goals and policies:

Land Use Goal 2: Land Use decisions are consistent with the Vision, Land Use and Stability/Growth Maps.

Land Use Goal 5: Tulsa's regulatory programs support desired growth, economic development, housing, a variety of transportation modes and quality of life priorities.

Land Use Goal 16: Tulsa is known for its built and natural beauty.

Economic Development Goal 5: New development supports vibrant, sustainable, transit-oriented communities.

Housing Goal 1: A robust mix of housing types and sizes are developed and provided in all parts of the city.

Housing Goal 10: Housing planning is coordinated with transportation planning to maximize the benefits of transportation investments.

Streets and Circulation

Land Use Goal 3: New development is consistent with the PLANiTULSA building blocks.

Policy 3.1 Promote pedestrian-friendly streetscapes by designing pedestrian friendly streetscapes and encouraging new developments to provide pedestrian oriented amenities and enhancements, including:

- Walkways and sidewalks that differentiate the pedestrian space from the auto realm;
- Pedestrian oriented street lighting to increase the sense of safety and reduce the impact of light pollution;

Policy 3.2 Encourage a balance of land uses within walking distance of each other.

Transportation Goal 2: Tulsa has a sustainable network of roadways, trails, and transit infrastructure that is well maintained and not a burden on future generations to operate.

Policy 2.1: Adopt a network approach to transportation projects that focuses on connecting people to places-ultimately allowing places to become intense centers of economic development.

- Explore an addition to the local roadway project development process that includes the examination of a street network alternative.
- Encourage development of an interconnected and diverse street pattern to ease congestion, more evenly distribute traffic, and offer flexibility of routes.

Transportation Goal 3: The city's transportation system is cost-effective and adequate to meet the needs of the current and projected population.

Transportation Goal 4: Tulsa has high performance operations for all modes of travel.

Transportation Goal 7: Transportation Policy 3.1 Develop transportation projects using a context sensitive solutions process that involves stakeholders early in the process.

Policy 7.1: Enhance transportation Tulsa's right-of-ways so they both serve as great public places and promote multi-modal travel.

- Provide comfortable and attractive pedestrian and bicycle facilities within existing and new developments.

Policy 7.2: Consider aesthetic needs as an equal to vehicular capacity demands when planning and designing transportation right-of-ways.

Transportation Goal 8: Traffic Safety and mobility are improved.

Transportation Goal 11: Streets contribute to the urban environment.

Transportation Goal 13: Pedestrians have easy access to jobs, shopping, and recreation.

Policy 13.4: Ensure the continued development of sidewalk improvement with other improvements on major arterial corridors where opportunities to enhance the pedestrian environment exist.

Transportation Goal 14: Tulsans safely and efficiently use bicycles to go to work, shop and recreation areas.

Lot and Block

Land Use Goal 3: New development is consistent with the PLANiTULSA building blocks.

Policy 3.6 Encourage complimentary building height, scale, design, and character.

- Create a sense of place by encouraging development of buildings, structures, and landscapes that complement the character and scale of their setting.
- Encourage new development to be appropriate to the context of its location in density, massing, intensity, and size, particularly when adjacent to existing residential areas and historic districts.

Land Use Goal 13: Existing neighborhoods are stable and infill development revitalizes, preserves and enhances these urban areas.

Policy 13.1 Promote the unique characteristics of existing neighborhoods as key to the city's long-term health and vitality.

Land Use Goal 15: Tulsa is a leader in sustainable development.

Policy 15.5 Promote sustainable building practices including:

- Energy efficiency
- Material Efficiency
- Waste reduction
- Durability
- Healthful building environment
- Integrated design

Stormwater and Floodplains

Land Use Goal 18— Development on impacted sites or areas is regulated to protect sensitive areas.

Policy 18.2: Preserve undeveloped floodplain areas for storm water conveyance.

Policy 18.3: Investigate compensation programs or zoning measures to allow transfer of development rights from environmentally constrained areas to unconstrained areas.

Policy 18.4: Continue to use best management practices for development within floodplain areas.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 1: Stormwater is captured and cleaned through landscape design, downspout disconnection, and other environmentally friendly techniques.

Policy 1.11: Promote low impact development strategies and designs as a way to manage stormwater runoff, including techniques such as vegetated swales, bio filters, eco-roofs, green streets, pervious pavement and other methods that mimic natural processes.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 2: Non-point pollution is reduced through low impact development principles, creative building practices,

and smart site design that can retain and treat stormwater generated on-site.

Policy 2.3: Through education, incentives, and regulation, promote low impact development principles that emulate natural water flow, minimize land disturbance, and incorporate natural landscape features into the built environment.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 7: Watersheds are protected and enhanced.

Policy 7.3: Avoid development in floodplains and wetland areas.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 10: Sensitive areas are protected by regulating development on affected sites.

Policy 10.2: Preserve undeveloped floodplain areas for stormwater conveyance.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 11: Open space is protected.

Policy 11.3: Restrict development within the floodplain. Where alternatives are not feasible, require balanced cut and fill to prevent loss of flood storage capacity and appropriate mitigation to prevent loss of ecological values.

Parks and Open Space

Land Use Goal 19: Planning and development of parks and trails are coordinated with the comprehensive plan and parks plan.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 12: Neighborhoods have adequate access to parks and open space areas.

Natural and Cultural Resources

Land Use Goal 14: The city's historic resources are protected and programs promote the reuse of these important cultural resources.

Land Use Goal 17: Tulsa's natural and sensitive areas are protected and conserved.

Parks Trails and Open Space Goal 7: Watersheds are protected and enhanced.

Policy 7.1: Update and improve City programs to protect, conserve and restore significant natural resources and habitats as part of a comprehensive watershed management strategy including education, incentives, regulation, and technical assistance.

2) Unincorporated Tulsa County

Three plans in unincorporated Tulsa County remain in effect as a guide for development in certain parts of unincorporated Tulsa County:

- The North Tulsa County Comprehensive Plan (1980-2000)
- District 9 Plan (bounded by the Arkansas River on the north and east, by the Skelly By-Pass and Tulsa County Line on the south, by 65th West Avenue on the west)
- District 24 Plan (bounded by 76th Street North on the north, by I-75 on the east, by 56th Street North on the south, and by the Osage County Line on the west)

The policies in these plans include concepts such as: preserving the natural environment, especially environmentally sensitive areas; improving the transportation network by providing pedestrian connections through sidewalks and trails; ensuring adequate infrastructure to support development; and prevent hazards in areas that flood. These district plans, although older, remain in effect and can be implemented through some of the provisions in the Subdivision and Development Regulations.

C. Staff Recommendation

The proposed Subdivision and Development Regulations appropriately responds to citizen input (goals and policies) found in the City of Tulsa Comprehensive Plan, while also addressing policies in the remaining district plans in the County.

Staff recommends **approval** of the adoption of the new Tulsa Metropolitan Area Subdivision and Development Regulations.

Ms. Miller stated she wanted to point out a few letters that were received since the last meeting. One is a letter from the Tulsa Health Department that you did not receive before the last meeting because it filtered as spam in email. The letter is supportive of the changes in the Subdivision Regulations that promote health and walkability such as connectivity and shorter block lengths. Ms. Miller stated a letter of support was also received by HBA. Ms. Miller stated after the packet was mailed a letter from Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was received and they are here to present a few recommendations. Ms. Miller stated staff recommendation is to adopt the Subdivision Regulations and Development Regulations as presented today or incorporating some of the recommendations from BPAC.

Travis Hulse from City of Tulsa Planner stated in the packet is a clean version of the Subdivision Regulations which does not include any edits or strike throughs

and a version that shows all the edits that have happened since the December 6th meeting. Mr. Hulse stated at the December 6th meeting there was both a public hearing draft and a redline version that was submitted as a part of the work groups recommendation. Mr. Hulse stated this commission asked staff at that time to reconvene with those groups and facilitate a conversation where as many or all the issues could be worked through if possible. Mr. Hulse stated the key issues that came from the December meeting were block lengths, performance guarantees, underground utilities and traffic impact analyses. Mr. Hulse stated there were other changes made things like adding language to policy and other modifications such as to allow administrative approval on things like general street layout patterns that would be seen on the Major Street and Highway Plan and some things with lot splits. Mr. Hulse stated supplemental summaries or “issue papers” of key issues that were previously identified in the proposed regulations and code amendments were created. Each paper includes a general introduction to the issue, a brief history of the conversation, and a regional/national comparison of a few analogous cities. The summarized research and analysis is followed by a recommended action of the staff technical team and work group.

BLOCK LENGTHS

Brief Description

Reducing allowable block lengths in subdivisions will result in increased connectivity, reduced traffic speeds, and a more efficient delivery of public and emergency services. The current Subdivision Regulations in the City of Tulsa and Tulsa County allow for a block length of 1,500 feet which is just over ¼ of a mile. This provision results in long, disconnected, and often times dangerous streets that prompt neighborhood requests for retroactive traffic calming measures such as speed bumps to be installed by the City/County.

Background

The work group and staff technical team focused on drafting language that would allow for both design flexibility and context sensitive solutions. The conversation mainly focused on maximum block lengths distinguished by development types (urban/suburban/rural), introducing non-motorized pedestrian connections, and the block length measurement practice. Block lengths started out as a one-size-fits-all approach and has evolved to allow for and encourage various infill and greenfield development scenarios. Additional modifications made since the public hearing include measuring blocks between property lines and adjusting the mean lot width dimensions of urban, suburban, and rural block types.

Comparison

In most regional sample markets the average maximum block length is 1,320 feet for residential subdivisions, with a dedicated easement to allow for a pedestrian connection if the block length exceeds 800 feet. Some communities further restrict nonresidential block lengths to 600 feet. National communities largely

follow similar provisions. The city of Fort Worth, TX employs the connectivity index method which is a required ratio of street segments to intersections.

Proposed Action

The subdivision regulations work group and staff technical team have agreed to the text as proposed in section 5-030.

PERFORMANCE GUARANTEES

Brief Description

Frequently when land is being subdivided certain public improvements are required to support the newly created lots. This may include streets, storm water management, sanitary sewer and water service, and other necessary utilities. Once the infrastructure development plans are approved, the developer is given the option of either installing the required improvements prior to filing the plat or providing written assurances that any required improvements will be installed within a set timeframe. The current development practice in Tulsa is to elect deferral of installation by signing the "Agreement Guaranteeing Installation of Improvements." This agreement requires no financial commitment from the developer. In the unlikely event the developer fails to complete the project due to bankruptcy or other unforeseen issues a performance guarantee, if adopted, would provide the City of Tulsa and Tulsa County with the financial means to complete the required improvements and ensure the newly created lots are served by all necessary utilities.

Background

The work group and staff technical team have worked to come up with a solution to minimize risk and liability while still providing an option to create legal lots of record at a minimal cost to the developer. Process improvements have been made to eliminate mandatory platting requirements as well as amendments to the state statutes to authorize some administrative (staff) approvals. Additional modifications made since the public hearing include allowing certain building permits to be released prior to filing of plat and requiring financial assurances for only that portion of required improvements not yet installed.

Comparison

Performance guarantees are required in all regional and national sample markets. Not all municipalities administer their program exactly the same and acceptable forms of financial assurances vary, but most allow a surety bond, letter of credit, certificate of deposit, etc.

Proposed Action

The subdivision regulations work group and staff technical team have agreed to the text as proposed in section 5-180.

TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSES

Brief Description

A transportation impact analysis (TIA) is a tool used to analyze and evaluate the impact that a proposed development may have on future traffic, transit, pedestrians, and cyclists. A few members of the Tulsa City Council have repeatedly expressed a desire for more specific information regarding transportation impacts during their review of certain projects that will result in increased intensities. By including a transportation impact analysis with requests for zoning map amendments, decision-makers can verify that the proposed development of the site will not have an injurious effect on surrounding property owners with regard to traffic.

Background

Tulsa does not presently have codified language or an established policy for TIA's during private development review. The work group and staff technical team started from scratch to draft an entirely new section to address all components including the applicability, timing of submittal and overall content. Much of the conversation has focused on when to require TIA's and also identifying specific land use categories that pose the greatest impact. Input collected during public review suggested an all or nothing approach based on thresholds of either increased peak hour traffic counts or average daily trips. The subject section has not received full support from the group and is still a work in progress.

Comparison

A TIA is a requirement of most national sample markets including, Omaha, Kansas City, Fort Worth, and Oklahoma City. Broken Arrow is the only regional municipality that has language concerning TIA requirements. A TIA is either required based on the established thresholds of increased peak hour and average daily traffic and/or at the discretion of engineering staff e.g. director of public works, development services staff, or director of engineering.

Proposed Action

The subdivision regulations work group and staff technical team have agreed to remove the proposed text in section 70-045 of the Zoning Code amendments to be considered separately at a future date.

UNDERGROUND UTILITIES

Brief Description

In an effort to enhance public safety, maintain reliable utility service, and reduce visual clutter within street rights-of-way, the new Subdivision and Development

Regulations propose a requirement that all new utility installations be placed underground.

Background

The topic of requiring new utilities to be buried underground was raised as a potential issue during the TMAPC work session and subsequent public hearing. The work group and staff technical team have identified cost implications as the main concern, primarily for infill/redevelopment sites. The existing utility franchise agreements and their impending renewal make this conversation especially challenging. In an effort to not lose ground with future development, current practices should be codified for clarity and consistency. A modification made since the public hearing includes adding the standardized plat language presently used on all Tulsa subdivision plats.

Comparison

Language concerning installation of utilities underground is only expressly stated nationally in Pittsburgh and regionally in Broken Arrow. Some sample communities make reference to additional standards and specifications for utility installation requirements not captured here.

Proposed Action

The subdivision regulations work group and staff technical team have agreed to the text as proposed in section 5-140.

Mr. Hulse stated this document is a blended document.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Jeffery Smith 11545 East 43rd Street, Tulsa, OK 74146

Mr. Smith stated he is the CEO of the Home Builders Association and is here to speak in support of the current document. Mr. Smith stated his group has worked hard the last 18 months with the Technical Team, the Consultant and the Working Group and are excited to move forward with pro development in the City of Tulsa and would urge the Planning Commission to vote in favor of the Subdivision Regulations.

Larry Mitchell 1211 West 2nd Street Tulsa, OK 74127

Mr. Mitchell stated he is the chairperson of the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). Mr. Mitchell stated BPAC was created 6 years ago with the idea that an advisory group in Tulsa would make Tulsa safer and friendlier for the people who ride bikes and walk. Mr. Mitchell stated BPAC would like to be more aware of what TMAPC is doing and offer BPAC's advice regarding Bicycle and Pedestrian matters.

Sarah Kobos 3709 East 43rd Street Tulsa, OK 74135

Ms. Kobos stated she is the secretary of BPAC and a bicycle commuter. Ms. Kobos stated in 2012 the City of Tulsa adopted a complete streets policy to

ensure the streets are safe, accessible and convenient for all people including pedestrians, bicycles and public transit riders. Ms. Kobos stated the neighborhoods where people live are designed solely for cars and that is where the Subdivision Regulations come in from BPAC's perspective. Ms. Kobos stated there is a lot in the Subdivision Regulations that BPAC does not have the knowledge about to have an opinion about but BPAC does know what kind of places work well with people who walk, bike or use public transit. Ms. Kobos stated some of the things important to BPAC is block length, connected streets, comfortable sidewalks and access to nearby destinations. Ms. Kobos stated she urges the Planning Commission to think about the BPAC recommendations. Ms. Kobos stated when the developer builds the streets and puts the utilities in place, builds the houses, sells the houses and transfers the streets to the city and then they are finished. Ms. Kobos stated from that point on the streets belong to the city so that is why it is important to ask for and demand the kinds of street networks that are flexible and efficient to the overall transportation system and neighborhoods play a key role in this decision. Ms. Kobos stated BPAC would like to see short connected block lengths for people who like to walk and bike. They increase the number of routes and decrease travel distances. Mr. Kobos stated long blocks do the opposite and encourage drivers to speed. Ms. Kobos stated BPAC would like to ask for a category for Urban High Density and Urban Low Density and make the Urban High Density with shorter blocks that would correspond with RS-4 and RS-5 zoning. She stated with Urban Low Density clarify average lot sizes between 50 and 60 feet in width. Ms. Kobos stated on the Suburban block lengths she believes there was a change to reduce lot widths to 125 feet and it was originally 150 feet and BPAC thinks that is appropriate because it corresponds with RS-1 and RS-2 zoning. Ms. Kobos stated BPAC would like to add the language "as well as adjacent parks, schools, libraries and other public facilities" and both "existing and planned" to 5-060.4 B. BPAC doesn't want occasions where it just isn't possible to conveniently get to the places you want to go. Ms. Kobos stated cul-de-sacs are another factor that limits street connectivity and route choices, in 5-060.5 BPAC would recommend changing from 750 feet to 500 feet that is still way to long but a good starting point for a compromise. Ms. Kobos stated in 5-060.9 Street Intersections it is important that offsets are not just considered on major streets but also on neighborhood streets. BPAC would like to strike "on a major street". Ms. Kobos stated in 5-080 Trails BPAC would recommend the language from the GoPlan be adopted and instead of using just the word trail use sidepath/trail and reference the GoPlan as one of the approved trails plan. Ms. Kobos stated under 5-140.2 Utilities BPAC would suggest a minor change saying utilities don't have to be buried if they are located on rear easements or alleyways. This keeps sidewalks clear for shade trees that are critical in Tulsa because of the heat in the summertime.

Andrew Shank 2727 East 21st Street, STE 200, Tulsa, OK 74114

Mr. Shank stated he would like to thank the Mayor's office for the opportunity to serve and this Commission for the opportunity to be meaningfully heard on how

these regulations impact development in Tulsa. Mr. Shank stated the Work Group is happy with the document before the Commission as submitted by staff. Mr. Shank stated he would like to thank a few people he leaned on through this process, Ken Klein, Ed Schermerhorn, Justin Morgan, Alan Betchan, Mark Capron and Eric Sack and we would ask that you approve the draft of the Subdivision Regulations given to the Commission by staff. Mr. Shank stated he has not seen the BPAC comments so he can't comment on those changes. Mr. Shank stated the Work Group has told him that the BPAC comments were inconsistent with the blended document from staff and the work group and the work group objects to any changes.

Bruce Dart 5051 South 129th East Avenue Tulsa, OK 74133

Mr. Dart stated he is Executive Director of the Tulsa Health Department and supports the Subdivision Regulation Draft. Mr. Dart stated only 20 percent of your ability to stay healthy rely on clinical care and the rest is social economic behaviors and environmental factors. Mr. Dart stated the regulations specifically touch on these factors and allows the community to be healthier. Tulsa and Oklahoma have struggled in health rankings. Mr. Dart stated Tulsa has improved because of some things Planning Commission has done. This is another step in making Tulsa a community where quality of life is extremely important for ourselves and our grandchildren.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Dix stated he believes things are concluding and he appreciates the handout BPAC provided but it's a little late to be including changes in this 18-month process. Mr. Dix made a motion to approve the Subdivision and Development Regulations as submitted by staff without further changes.

Mr. Walker seconded the motion.

Mr. Doctor stated he would like to make a small objection to Mr. Dix. After the meeting of November, the document was pushed back to staff and the work group to come up with the greatest consensus as possible. Mr. Doctor would like to thank the everyone for putting the time and effort especially the Work Group that put in months of time. Mr. Doctor stated a few points that were brought up by BPAC and echoed by the Tulsa Health Department need to be discussed by TMAPC as a body. Mr. Doctor stated the past few months has brought the document to its final stages and when the public review didn't go well in November TMAPC pushed it back to Working Group and staff so Mr. Doctor views this as the final stage of the public hearing on this document. Mr. Doctor stated there are a few recommendations from BPAC that he believes were not out of line with the consensus document brought forth today. Mr. Doctor stated to Mr. Shank acknowledging the trails language seems like a minor change but a more important piece is recognizing the GoPlan as a formally adopted planning

document adopted by TMAPC and by City Council making sure trails plans and trail side paths are being considered to build up that infrastructure that is included when addressing subdivision regulations around trails. Mr. Doctor stated that seems to be more semantic by including the correct terminology in terms of sidepaths and recognizing the GoPlan as a planning document for our city.

Mr. Shank answered respectively he doesn't feel comfortable commenting on a plan he has never seen. Mr. Shank stated the work group responded to a request of the commission to reconvene and the reason I thanked those guys on the record is because those guys took time out from our clients and businesses in doing this. Mr. Shank stated he has permission to say the BPAC plan is inconsistent with what was vetted from the work group and staff. Mr. Shank stated if TMAPC wants a comment he can't provide it today but can ask that the Commission approve the document before you today.

Mr. Doctor asked since this was such a small wording was this more of an inconsistency or clarification issue.

Mr. Shank answered small wording sinks ships in his world. Mr. Shank said he didn't know the effects of changing the document because he had not seen it so he could not say yea or nay until he read it. Mr. Shank stated that would be his answer to all Mr. Doctors questions. Mr. Shank asked Mr. Doctor if that made sense.

Mr. Doctor stated he understood Mr. Shank position.

Mr. Reynolds asked to address the commission.

Mr. Foster stated the members of BPAC are also volunteers who take time out of their day to contribute to these components and reviews. Mr. Foster stated he realized the comments were brought late but from their perspective they couldn't engage the process while staff worked through a consensus document with the work Group. Mr. Foster stated he thinks it's important to acknowledge that when reviewing the comments that they spent time on and they could be making money in their own jobs to get BPAC's comments a proper vetting and understand that these things are good for the city and understand the motivations of all the groups contributing to the conversation.

Lou Reynolds 2727 East 21st Street, STE 200, Tulsa, OK 74114

Mr. Reynolds stated in the Introductory Section 1-050 it says these regulations are adopted for the purposes of: Implementing the comprehensive plan and other adopted plans and policies. Mr. Reynolds stated the Go Plan is an adopted plan so it is already included.

Mr. Foster stated considering its already a part of the Subdivision Regulations he wouldn't think making an explicit reference would be objectional.

Mr. Covey stated everyone keeping jumping up like they have permission to speak and he stated he was not thrilled with that.

Mr. Doctor stated he was hoping to vet some of these ideas now. Mr. Doctor stated there are some recommendations he would like to give in terms of looking at this as a Board and if there is additional time to vet the smaller issues Mr. Doctor stated he wanted the board to do its due diligence. Mr. Doctor stated he thought the connectivity of the streets was important to the public infrastructure when it relates to parks, schools, libraries and other public facilities that are designed to be hubs for the community and building connections to those is a meaningful part of providing access to these amenities.

Ms. Adams stated she agrees with the comments Mr. Doctor stated, Rome wasn't built in a day and she believes they are on the cusp of doing great things in Tulsa and if it takes a little longer to get it right so that everyone agrees. Ms. Adams stated if there are questions out there if other things should be included or not quite right she believes that should be explored.

Mr. Shivel stated regarding BPAC, the other hat Mr. Shivel wears is chairman of the Transportation Advisory Board and one of the things stressed over the years in that respect is complete streets. Mr. Shivel stated as well intended as the motion was he believes, as Ms. Adams does, all items should be considered that directly affect the ability to have complete streets.

Ms. Krug stated she wanted to agree with Mr. Doctor and other Commissioners. Ms. Krug stated there are only a few small things left and she doesn't think it's a problem to keep constructively talking about those issues.

Mr. Doctor stated he wanted to clarify that this was the extension of the public input process and this is such an improved document over the first draft but to Mr. Doctor the important piece is the time to listen to public input and make minor shifts and build a stronger document. Mr. Doctor stated that was the public discussion he was hoping to have today. If a little extra time outside of today's meeting is needed he would prefer that be done.

Mr. Fretz stated would it be appropriate to go ahead and approve what is before the Board and work the changes in as amendments later.

Dr. Doctor stated we don't know if those would be big amendments or not because we aren't able to have that conversation today and until the items can be weighed and evaluated and included in our deliberations Mr. Doctor prefers to hold off on deciding if these changes can be done as amendments. Mr. Doctor

purposes a continuance to the next Planning Commission meeting for staff to look at these recommendations and vetted by the Work Group.

Mr. Covey asked Mr. Shank how much time the Working Group needed to review the document presented by BPAC.

Mr. Shank answered a week if someone will send him the document.

Ms. Krug stated after the document has been reviewed will there be an opportunity to discuss the topics and what changes we support.

Mr. Covey stated Ms. Krug could do that now.

Ms. Krug answered she would do that after hearing the changes at the next meeting.

Mr. Mitchell asked if there were people in the Work Group that would represent a bike plan viewpoint or active transportation viewpoint and if not, could there be.

Ken Klein 3240 East 61st Place, Tulsa, OK 74136

Mr. Klein stated he was with the Work Group and appreciates that there needs to be as broad citizen input as possible. The Working Group and a staff of over 20 planners who represent all the things being discussed now. Mr. Klein stated by their own presentation the bicycle group meets with the Mayor's office, meets with the planning department and meets with INCOG, where has all this been the last 18 months. Mr. Klein stated at some point you must draw a line in the sand and say we will continue to revise the document through amendments brought before TMAPC. Mr. Klein stated TMAPC gave very specific instructions, get together, get this solved and come back and let Planning Commission know where the groups are unified. Mr. Klein stated Planning Commission received a report from the Working Group and the Technical Committee saying they are in total accord and now all of that is being thrown out and now we start over again and we will have input from other groups and this is a waste of every one's time. Mr. Klein stated this should be voted on today and approved and then make amendments as needed.

Mr. Covey stated everyone that was a part of the Working Group including the Planning Commissioners put in a lot of time and effort to do their job to the best of their ability with that said Mr. Covey stated he can see both sides of this issue. Mr. Covey stated "yes" we are at a public hearing and that's the opportunity for public comments as BPAC has done and why should their comments be any less important than any one else's and shouldn't we consider them. Mr. Covey stated on the other side Mr. Klein articulated the position Mr. Covey was thinking about when is the line in the sand, if this is continued to next meeting and somebody else comes forward with comments are those comments any less valuable than

BPAC's. Mr. Covey stated at what point do we say no more and adopt the document and make the changes with amendments.

Mr. Fretz stated he would second everything Mr. Klein stated.

Mr. Doctor stated he couldn't agree more that there needs to be a line in the sand but the key distinction is this is the first chance for Commissioners and public to see the compromised document. This is the first public hearing since the document has changed substantially. Mr. Doctor stated he would be comfortable saying this next meeting would be the line in the sand and the document would be voted on in that meeting. Mr. Doctor stated we have had the public meeting today and distributed the draft document and if we aren't able to vet those ideas in this meeting based on the public comments and if that takes a couple meetings Mr. Doctor stated he was fine with that timeline.

Mr. Shivel stated he agreed with Mr. Doctor. Mr. Shivel stated as much as the Transportation Advisory Board is focused on complete streets and safe streets the whole task of making this a better city. If it's possible to do it in 2 weeks Mr. Shivel would support that.

Mr. Dix stated you don't want to know what he thinks but you will hear what he must say. Mr. Dix stated you are going to hear what he thinks. Mr. Dix stated he thinks the late coming group of suggestions or changes is a slap in the face to not only the Working Group but the Commissioners and the staff. Travis Hulse and Nathan Foster have done yeoman's work to get this document to this point. Mr. Dix stated this process has been going on for 18 months and to say BPAC has not had the opportunity to present their proposed changes is not correct. They have had more than ample opportunity to provide this input. Mr. Dix stated some of the changes he noticed have been considered and rejected or adopted but he can't know that for sure until he compares it with the original document. Mr. Dix stated he understands there is mood among the Commission to try and incorporate the changes into the current document. If staff can be instructed not to consider any further changes from any other groups or any further changes by this group then Mr. Dix stated he would withdraw his motion in difference to Mr. Doctors recommendation to table this item until the next meeting. Then we can vote on whatever changes staff and the Working Group can agree upon and only out of this BPAC document.

Ms. VanValkenburgh asked Mr. Walker if he would withdraw the second to this motion.

Mr. Walker stated he would withdraw his second.

Mr. Covey asked Mr. Dix if he withdrew his motion

Mr. Dix stated he thought he did.

Mr. Covey stated there were a lot of conditions so he was not sure he did.

Mr. Dix stated the condition being there are no further changes allowed beyond this by this or any other group and there are no further changes to the face document itself other than what might be agreed upon out of this BPAC document.

Mr. Covey stated he didn't know who was agreeing to that.

Mr. Dix stated deferred to Mr. Doctor if he will accept his recommendation.

Mr. Covey asked Ms. VanValkenburgh if that is something Mr. Doctor can do.

Ms. VanValkenburgh stated "no", they would just have to have a collegial understanding with one another about such matters.

Mr. Dix stated let's do it this way, at the next meeting Mr. Dix will ask if there have been any other changes by staff or the Working Group other than the BPAC document and understanding that at the next meeting I will withdraw my motion.

Mr. Doctor stated this is the only public comments we are receiving today and he can't imagine what other comments the Commission would be contemplating.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOCTOR**, TMAPC voted **8-1-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; Fretz, "nays"; none "abstaining"; Millikin, Reeds, "absent") to **CONTINUE** the Subdivision and Development Regulations to February 21, 2018.

* * * * *

Ms. Miller stated items 17 and 18 are amendments that go with the Subdivision and Development Regulations and therefore the Planning Commission may want to continue those also.

17. **ZCA-5** - Various amendments (related to new Tulsa Metropolitan Area Subdivision and Development Regulations) to the **City of Tulsa Zoning Code** in the following sections: Section 25.040 CO, Corridor District; Section 25.070 MPD, Master Planned Development District; Section 30.010 PUD, Planned Unit Development (Legacy) District; Section 40.110 Cottage House Developments; Section 40.290; Patio Houses; Section 40.390 Townhouses; Section 70.040 Development Plans; Section 70.050 Site Plans; Section 70.045 Transportation Impact Analysis(new); Section 70.080 Zoning Clearance and Platting Requirements; Section 90.080 Open Space per Unit; Section 95.150 Terms beginning with "L". (Continued from December 6, 2017)

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOCTOR**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Millikin, Reeds, “absent”) to **CONTINUE** ZCA-5 to February 21, 2018.

* * * * *

18. Various amendments (related to new Tulsa Metropolitan Area Subdivision and Development Regulations) to the **Tulsa County Zoning Code** in the following sections: Section 260. Platting Requirement; Section 850. Site Plan Review; Section 1120. General Provisions; Section 1140. Bulk and Area Requirements; Section 1150. Perimeter Requirements; Section 1160. Off-Street Parking and Loading; Section 1170. Administration of Planned Unit Development. (Continued from December 6, 2017)

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOCTOR**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Millikin, Reeds, “absent”) to **CONTINUE** Tulsa County Zoning Code to February 21, 2018.

OTHER BUSINESS

19. Commissioners' Comments

* * * * *

ADJOURN

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Krug, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Millikin, Reeds, "absent") to **ADJOURN** TMAPC meeting 2763.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Date Approved:

02-21-2018


Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary