

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 2776

Wednesday, August 15, 2018, 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		Chapman	Jordan, COT
Covey		Hoyt	Silman, COT
Dix		Miller	VanValkenburgh, Legal
Doctor		Sawyer	
Fothergill		Wilkerson	
Fretz		Ziegler	
Krug			
Millikin			
Reeds			
Ritchey			
Shivel			
Walker			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Friday August 10, 2018 at 3:30 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:

Chairman's Report:

Director's Report:

Ms. Miller discussed City Council actions taken and other special projects.

* * * * *

1. **Minutes:**

Approval of the minutes of August 1, 2018 Meeting No. 2775

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, the TMAPC voted 11-0-0 (Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fothergill, Fretz, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of August 1, 2018 Meeting No. 2775.

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. **PUD-307-C-1 Pete Webb** (CD 2) Location: West of the northwest corner of East 71st Street South and South Lewis Avenue requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to increase the allowable area of a dynamic display

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: PUD-307-C-1 Minor Amendment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Amendment Request: Modify the PUD Development Standards to allow a 43.5 sf dynamic display.

Currently, the sign standards for this site limit the size of a dynamic display to 32 sf. The applicant is proposing to increase this to 43.5 sf to provide better visibility to the sign. The sign would be used to promote events and activities at the Zarrow Campus.

Staff Comment: *This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 30.010.I.2.c(12) of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.*

“Modifications to approved signage, provided the size, location, number and character (type) of signs is 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-307-C shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment request to increase the allowable area of a dynamic display to 43.5 sf.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fothergill, Fretz, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to **APPROVE** Item 2 per staff recommendation.

Legal Description of PUD-307-C-1:

2025 E 71st St S
Lot 1, Block 1 Camp Shalom

* * * * *

Ms. Millikin read the opening statement and rules of conduct for the TMAPC meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

3. **PUD-757-A Stuart Van De Wiele** (CD 4) Location: North of the northwest corner of South Norfolk Avenue and East 15th Street South requesting a **PUD Major Amendment** to change development standards to original PUD (Continued from August 1, 2018)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: PUD-757-A

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:

Maple Terrace is a single-family residence infill development with a maximum of three (3) single family homes located on three (3) individual lots designed for occupancy by single family resident owners with common area facilities and one reserve area (Reserve A) to be maintained by a Homeowners Association as shown on Exhibit “A”, Detailed Site Plan.

The subject property is zoned Residential Townhome and is subject to Planned Unit Development No. 757 (as amended by PUD-757-1, PUD-757-2, and PUD-757-3). The Development and the PUD have undergone multiple changes and amendments and this major amendment is designed to set forth the development standards applicable to the project and property both as currently constructed

and as-constructed at completion. The development standards shown herein and amended pursuant to the current City of Tulsa Zoning Code shall supersede and replace the development standards as previously adopted or amended under the prior version of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

The three (3) lots will provide for a minimum aggregate average of 1,200 square feet of Open Space per residential lot (taking into account the Open Space of Reserve A) and will provide for more than adequate off-street parking for the residents and their guests. The Homeowners Association will maintain a reserve area (Reserve A) which will serve not only as a common access point for the residents, but also as an emergency access point for emergency vehicles and as a turnaround for emergency vehicles on Norfolk Avenue. Turnaround for local traffic is a requirement of the PUD will be addressed in the infrastructure development plan (IDP) process separate and apart from this PUD amendment.

SECTION II: PUD 757-A Development Standards

LAND AREA:

Net	18,612 Square feet
Gross	24,994 square feet

PERMITTED USES - LOTS:

Three (3) single-family residences and uses customarily accessory to the same

PERMITTED USES - RESERVE A:

Mutual access, Open Space, landscaping, landscape lighting, and walls / fences subject to the approval by the city. Gate controlled entrance (minimum 20' in width) for resident and guest pedestrian and vehicle access, emergency vehicle access, emergency vehicle turnaround from South Norfolk Avenue, common area facilities and utilities, and other uses customarily accessory to residential dwellings, to be maintained by the Homeowners Association.

Gate controlled entrance within Reserve A shall be a minimum width of twenty feet (20').

Conceptual diagram of gate is as shown on Exhibit "C" and the location of the gate within Reserve A is as shown on

the Conceptual Site Plan attached as Exhibit "A".

<u>MAXIMUM NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS:</u>	Three (3)
<u>MINIMUM WIDTH - LOT:</u>	33 Feet
<u>MINIMUM LOT AREA:</u>	3,450 Square Feet
<u>MINIMUM OPEN SPACE:</u>	1,200 Square Feet per Lot (aggregate average including Reserve-A) as shown on the Open Space Exhibit attached as Exhibit "B"
<u>MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT:</u>	38 Feet from finished floor elevation as shown on the Detailed Site Plan attached as Exhibit "A" and on the Conceptual Building Elevations attached as Exhibit "E".
<u>OFF-STREET PARKING:</u>	Minimum of 6 per Lot (including stacked parking on the respective Lot in garages or on driveway)
MINIMUM SETBACK: East*	8 Feet from Property Line**
MINIMUM SETBACK: North*	5 Feet from Property Line**
MINIMUM SETBACK: West*	5 Feet from Property Line**
MINIMUM SETBACK: South*	10 Feet from Property Line**
MINIMUM SETBACK: Interior lot line	0 3 feet

* Any encroachment into a utility easement is subject to approval by the City.

** References to the property line are the exterior boundary of the Maple Terrace Plat.

SIGNS: One (1) neighborhood identification sign or "Maple Terrace" sign shall be permitted either on the gate or on the fence at the South Norfolk Avenue entrance. Such sign shall have a maximum of 12 square feet of display surface area.

LIGHTING:

No exterior lighting other than (i) customary exterior home lighting, (ii) landscape lighting, or (iii) LED underlighting to be located under each column cap along the fence / wall columns (inside and outside of columns).

FENCES/WALLS:

A masonry, decorative iron and stucco screening fences and retaining wall structure shall be permitted along the east, north, west and south perimeters of the property similar to the type, size and style depicted on the Conceptual Wall / Fence diagrams as shown on Exhibit "D" attached hereto if permitted by the city. A Fence / Wall profile with appropriate details shall be approved as part of a TMAPC Detailed Site plan approval prior to receipt of a building permit. Exhibit D is provided for illustrative purposes only.

The maximum height of the fence/wall structure as measured on the inside may not exceed 8 feet from the finished ground or pavement surface.

The columns which are made a part of the wall and fence are excluded from that dimension however those columns may not exceed the height of the wall or fence panel by no more than 1.5 feet.

The existing retaining wall shall not be considered part of the fence height.

ENTRY GATE:

Entrance gate, if constructed, shall be open decorative wrought iron type gate as shown on the Conceptual Gate Design and Specifications as shown on Exhibit "C" attached hereto. The entrance gate shall maneuver as shown on the Detailed Site Plan attached as Exhibit "A" attached hereto.

PRIVATE DRIVE / ACCESS:

The private access drive will be constructed to connect to the City right-of-way on South Norfolk Avenue with a quality and thickness that meets or exceeds City standards for a minor residential public street. The apron to access to the property from the existing edge of pavement to the West right-of-way of South Norfolk Avenue will be constructed to meet or exceed City standards for Residential Concrete Driveway / Asphalt Streets. The access drive details will be determined prior to Detailed Site Plan approval

and meet the standards required by the Tulsa Fire Department.

Local Traffic Turnaround A turnaround for local traffic, of a design approved by the City fire department, engineering services department and development services department, shall be constructed by the developer at the north end of Norfolk avenue.

PLATTING REQUIREMENT: Already platted.

DETAILED SITE PLAN: Attached as Exhibit "A" illustrates the general concept for the development but does not accurately illustrate details of building locations ~~and does not illustrate~~ final design for Reserve A or for the expected pavement improvements at the north end of Norfolk (turnaround for local traffic).

Detailed Site Plan approval for the perimeter fencing, retaining walls, gates, **Norfolk pavement requirements required by various city departments.** and Reserve A will be reviewed through the normal **detailed** site plan approval process identified in the Tulsa Zoning Code. Final site plan approval will not be released by INCOG staff until written approval of the final design is received from the Fire Department, **Engineering Department** and from Development Services.

Final home inspections will not be released until the detailed site plan is approved and all site plan improvements are fully completed. An Engineer licensed in the state of Oklahoma shall provide a letter stating that all Site Plan Improvements are completed prior to release of the final home inspections.

OPEN SPACE PLAN: Attached as Exhibit "B".

HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION: Developer will create a Homeowners Association to maintain Reserve A and all common facilities.

TOPOGRAPHY: Alteration of grades from the contours existing upon the completion of the installation of utilities and the completion of all construction activities shall be

prohibited unless required permitting (if any) is obtained from the City of Tulsa for such alteration.

IDP PROCESS:

Infrastructure improvements necessary for the development shall be pursued and approved through IDP process separate and apart from the PUD amendment process.

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE:

It is anticipated that upon release of the necessary permits, construction of the development will be complete within six (6) months thereof.

DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Development standards identified in Section II above are consistent with the provisions of the PUD chapter of the Tulsa Zoning Code and,

PUD 757-A establishes new development standards that may have been considered minor amendments if reviewed individually. The aggregate of all changes along with engineering and fire code requirements which will affect abutting property owners to the extent that staff has determined that the PUD amendment cannot be processed except through a major amendment and,

The Development Standards for PUD 757-A in Section II above are consistent with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and,

Infrastructure that was required by the previous PUD has not been installed and concepts important to fire safety and vehicular access have not been reviewed or approved by City of Tulsa Development Services. Those infrastructure design solutions could affect the final site plan approval as it relates to the private drive and gate approval. Staff will support engineering department and development services department regarding any additional site plan design details that may be necessary to satisfy infrastructure and fire safety requirements during the detailed site plan required by the PUD and,

The construction of several structures has proceeded outside the standards of the original PUD. This PUD amendment has been written to amend the site details that that can be amended within the PUD chapter provisions of the Tulsa Zoning Code therefore,

Staff recommends approval of PUD-757-A as outlined in Section II above.

SECTION III: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: The PUD development standards identified in Section II above are consistent with the New Neighborhood land use designation and the Area of Growth concept identified in the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan.

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: New Neighborhood

“The New Neighborhood residential building block is comprised of a plan category by the same name. It is intended for new communities developed on vacant land. These neighborhoods are comprised primarily of single-family homes on a range of lot sizes but can include townhouses and low-rise apartments or condominiums. These areas should be designed to meet high standards of internal and external connectivity and shall be paired with an existing or New Neighborhood or Town Center.”

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Growth

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

Areas of Growth are found throughout Tulsa. These areas have many different characteristics but some of the more common traits are proximity to or abutting an arterial street, major employment and industrial areas, or areas of the city with an abundance of vacant land. Also, several of the Areas of Growth are in or near downtown. Areas of Growth provide Tulsa with the opportunity to focus growth in a way that benefits the City as a whole. Development in these areas will provide housing choice and excellent access to efficient forms of transportation including walking, biking, transit, and the automobile.”

Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: None that affect site development

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: PUD 757-A abuts the Midland Valley Trail. Connectivity to the trail is an important concept in the GO Plan. Access from the north End of Newport by ODOT fencing however easy access to the trail is located just west of this site on E. 15th Street. Sidewalk construction should be required from the front entrance on Norfolk to E. 15th Street.

Small Area Plan: None

Special District Considerations: None

Historic Preservation Overlay: None

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Staff Summary: Construction on the site has started with at least one home that does not conform limitations that were part of the original PUD. Additional construction for fencing and retaining walls have been started without building permit approval or detailed site plan approval and appear to conflict with design requirements that were originally approved in the PUD. The retaining wall system on the south end of the site and conflicts with City sanitary sewer and it is likely that a new public sewer system will be required for this project.

Environmental Considerations: None that affect site redevelopment

Streets:

<u>Exist. Access</u>	<u>MSHP Design</u>	<u>MSHP R/W</u>	<u>Exist. # Lanes</u>
South Norfolk Ave	None	50 feet	2

Utilities:

The subject tract has municipal water and sewer available. Note: Sanitary sewer service relocation may be required.

Surrounding Properties:

Location	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use Designation	Area of Stability or Growth	Existing Use
North	RS-3	None	None	Broken Arrow Expressway and Inner dispersal Loop
East	OL and RS-4 (north lot)	Existing Neighborhood and Main Street	Stability on north and Growth on south	Single Family Residential
South	OL	Main Street	Existing Neighborhood	Medical Office
West	RM-2	Main Street	Growth	Vacant

SECTION IV: Relevant Zoning History

ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 21978 dated January 6, 2009, established zoning for the subject property. (RS-3/OL to RT/PUD)

Subject Property:

PUD-757/Z-7096 January 2009: All concurred in **approval** of a proposed *Planned Unit Development* on a .43± acre tract of land and **approval** of a request for *rezoning* from RS-3/OL to RT/PUD for a townhouse development on property located north of the northwest corner of South Norfolk Avenue and East 15th Street South, the subject property.

Minor Amendments:

PUD-757-1 February 2014: All concurred in **approval** of a *minor amendment* to PUD-757 to allow Use Unit 6 (Single-family Dwellings); and **denied** a *minor amendment* to allow architectural elements to extent past the 35 feet height element.

PUD-757-2 August 2014: All concurred in **approval** of a *minor amendment* on the consent agenda for PUD-757 to reduce the setback from South Norfolk Avenue to ten feet from the property line.

PUD-757-3 November 2014: All concurred in **approval** of a *minor amendment* on the consent agenda for PUD-757 to reduce the setback of the west boundary from 20 feet to 11 feet.

Z-6081 January 1986: All concurred in **approval** of a request for *rezoning* a tract of land from RS-3 to OL for office use on property located on the northwest corner of East 15th Street South and South Norfolk Avenue (included a portion of the subject property).

Surrounding Property:

BOA-21925 July 2015: The Board of Adjustment **denied** a *special exception* to permit an office in an RM-2 district; a *variance* to reduce the required building setback from the centerline of East 15th Street from 85 feet to 50 feet; and a *variance* to permit a 3-story office building in an RM-2 zoned district, on property located south and west of the subject property, or west of the northwest corner of East 15th Street South and South Norfolk Avenue.

Z-6378 April 1993: All concurred in **approval** of a request for a *supplemental overlay zoning* on a tract of land to HP for historic preservation on property located south of the subject property.

Z-6339/PUD-478 December 1991: All concurred in **approval** of a request for *rezoning* a 7.73± acre tract of land from OL/OMH/RS-3 to RS-4 and **approval** of a proposed *Planned Unit Development* for a single-family development with private streets on property located west of the northwest corner of South Peoria Avenue and East 15th Street.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Dix asked staff where the sewer line was in reference to the retaining wall.

Staff answered the sewer line is underneath and parallel to the retaining wall.

Mr. Dix asked if the sewer line was inside the retaining wall.

Staff answered it is underneath the retaining wall just below the footing. Staff stated this is one of many issues. Staff stated the City has gone to the site and ran a camera through the sanitary sewer system and it was determined the line is sagging already and the City won't accept ownership and maintenance of the sewer line. Staff stated the sewer line will have to be relocated somewhere else.

Applicant's Comments:

Stuart Van De Wiele 320 South Boston, STE 200, Tulsa, OK 74103

Mr. Van De Wiele stated he represents Paul Jackson who is the developer in connection with the amendment to this previously approved PUD. Mr. Van De Wiele stated the primary issues are the sewer at the southwest corner and the turnaround at the end of the street, both are being addressed through the IDP process. Mr. Van De Wiele stated as staff mentioned this is a cleanup process to have the development constructed according to the PUD. Mr. Van De Wiele stated one of things that has caused this issue is the cutting in of the Broken Arrow Expressway which created several dead-end streets in the neighborhood. Mr. Van De Wiele stated this will be corrected in the IDP. Mr. Van De Wiele stated the process for calculating the building height was an issue in a previous amendment, but the permits were issued after a discussion between permitting and the architect. Mr. Van De Wiele stated there is a petition in the packet signed by almost all the neighbors impacted on Norfolk Avenue, north of 15th Street except for Mr. Pielsticker who is concerned about the turnaround at the end of the street.

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Kenneth Fike 1431 South Owasso Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74120

Mr. Fike stated he lives in the addition to the East of the subject property. Mr. Fike stated this development has no effect on his view or his life. Mr. Fike stated

he listened to both Mr. Wilkerson and Mr. Van De Wiele speak and doesn't disagree with anything either one of the speakers stated but how many changes can someone do and flaunt in the City's face and the City be okay with that. Mr. Fike stated it is easier to ask for forgiveness than permission, most have done that with their mothers and somebody is doing that with the City. Mr. Fike stated it doesn't seem right, there is an issue with the sewer, an issue with how the walls are built, and an issue with how to turn around. He said there won't be a driveway for this property and Mr. Fike can't see how they are going to build a hammerhead turnaround in this area because there is not a park area like in his neighborhood. Mr. Fike stated he thinks they will have to turn around in Mr. Pielstickers driveway or someone else's driveway. Mr. Fike stated if there was only one problem then no one would be here but it's one after another after another.

Mr. Van De Wiele stated he spoke to another neighbor that had the same concern as Mr. Fike, which is could this creep to the east. Mr. Van De Wiele stated he told that neighbor this PUD does not change the zoning of the homes on the east side of Norfolk Avenue.

Mr. Walker asked the applicant where did the mistakes and negligence stem from?

Mr. Van De Wiele stated he wouldn't agree that it was negligence. He stated in the letter of deficiency the permitting office issued it stated there was a 35-foot height issue and Mr. Van De Wiele thinks they were referencing the building code aspect without referencing the PUD development standards. Mr. Van De Wiele stated he believes some of the issues are because of a time lapse in when the PUD was approved and when the building was built. Mr. Van De Wiele stated in the meeting with Development Services, Engineering and INCOG there is clearly a breakdown in communication on both sides and that is why he has been involved to push this to a finale.

Mr. Reeds stated when looking at the measurements on pages 3.26 and 3.27 of the agenda packet he would like to know if there were a set of plans for this project.

Mr. Van De Wiele answered "yes" some of the issue is there are cantilevers and the bottom floor is further from the property line and the building is wider as it goes up. Mr. Van De Wiele stated what is being shown is the footprint as if it were smashed down to be 2 dimensional. Mr. Van De Wiele stated these are the buildings that were permitted.

Mr. Reeds stated there are ways you can work with City Engineering to cantilever over easements but that is done before you start building.

Mr. Van De Wiele stated he understands.

Mr. Reeds stated Mr. Van De Wiele is trying to help the developer but he is having trouble supporting his application.

Mr. Covey asked, Mr. Reed as an Architect if this is not approved what is the alternative?

Mr. Reeds answered he would like to wait until it goes through City Engineering to allow them to work out the issues.

Mr. Covey asked staff what is the likelihood that everything that needs to be done is in this plan.

Mr. Wilkerson stated one of the reasons a continuance was needed at the last meeting was because when we asked for information and that information was provided there were a few more issues to address but at this point Mr. Wilkerson believes they have an accurate representation of what is on the ground, but it would be impossible to predict the future. Mr. Wilkerson stated on Friday it was decided to look at this at the detailed site plan review level because that would give another chance to look at this to make sure everything is done as it should be before the final home inspections are granted. Mr. Wilkerson stated if something comes up that needs to be addressed the applicant would have to come back for another PUD amendment at that time.

Mr. Dix stated his real issue is the sewer line. Mr. Dix asked if there was an option rather than relocating such as a maintenance bond to allow repair of the sewer line should there be an issue.

Staff stated the City Engineering office is not interested in any of the other options.

Mr. Van De Wiele stated the principal discussions with City Engineering are PUD, the IDP, the sewer line which is part of the IDP, and the retaining wall. He stated in a lot of the discussions it is unclear which of those dominoes needs to fall first so the thought and goal was to get those taken care of and this will come back through INCOG for the Detailed Site Plan review.

Mr. Walker asked the applicant how this application was triggered.

Mr. Van De Wiele stated he filed the application and he filed it to address several issues as discussed. But it ultimately came about through discussions with the City and the developer. Mr. Van De Wiele stated it was at the insistence of the City that this development could not continue until the issues were addressed.

Mr. Reeds stated this is a unique situation.

Mr. Dix stated it bothers him that the surveyor laid the building out and allowed this to happen and the contractor ignored the surveyor's lines or choose to violate it. Mr. Dix stated the City is not going to make him tear it down, so you must deal with the issues and how to fix them and staff has agreed so Mr. Dix doesn't see any reason to delay it.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fothergill, Fretz, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** Major Amendment PUD-757-A per staff recommendation.

Legal Description of PUD-757-A:

LOT 1 BLOCK 1; LOT 2 BLOCK 1; RESERVE A; LOT 3 BLOCK 1, MAPLE TERRACE, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

4. **Z-7451 Kathryn Hall** (CD 4) Location: South of the southwest corner of East 7th Street South and South Troost Avenue requesting rezoning from **RM-2 to IL**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: Z-7451

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:

The site is occupied by an existing industrial building in a residentially zoned area. The building has been used for light industrial and office uses for decades. Currently the building is being used as a design incubator and upholstery shop and conflicts with the zoning on the property. The proposed uses and existing uses are allowed in a CH district as Commercial Services.

DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

CH zoning is consistent with the Downtown Neighborhood land use designation in the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and,

CH zoning is consistent with the expected development pattern outlined in the 6th Street Infill Plan and,

Uses allowed in CH zoning are non-injurious to the surrounding properties therefore,

Staff recommends denial of the request for IL zoning on this site however staff recommends approval of Z-7451 to rezone property from RM-2/ to CH.

SECTION II: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: IL zoning was originally recommended by staff and requested by the applicant. After further review, IL zoning was determined to be inconsistent with the land use vision of the small area plan. Staff met with the property owner and determined that CH zoning would satisfy the future needs of the current property owner and encourage future development goals of the small area plan. CH zoning is consistent with the Downtown Neighborhood and also with the large-scale mixed-use infill area designated in the small are plan.

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: Downtown Neighborhood

Downtown Neighborhoods are located outside but are tightly integrated with the Downtown Core. These areas are comprised of university and higher educational campuses and their attendant housing and retail districts, former warehousing and manufacturing areas that are evolving into areas where people both live and work, and medium- to high-rise mixed-use residential areas. Downtown Neighborhoods are primarily pedestrian-oriented and are well connected to the Downtown Core via local transit. They feature parks and open space, typically at the neighborhood scale.

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Growth

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

Areas of Growth are found throughout Tulsa. These areas have many different characteristics but some of the more common traits are close proximity to or abutting an arterial street, major employment and industrial areas, or areas of the city with an abundance of vacant land. Also,

several of the Areas of Growth are in or near downtown. Areas of Growth provide Tulsa with the opportunity to focus growth in a way that benefits the City as a whole. Development in these areas will provide housing choice and excellent access to efficient forms of transportation including walking, biking, transit, and the automobile.”

Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: None that affect site redevelopment

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: None that affect site redevelopment

Small Area Plan: The Pearl District-6th Street Small Area Plan

The general urban design recommendations of the Pearl District small area plan recognize this area as a large-scale, residential/mixed use infill area. The site is also very close to planned flood control facilities that will help mitigate the flooding in this area that was developed long before contemporary flood plain management criteria were established.

Z-7451 is all within the redevelopment sub area which recognizes the potential for higher density redevelopment that can be successfully integrated into the neighborhood in areas surrounding future flood control areas.

Special District Considerations: None except the small area planning efforts.

Historic Preservation Overlay: None

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Staff Summary: The site is occupied by a two-story building which was constructed over 50 years ago. Originally the building was an industrial building approved by the Board of Adjustment. The site is in the City of Tulsa regulatory floodplain. Redevelopment opportunities will be affected by that designation.

Street View Snippet from southeast corner of lot looking northwest: (See next page)



Environmental Considerations: No known concerns that would affect site redevelopment except the Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain.

Streets:

<u>Exist. Access</u>	<u>MSHP Design</u>	<u>MSHP R/W</u>	<u>Exist. # Lanes</u>
South Troost Avenue	None	50 feet	2 lanes

Utilities:

The subject tract has municipal water and sewer available.

Surrounding Properties:

Location	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use Designation	Area of Stability or Growth	Existing Use
North	IL	Downtown Neighborhood	Growth	Car repair
East	RM-2 and OL	Downtown Neighborhood	Growth	Empty lot and Multi-family
South	RM-2	Downtown Neighborhood	Growth	Empty lot

West	RS-4	Downtown Neighborhood	Growth	Empty lot and single family residential
------	------	--------------------------	--------	--

SECTION III: Relevant Zoning History

History: Z-7451

ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 11815 dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property:

BOA-2571 July 14, 1954: The Board of Adjustment **approved** a *request* from Coleman Instrument Company to establish off-street parking on Lots 3, 9-12, 23, and 24, Block 2, Parkdale Addition, subject to the off-street parking regulations with no access road on Trenton, daylight parking only from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. and the lot being shrubbed four feet from the property line, on property located on the subject property.

BOA-1800 April 9, 1946: The Board of Adjustment **approved** a *request* from Coleman Instrument Company to erect a 50' addition to the present building on Lots 7 and 8, Block 22, Parkdale Addition, to extend to Lots 5 and 6, being the extension of a nonconforming use in a U-2 district, located on the subject property.

Minutes read: "Moved by Bashaw (Borochoff) that, in view of the fact that this property is in line with the industrial development of this area, application be granted. All members voting yea. Carried."

Surrounding Property:

Z-6481 May 1995: All concurred in **approval** of a request for *rezoning* a 58+ acre tract of land from RM-2 to RS-4 on property located between East 7th Street South and approximately 150' north of East 11th Street and approximately 130' west of South Quaker Avenue to approximately 250' east of South Troost Avenue, and it abuts the western boundary of the subject property.

BOA-11150 August 21, 1980: The Board of Adjustment **approved** a *variance* of the setback requirements from 37.5' to 31.9' from the centerline of the street; and a *variance* of the setback from an R district from 75' to 6'; and a *special exception* to waive the screening requirement where the purpose of the screening cannot be achieved, on property located on the southwest corner of East 7th Street South and South Troost Avenue.

BOA-9631 August 18, 1977: The Board of Adjustment **approved** a *variance* to the setback requirements from the centerline of 7th Street from 37.5' to 31.9' in an

IL district; and a *special exception* to remove the screening where the purpose of the screening cannot be achieved, per plot plan submitted, on property located on the southwest corner of East 7th Street South and South Troost Avenue.

Z-4484 August 1973: All concurred in **approval** of a request for *rezoning* a 0.16± acre tract of land from RM-2 to IL on property located on the southeast corner of South Troost Avenue and East 7th Street South (Lots 1 and 2, Block 2, Parkdale Addition).

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Dix asked staff if this is approved and funding becomes available to complete the Pearl Street retention plan does the Applicant have recourse or does the City have to use condemnation to take this property for the retention basin.

Staff stated the storm water retention area is south of this site and now is a voluntary acquisition.

The applicant indicated her agreement with staff’s recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fothergill, Fretz, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to **APPROVE** Z-7451 rezoning from RM-2 to CH per staff recommendation.

Legal Description of Z-7451:

Lots 3-12, BLK 2, PARK DALE AMD, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

* * * * *

Ms. Miller stated Jane Ziegler who is a Transportation Planner at INCOG will present item 5

5. CPA-74, Consider adoption of amendments to the **GO Plan/Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

A. Item for consideration: Adoption of amendments to the *GO Plan* (Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan) as an amendment to the *Tulsa Comprehensive Plan*.

B. Background: The *GO Plan* is a guide to determine street design, but engineering constraints and judgement will be considered as street projects are designed and implemented, with connectivity of the overall network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities as the primary goal. During implementation, the *GO Plan* recommendations will be cross-referenced with the latest version of the Highway Capacity Manual Multimodal Level of Service (MMLOS) to ensure the best levels of service are achieved for all users in the design process, and in choosing appropriate bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

The *GO Plan* was adopted by the TMAPC on August 16, 2017 and approved by City Council on August 30, 2017. The plan document can be found at www.TulsaTRC.org/GOPlan.

Since adoption, several proposed amendments have been identified. The recommended changes located at or near the South Garnett Road & E. 23rd Street South intersection were recommended after a walkability study that included members of INCOG's Transportation Department, the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, City of Tulsa Planning and Tulsa Health Department. There is both public and private interest in turning this corridor into an International District. A private developer, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and other business owners already have design plans for the area. The amendments to the *GO Plan* is the transportation component for these plans.

The Jeff Speck amendments in the IDL were upon request by the Mayor's Office. The DCC invited and paid for Jeff Speck to analyze downtown in hopes to, "...have a profoundly positive impact on the physical form, economic success, and social vitality of the city." Once these amendments are adopted, the city will be able to use *GO Plan Improve Our Tulsa* funds to implement some of the downtown bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure named in the study.

Additionally, there are also amendments proposed to reflect the 1999 Trails Plan, as well as projects that the City of Tulsa is currently working on.

C. Staff recommendation: Staff recommends that the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission adopt the *GO Plan* (Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan) as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Fothergill asked why change number 62 stopped at 65th West Avenue?

Ms. Ziegler stated it stops at 65th West Avenue because there is a connector there to the Katy Trail. She stated the idea is to get people off Charles Page Boulevard and on to the Katy Trail.

Mr. Fothergill stated the jurisdiction states Tulsa City, but it stops at 49th West Avenue.

Ms. Ziegler stated the City of Tulsa Planning Department and the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee requested this because the City of Tulsa is working on a Small Area Plan for the Crosbie Heights area and they wanted this included in their plan, but Ms. Ziegler stated she can do Tulsa City/Tulsa County.

Mr. Reeds asked if an app has been developed for bike riders to know where there would be in less danger.

Ms. Ziegler stated “no” but there is Tulsa Bike Share and there is a computer on the bike that tells you where to go.

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fothergill, Fretz, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to recommend **ADOPTION** of CPA-74 *GO Plan* (Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan) amendment to the Comprehensive Plan per staff recommendation.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. Commissioners' Comments

None

* * * * *

ADJOURN

TMAPC Action; 11 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **11-0-0** (Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fothergill, Fretz, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; none “absent”) to **ADJOURN** TMAPC meeting 2776.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Date Approved:

06-05-2018


Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary