

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 2796

Wednesday, June 19, 2019, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Chamber

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

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Covey	Doctor	Foster	Jordan, COT
Kimbrel	Fothergill	Good	Silman, COT
McArtor	Reeds	Hoyt	VanValkenburgh, Legal
Ray	Ritchey	Jones	Brierre, INCOG
Shivel	Walker	Miller	
Van Cleave		Sawyer	
		Wilkerson	
		Wing	

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Thursday, June 13, 2019 at 2:00 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:

None

Director's Report:

Ms. Miller reported on City Council and Board of County Commissioner actions and other special projects. Ms. Miller stated the City Council has officially voted to rescind the initiation of the Lewis Study Overlay. There was a community meeting in January to allow the affected property owners who own property along Lewis be part of the discussion. Ms. Miller stated there was a consensus that the

Overlay was not needed at this time. Ms. Miller stated every 3 years the Oklahoma State Chapter of the American Planning Association instead of having just a state conference for Oklahoma, partners with several other states Kansas, Missouri and Arkansas hold a quad state conference. Ms. Miller stated this year it will be held here in Tulsa. Ms. Miller stated it will be at the Hyatt on October 9 through 12th. Ms. Miller stated if any Planning Commissioner would like to attend their registration fees we will covered. Ms. Miller stated she will email the information to Commissioners.

* * * * *

1. **Minutes:**

Approval of the minutes of June 5, 2019 Meeting No. 2795

On **MOTION** of **SHIVEL**, the TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, “absent”) to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of June 5, 2019, Meeting No. 2795.

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-816-3 Ken Barth** (CD 6) Location: Southeast corner of East 45th Place South and South 180th East Avenue requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to reduce the required rear setback from 20 ft to 18 ft

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: PUD-816-3 Minor Amendment

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Amendment Request: Revise the development standards to reduce the required rear setback from 20 ft to 18 ft.

Currently, the development standards limit the rear setback for this lot to 20 ft. The applicant is proposing to build over this line by less than two feet. The applicant’s proposed site plan has been included with this report. This proposal would reduce the rear yard setback for the subject lot to 18 ft, to permit the

home, as shown on the site plan. This proposed setback is outside of the 17 ½ ft Utility Easement located at the south boundary of the lot.

Staff Comment: This request can be considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 30.010.I.2.c(9) of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

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

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

- 1) The requested amendment does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD.
- 2) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-816 and subsequent amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment request to reduce the required rear setback from 20 ft to 18 ft for the subject lot.

Legal Description PUD-816-3:

Lot 7, Block 5 Huntington Park

17926 E 45th PI S

3. **5300 Commerce Park Addition** (CD 7) Change of Access, Location: West of the northwest corner of East 56th Street South and South Mingo Road

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **McARTOR**, TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, “absent”) to **APPROVE** Items 2 and 3 per staff recommendation.

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

4. **Z-7485 Mike Thedford, Wallace Engineering** (CD 9) Location: South of the southeast corner of South Toledo Avenue and East 31st Street South and requesting rezoning from **RS-3 to CS with optional development plan (Applicant requests a continuance to July 3, 2019)**

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **McARTOR**, TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, “absent”) to **CONTINUE** Z-7485 to July 3, 2019.

* * * * *

5. **MR-11** (CD 4) Modification to the Subdivision & Development Regulations to remove the sidewalk requirement for a new single-family residence, Location: East of the northeast corner of South Florence Avenue and East 27th Street South

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant has requested that the Planning Commission remove the requirement that the property owner construct a sidewalk as part of the construction of a new home. The newly adopted Subdivision and Development Regulations require sidewalks to be constructed on any new development requiring both new construction building permits and a certificate of occupancy.

As alternative solutions for sidewalks are explored, staff will begin evaluating each request for modification based on a set of criteria. Any future program would utilize similar criteria when making eligibility determinations for alternatives. Examples of criteria include the following:

1. Proximity to major pedestrian destinations such as parks, schools, public amenities, and retail areas.
2. Presence of existing pedestrian infrastructure within a walkable area of the subject property
3. Funded capital improvement projects that will impact property under application
4. Proximity and ability to connect to collector or arterial streets
5. Topographical or environmental challenges that make sidewalk installation impossible or impractical

Based on the selected criteria, staff finds the following facts to be **favorable** to the modification request:

1. The subject property is located in the middle of an established neighborhood with no existing sidewalks.
2. Subject property is located in the middle of a block.

3. East 27th Street does not provide connections to vital destinations within the neighborhood.
4. Planning Commission has approved requests for modification on three other properties within the same neighborhood with similar circumstances.

Staff recommends **approval** of the modification of the Subdivision and Development Regulations to remove the requirement for sidewalk construction

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. McArtor stated on page 5.2 of the agenda packet number 4 states "Planning Commission has approved requests for modification on three other properties within the same neighborhood with similar circumstances." Mr. McArtor asked staff if these have been approved since the Subdivision Regulations were updated.

Staff stated, "yes", the last one approved was in the same vicinity. It was located on Gary Drive about two blocks to the east. Also, a previous application was made on 27th Place just to the southwest of this property.

Mr. McArtor stated these have all been modifications or waivers since the Subdivision Regulations have gone into place.

Staff stated "yes".

Mr. McArtor stated these three properties don't have sidewalks now because of Planning Commission actions.

Staff stated, "that is correct".

Mr. McArtor stated had Planning Commission not voted for the waiver, there would have been three new sidewalks in this area.

Staff stated "yes", they would have been required for the permits.

Applicant Comments:

The applicant stated they purchased the subject lot last year with the intent to build a home that they are going to live in. At the time of the purchase the applicant stated they were not aware of the requirement for the additional sidewalks. The applicant stated there are no other sidewalks in this neighborhood and for a number of blocks surrounding it. The applicant stated he is a proponent of sidewalks but this would be a sidewalk to nowhere. The

applicant stated he would appreciate Planning Commission approving his application.

Ms. Kimbrel asked the applicant if there were any other hardships or inconveniences to him besides the fact that there are no other sidewalks in the neighborhood if he were not given the waiver?

The applicant stated the financial obligation that comes with installing the sidewalk and the concern that there is a large oak tree in the front yard that has been there a long time. The applicant stated the tree is probably at least 36 inches in diameter and he would prefer not to put a sidewalk over its roots.

Mr. McArtor asked the applicant how he knows that tree will be impacted.

The applicant stated when he brought the lot there was silver oak trees that needed to be removed and he contacted an Arborist. The applicant stated 3 different Arborists gave him an estimate and all three indicated that he needed to be careful during the construction process and post construction not to place dirt any greater than a quarter inch on top of the tree roots because that particular type of tree would be impacted by that. The applicant stated the tree resides maybe 10 feet off the street and a sidewalk would be within three feet of the base of that tree level.

Mr. McArtor stated how far from the curb is the sidewalk supposed to be?

Sandy Silman stated he is the lead engineer in development services for the City of Tulsa. Mr. Silman stated the sidewalk can be adjacent to the curb and the curb is eight inches wide from the gutter line and 13 feet from the centerline of the street.

Mr. McArtor asked Mr. Silman how wide the sidewalk would be?

Mr. Silman stated in residential there is a four-foot minimum.

Mr. McArtor stated so it wouldn't immediately impact a tree that was 10 feet off the curb.

Mr. Silman stated he didn't know this specific situation but sidewalks are built adjacent to trees all the time. It might impact it. It might not. Mr. Silman stated he was not an Arborist.

Mr. Shivel stated Tulsa wants to be known for its walkability and interconnectivity but so much of the City was constructed without having sidewalks. Mr. Shivel stated in his other role is Transportation Advisory Board Chairman he stresses the walkability because you don't want people to have to walk in the streets but

the reality is that having one sidewalk in front of one house on the block makes no sense. So, he will be supporting of the application.

Mr. McArtor stated many years ago a new Comprehensive Plan was passed that called for sidewalks to be built in new subdivisions. Mr. McArtor stated that was done because we wanted a more walkable City, a healthier City and a safer City and studies have shown that sidewalks do that. Mr. McArtor stated he doesn't believe that if you have one sidewalk in the entire neighborhood that it will not be used. Mr. McArtor stated his neighborhood lacks sidewalks in some areas and when he and his wife walk the dogs every morning and night they use the sidewalks that are there. Mr. McArtor stated the new Subdivision Regulations require sidewalks in new builds. Mr. McArtor stated staff has put together an administrative set of exceptions that are only being done by custom and are being enforced, in his opinion, in error by this Planning Commission. Mr. McArtor stated there have been 3 requests for modification in this area and had Planning Commission rejected those requests there would be three new sidewalks in the area and this would be a fourth. Mr. McArtor stated this is the direction that the Comprehensive Plan and the Subdivision Regulations say we should be going. Instead, we're going in the opposite direction. Mr. McArtor stated this is being done not by regulation but by staff and by this Commission and he thinks that is a bad policy. Mr. McArtor stated he hears what staff is saying about sidewalks but the City has a policy and now routinely for various reasons Planning Commission is denying that policy. Mr. McArtor stated this is going in the wrong direction and that needs to change.

Mr. Ray stated that he appreciates the applicant's situation and hopes he appreciates the situation of Planning Commissioners. Mr. Ray stated his research is the same as Mr. McArtor and if Planning Commission had denied the waivers for sidewalks there would now be sidewalks started in the applicant's area and in other parts of the City. Mr. Ray stated and while he does appreciate the financial burden on creating a house on the hill, he completely understands the applicant's belief that it's a sidewalk to nowhere. Mr. Ray stated he does not believe it is a sidewalk to nowhere he believes it's a starter sidewalk to somewhere.

Mr. Covey stated he will be voting in favor of the sidewalk waiver for a couple of reasons. Number one the Planning Department has recommended that we waive the sidewalk requirement. Number two, Planning Commission has waived numerous sidewalk requirements since the Subdivision Regulations have been enacted. Number three, this is Mr. Covey's personal opinion that it's one house, it's one sidewalk, three other sidewalk waiver requests in this general vicinity have been approved. Mr. Covey stated he doesn't know what good it does to put in one sidewalk that again goes to nowhere when there is no foreseeable path in the future to a connected sidewalk that actually goes to somewhere. Mr. Covey stated what he is in favor of is a fee that each property owner can pay in lieu of the sidewalk to go to the City of Tulsa. Mr. Covey stated the City can then decide

where they want to implement sidewalks and connected sidewalks could be built that go somewhere. Mr. Covey stated it is his understanding that the City is still working on plan for the fee in lieu and until that plan is implemented staff is recommending that we waive the sidewalk requirement. Mr. Covey stated obviously not all of them, but in certain situations and this is one of the situations. Mr. Covey stated he doesn't know what good it does to put a sidewalk on the subject lot when the remaining sidewalks in the area may not be put in for 50 years. Then in 50 years what is this sidewalk in front of this house going to look like? Mr. Covey stated it won't be uniform, it will be cracked and there is no requirement for the homeowner to replace it. Mr. Covey stated he just doesn't see what the benefit is so he will be voting in favor of the waiver.

Ms. Kimbrel asked staff if the City had a timeline for the fee in lieu program?

Staff stated there have been a series of meetings with different groups from the City who would have to be involved in the process of collecting the fee and administering the fee and then ultimately deciding who's eligible for the fee. There is a third meeting arranged for next Monday where the hope is to present a map of essentially sidewalk zones in the City where fees can be then collected and reallocated within that zone to pay for sidewalk projects. Staff stated with that map there will also be a list of criteria that was used to develop those areas. Staff stated at the same time the Streets and Stormwater Department are working on how to calculate the fee. Staff stated the thought is that on Monday, this will all be package together and begin the review process through the City's Legal Department and through the other departments who would have to be involved in this. Staff stated it would then go through the City Council for approval and an ordinance in place. Staff stated the hope would be to have something in place by the end of this year and that's a reasonable estimate. There may be remaining obstacles that has to be addressed before its completed. Staff stated it takes a lot of different departments, different people to make a fee in lieu program work, it is not as simple as taking the applicants money. Legal requirements have to be met in terms of where the money can be used. Staff stated it has to be very nicely coordinated with Streets and Stormwater and how they process their budget and their projects that they work through. Staff stated it needs to be effective and something that can be used in the future.

Ms. Kimbrel asked if there are model cities or municipalities that this program is modeled after.

Staff stated "yes", it's very common and they are looking at what Austin, Texas has done, they use the model in a way that essentially does what the City needs which is to break out zones of the City where they identify within those zones the priorities. Staff stated once you have a segment of the City of Tulsa, you could then go in and look at that segment alone determine where the priority projects are located within this area and those funds would then be allocated as they are collected. Staff stated he would envision there being priorities around collector

streets and arterial streets first and then working through neighborhood projects. Staff stated Nashville and Kansas City also has a fee in lieu program that was also looked at. Staff stated it's a very common tool utilized by municipalities and there can be scenarios where individual lots building sidewalks. But what would be a better tool and more efficient for the City would be to take that and comprehensively create a network that actually provides that walkability goal that the City would like to see.

Ms. Kimbrel asked if there was a reason why the fee policy was not implemented at the time of the sidewalk waiver?

Staff stated at the time the new Subdivision Regulations were adopted with the allowance to pay any available fee in lieu options, it was known that there was an existing fee in lieu ordinance. What staff learned quickly was that it had not been utilized in a long time and there was no account setup to collect the funds. Staff stated as you dug deeper the ordinance was pretty restrictive in its application and when it could be used. It became fairly evident that the ordinance needed to be amended and refined to match the actual City goals that were in place now.

Mr. Covey stated without casting blame on anybody, he thinks what staff said was, they thought there was an ordinance that they could rely upon when the Subdivision Regulations were enacted but found out that it wouldn't work.

Staff stated there was an existing fee in lieu ordinance but it was late when it was determined that it didn't really help the situation. Staff stated they learned immediately after adopting this regulation that the problem was going to be these infill sites and then learned that the ordinance couldn't be used to work on residential site it could only be applied to arterials and collectors.

Mr. McArtor stated he is voting against staff recommendation and would like the applicant to know it is nothing personal.

Mr. Ray stated he thinks it is important that everything possible is done to be sure that the City Council, staff and the public at large recognize that a no vote on this is not necessarily a personal vote, but about getting something going that's going to make the City a lot better. Mr. Ray stated another Commissioner started a "if not now then when" movement but then moved on from it, he is still there. Mr. Ray stated he thinks more pressure on this issue will help the solution along. Mr. Ray stated he feels it's important to this City, to the overall livability of the area and our economic development recruitment.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **SHIVEL**, the TMAPC voted **3-3-0** (Covey, Shivel, Van Cleave, "aye"; Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, "nays"; none "abstaining"; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, "absent") to **APPROVE** MR-11 Modification of the

Subdivision and Development Regulations to remove sidewalk requirement per staff recommendation.

Mr. Covey asked City Legal what happens now with the tie vote.

City Legal stated the application was not approved so the sidewalk will be required.

* * * * *

6. **Z66 Center** (CD 3) Preliminary Plat, Location: Southeast corner of South Mingo Road and East Admiral Place

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of 2 lots, 1 block on 21.48 ± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on June 6, 2019 and provided the following conditions:

1. **Zoning:** Lot 1 as proposed is zoned CG with an optional development plan (Z-7440). Development standards for Z-7440 are required to be in the covenants of the final plat and the case number should be notated on the face of the plat. Lot 2 is zoned CS with no development plans. Both lots conform to the zoning districts in which they are located.
2. **Addressing:** City of Tulsa addresses and street names must be assigned and affixed to the face of the final plat.
3. **Transportation & Traffic:** East Admiral Place and South Mingo Road are considered secondary arterials in this area and require 50' of ROW dedication. Either dedicate required right-of-way by plat or label existing dedication information on the face of the final plat.
4. **Sewer/Water:** Water main extensions are required to serve the property. Easements must be provided as required to cover existing/proposed public infrastructure. All easements are required to be labeled and dimensioned on the face of the final plat.
6. **Engineering Graphics:** Submit subdivision data control sheet with final plat submittal. Update location map with all platted subdivision boundaries and label all other property "unplatted". Graphically show all pins found or set associated with this plat. Provide full contact information for Engineer/Surveyor and owner. Remove contours from final plat. Graphically label the point of beginning. Provide a date of preparation.
7. **Stormwater, Drainage, & Floodplain:** There is existing floodplain on the subject property that must be accurately delineated on the face of the plat and, if required, contained within an overland drainage easement.

Floodplain shall be plotted based on actual flood elevations and contours and labeled appropriately. Label and clarify all reserve and easement boundaries. All drainage must be contained within appropriate easements.

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

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the conditions provided by TAC and all other requirements of the Subdivision and Development Regulations.

The applicant was not present.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **McARTOR**, TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, “absent”) to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Subdivision Plat for Z-66 Center per staff recommendation.

- 7. Dollar 11th** (CD 3) Preliminary Plat, Location: West of the southwest corner of East 11th Street South and South 129th East Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This plat consists of 1 lot, 1 block on 1.13 ± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on June 6, 2019 and provided the following conditions:

- 1. Zoning:** All property included within the proposed subdivision is zoned IL (Industrial – Light). The proposed lot conforms to the requirements of the IL district.
- 2. Addressing:** City of Tulsa addresses and street names must be assigned and affixed to the face of the final plat.
- 3. Transportation & Traffic:** East 11th Street South is a secondary arterial street per the Major Street & Highway Plan. A 50' ROW is required to be dedicated or previous dedications must be labeled with a book/page on the face of the plat.

4. **Sewer/Water:** Easements must be provided as required to cover existing/proposed public infrastructure. All easements are required to be labeled and dimensioned on the face of the final plat.

6. **Engineering Graphics:** Submit subdivision data control sheet with final plat submittal. Update location map with all platted subdivision boundaries and label all other property "unplatted". Graphically show all pins found or set associated with this plat. Provide full contact information for Engineer/Surveyor. Remove contours from final plat. Graphically label the point of beginning. Include a bearing angle on the face of the plat under the Basis of Bearing heading.

7. **Stormwater, Drainage, & Floodplain:** There is existing floodplain on the subject property that must be accurately delineated on the face of the plat and, if required, contained within an overland drainage easement. Floodplain shall be plotted based on actual flood elevations and contours and labeled appropriately. Offsite drainage from the east must be intercepted and conveyed across the property. All drainage must be contained within appropriate easements.

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

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the conditions provided by TAC and all other requirements of the Subdivision and Development Regulations.

The applicant was not present.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **McARTOR**, TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Subdivision Plat for Dollar 11th per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

8. **TCCP-1** consider adoption of an amendment to the **Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area** for the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County lying within the fence lines of **Bixby, Glenpool, Jenks, Owasso, and Skiatook**.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Item

TCCP-1 consider adoption of an amendment to the **Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area** for the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County lying within the fence lines of **Bixby, Glenpool, Jenks, Owasso, and Skiatook**.

Background

Historically, Tulsa County communities would submit their Comprehensive Plans to TMAPC for adoption so that they might be considered in land use decisions in surrounding unincorporated areas by TMAPC and Tulsa County. The adopted plans were then used as a guide to inform decision makers when planning for the physical development of the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County. Unfortunately, the practice of adopting these community Comprehensive Plans as they were updated fell by the wayside. The existing District Plans have also become outdated and they are no longer a true representation of the community's desires.

In 2018, Tulsa County recognized the need to have an adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County and to update or establish plans as necessary for the remainder of Tulsa County.

The first step of the process is the adoption of the existing Comprehensive Plans from the municipalities in Tulsa County. The next step will be to develop new Land Use Plans for the remaining areas in unincorporated Tulsa County.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that TMAPC adopt an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area for the unincorporated areas of Tulsa County lying within the fence lines of Bixby, Glenpool, Jenks, Owasso, and Skiatook.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. McArtor stated he was going to reveal his total ignorance here. These communities have their own Comprehensive Plans so we're not doing anything to their Comprehensive Plans

Staff stated "yes", these are the exact words from their Comprehensive Plans. We have used their land use descriptions; the maps have their City limits grayed out but you can see the fence line areas of the unincorporated areas.

Mr. McArtor stated the colored areas are their Comprehensive Plan?

Staff stated "Correct", all we're doing is asking to adopt their plan as part of the Tulsa County Plan.

Ms. Kimbrel stated when we are adopting their plan into our plan we cannot change it, we are adopting their plan as it is.

Staff stated "correct".

Ms. Kimbrel stated when staff makes the recommendation to adopt, Ms. Kimbrel assumes staff has reviewed it for consistencies with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff stated "yes" historically in the past other County plans were adopted by and included in the Tulsa County Plan.

Mr. Ray stated historically speaking, a lot of years ago, there was a system between the suburban cities and the Planning Commission where there were referrals. Those referrals were given to the City, and the City made comments on them and that kind of went by the wayside over the years, Mr. Ray stated bringing this back to TMAPC is a great step forward in his opinion. Mr. Ray stated this will allow Planning Commission to know that there is a plan and we can ask those Counties if there are any concerns regarding an application. Mr. Ray stated he thinks this is a great move and he has been here since 1976 and understands the evolution of this whole thing. Mr. Ray stated he supports this strongly and thinks City Managers and City Councils in the area would all agree that this was a needed step.

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **COVEY**, TMAPC voted **6-0-0** (Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, "absent") to **ADOPT** TCCP-1 as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area per staff recommendation.

OTHER BUSINESS

9. Commissioners' Comments

None

* * * * *

ADJOURN

TMAPC Action; 6 members present:

On **MOTION** of **McARTOR**, TMAPC voted **6-0-0**(Covey, Kimbrel, McArtor, Ray, Shivel, Van Cleave, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Doctor, Fothergill, Reeds, Ritchey, Walker, "absent") to **ADJOURN** TMAPC meeting 2796.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:13 p.m.

Date Approved:

07-03-2019


Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary