

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 2844

Wednesday, June 16, 2021, 1:00 p.m.

City Council Chamber

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

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Blair	Adams	Foster	Jordan, COT
Covey		Hoyt-R	Silman, COT
Craddock		Miller	Skates, COT-R
Kimbrel		Sawyer	VanValkenburgh, Legal
McArtor		Wilkerson	
Reeds			
Shivel			
Walker			
Whitlock			

R=Remote

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Thursday, June 10, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

Staff, and members of the public were allowed to attend and participate in the TMAPC meeting in person or via videoconferencing and teleconferencing via **GoToMeeting**, an online meeting and web conferencing tool.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Covey called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

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

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

None

Director's Report:

Ms. Miller reported there would be a Work Session on August 18, 2021, and topics will be PlaniTulsa Update, Route 66 BRT Land Use Framework and Zoning Code Amendments.

* * * * *

Minutes:

1. TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

Approval of the minutes of **June 2, 2021, Meeting No. 2843**

On **MOTION** of **CRADDOCK**, the TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Blair, Covey, Craddock, Kimbrel, McArtor, Reeds, Shivel, Walker, Whitlock, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Adams, "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of June 2, 2021, Meeting No. 2843

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-198-A-4 Crown Neon Signs** (CD 9) Location: West of the southwest corner of East 61st Street South and South Sheridan Road requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to increase the allowable size of the ground sign. (Continued from June 2, 2021)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: PUD-198-A-4 Minor Amendment

Amendment Request: Revise the PUD Development Standards to increase the allowable size of the ground sign.

The current development standard allow a ground sign of 32 sf in area and 10 ft in height for the existing office park. The office park desires to construct a tenant ID sign that would provide small panels for each tenant. The applicant is proposing to construct a sign 18'-6" in height and with a signage area of approximately 85 sf.

The uses allowed in Development Area B & C are those allowed in an OL district. The zoning code would allow signage in an OL zone to be 20 ft in height and 0.3 sf per linear foot of street frontage up to 150 sf. Based on the street frontage of the office park, the sign would be allowed approximately 120 sf in an OL zone.

This request would be limited to a ground sign located along 61st St S.

Staff Comment: This request is considered a Minor Amendment as outlined by Section 30.010.1.2.c(12) of the City of Tulsa Zoning Code.

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

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

- 1) PUD-198-A-4 does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD and is considered a minor amendment to PUD-198-A.
- 2) The requested amendment would only to a ground sign along 61st St S.
- 3) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-198-A and subsequent amendments shall remain in effect.

With considerations listed above, staff recommends **approval** of the minor amendment to increase the allowable size of the ground sign along 61st St S to 18’-6” in height and 85 sf in signage area.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **COVEY**, the TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Blair, Covey, Craddock, Kimbrel, McArtor, Reeds, Shivel, Walker, Whitlock, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Adams, “absent”) to **APPROVE** Item 2 per staff recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARING-ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS

3. **ZCA-19** amendments to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code Title 42 Revised Ordinances, to add Section 20.080 establishing the regulations of a Neighborhood Infill Overlay (NIO) District, and consider amending Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3 and Section 5.030-B, Table Note [4].

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Item

Public hearing to provide a recommendation to the City Council regarding amending the City of Tulsa Zoning Code, Title 42 Revised Ordinances, to add Section 20.080 establishing the regulations of a Neighborhood Infill Overlay (NIO) District, and consider amending Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3 and Section 5.030-B, Table Note [4].

Background

The 2019 Downtown & Surrounding Neighborhoods Housing Study & Strategy (DSNHSS) was commissioned to comprehensively assess housing needs in the Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods (see **Attachment I** for project boundary). The final study results were presented to the City Council in June 2020 and released to the public in July 2020. The study identified the need for the creation of ‘missing middle’ Zoning Code amendments to promote a diversity of housing typologies that have the potential to be effective tools for expanding housing choice and affordability. According to the study, ‘missing middle’ housing could “potentially foster redevelopment in older neighborhoods with housing that “fits in” with the historic housing stock and land use patterns” in Tulsa.

‘Missing Middle’ housing, a term coined by Opticos Design, refers to the lack of housing options other than detached houses and large apartment complexes. Other residential building types available in the Zoning Code are often similar in size to a detached house but have two or more units, such as duplexes, multi-unit homes, townhouses, and smaller-scale multi-family apartments/condos. The term ‘missing’ suggests these other options have typically not been allowed to be built since the mid-1940s and ‘middle’ because size-wise they fit between the more common detached homes and large multi-family complexes.

Simultaneously, the Tulsa Planning Office compiled various Small Area Plan and Comprehensive Plan recommendations that show a similar desire for opportunities for a full range of housing types to fit every income, household and preference. Listed below are just a few recommendations from PlaniTulsa that could target ‘missing middle’ housing types both within the Study Area and Citywide.

PlaniTulsa:

- PlaniTulsa Goal #1: **Robust mix of housing types and sizes are developed and provided in all parts of the city.**
- PlaniTulsa Goal #7: **Low-income and workforce affordable housing is available in neighborhoods across the city.**
 - 7.2: Ensure that land use and zoning regulations allow a mix of housing types, including single family homes, cottage homes, townhomes, condominiums and apartments that serve people at a variety of income levels.

Crutchfield Small Area Plan:

- **Goal #5: Increase housing choices available in Crutchfield.**
 - 5.1: Support the development of an expanded range of housing types, including single-family housing types such as cottage housing, clustered homes, and narrow-lot homes and appropriately scaled “missing middle” (mid-density) housing types such as townhomes, multi-unit houses (duplexes, triplexes, quads), live-work units, and accessory dwelling units.

Crosbie Heights Small Area Plan:

- **Goal #2: Promote development of complete neighborhoods, defined in the Comprehensive Plan (p. LU-18) as “neighborhoods that blend...amenities, connectivity, and housing options together.”**
 - 2.4 In accordance with land use designations, support redevelopment to include a mix of smaller residential structures (e.g., duplexes, triplexes and cottage houses) to provide housing for the socioeconomic diversity (e.g, income, age, mobility) in the neighborhood.

Pearl District Small Area Plan:

- **Goal #1: Support compatible residential infill and reinvestment.**
 - 1.1 Support infill housing that fits with the character of the neighborhood. Encourage development that maintains the existing block and street patterns when feasible.

In May 2020, The Tulsa Planning Office began to identify possible Zoning Code amendments that seek to remove barriers to ‘missing middle’ housing types by making a few changes applicable citywide and by creating a Neighborhood Infill Overlay within the study area. In August 2020, a Housing and Neighborhoods Survey was launched citywide that helped inform what type of ‘missing middle’ housing types were supported by respondents. Based upon the adopted policies of various City plans, and feedback from over 1,500 survey responses, the City Council initiated the development of the overlay and a few citywide text amendments. Staff presented the first draft of the proposed changes to the Planning Commission at a March 17, 2021, work session.

A draft of the Neighborhood Infill Overlay and citywide changes was developed by a staff working group and refined from input received during meetings with neighborhood residents, local builders, licensed architects, and various City officials. The proposed zoning code amendments (see **Attachment II**) are intended to allow for a spectrum of ‘missing middle’ typologies to be developed by right, eliminating zoning obstacles that prevent these housing types.

Public Engagement

Throughout the development of the proposed Zoning Code amendments a developer's roundtable was held virtually in October 2020 to discuss the housing market, infill, and ideas for zoning code amendments in both an overlay area and citywide. In January 2021, Tulsa Planning Office staff and District 1 and District 4 City Councilors participated in 5 separate virtual neighborhood meetings in the proposed overlay boundaries to discuss the Neighborhood Infill Overlay. The meeting schedule is listed below:

- Riverview & Cherry Street Residents – Mon., Jan. 11
- Pearl District Residents – Tues., Jan. 12
- Crutchfield Residents – Thurs., Jan. 14
- Owen Park & Crosbie Heights Residents – Tues., Jan. 19
- Greenwood & Unity-Heritage Residents – Thurs., Jan. 21

Approximately 90 people attended the virtual meetings. During those virtual neighborhood meetings, residents were asked to participate in a poll that asked which type of missing middle housing options they supported being built in their neighborhood. Most of the residents who participated were in support of additional housing types being built in their neighborhoods. More specifically, support was expressed for duplexes, multi-unit homes, townhouses, and smaller-scale multi-family apartments/condos. The participants were also asked to submit comments and questions that staff answered during the meeting and were later used to document feedback for future use.

Staff used feedback from the developer's roundtable, community meeting sessions, and any additional commentary to continue to develop the Neighborhood Infill Overlay and other 'missing middle' zoning code changes citywide. In May 2021, staff presented the final draft of the proposed changes in two virtual public meetings. The first of the two meetings was targeted to residents in the proposed boundary and held on May 3, 2021. In this meeting, staff discussed the draft of the proposed overlay text, 17 people attended, and most attendees indicated that they lived in the proposed overlay boundaries. The second public meeting was held on May 6, 2021, where staff discussed the proposed citywide changes to the Zoning Code, 64 individuals attended. All virtual meetings were shared by City Councilors and advertised on the Tulsa Planning Office website, newsletter, and social media accounts.

All virtual meetings were recorded, and the presentation slides and video recordings have been available on the Tulsa Planning Office website. The Tulsa Planning Office website was updated to have a dedicated 'Housing Zoning Code Amendments' page. The dedicated page includes information such as the draft proposed text amendments with a brief explanation of what those changes mean, frequently asked questions, and other educational resources.

The public meetings were well attended and members of the staff working group presented and had significant discussion with attendees on how the proposed overlay and citywide changes would impact properties within the proposed boundary and citywide. The public engagement process satisfies the zoning code requirement that Special Area (SA) overlays “be based on an adopted plan or be prepared following an inclusive, transparent, and equitable planning and public involvement process that includes opportunities for affected property owners and residents to participate in the formulation of the district regulations or otherwise offer recommendations and provide input.” Further outreach will be done before the proposed map amendments defining the overlay boundaries are presented to TMAPC.

Process Schedule

2020

- (July) City of Tulsa public press release of Housing Study
- (July) Small group meetings with City Councilors
- (Aug) TMAPC Work Session to discuss Housing Study findings
- (Aug) Engage development representatives to discuss general infill concepts
- (Sept) City Council initiation of an Infill Overlay and citywide text amendments

2021

- (Jan) Engage with neighborhoods included in the Housing Study boundary
- (Mar) TMAPC Work Session to discuss proposed text amendments
- (May) Reengage with neighborhoods and present final draft of text amendments
- (June) TMAPC public hearing to provide recommendation on proposed text amendments
- (July/Aug) City Council initiation of map amendments to apply the NIO text
- (Sept) Engage with residents and property-owners of area to be affected by Overlay
- (Oct) TMAPC public hearing to provide recommendation on proposed map amendments

Staff Analysis

The standards in the proposed ZCA-19 will be consistent with promoting housing types that accommodate households of varying sizes and income levels and provide for a more efficient use of residential land. As outlined above, the proposed overlay and citywide changes implement multiple Comprehensive Plan goals and policies and Small Area Plan recommendations. The changes are consistent with the Zoning Code’s general purposes (Section 1.050) and the stated purpose and intent of the applicable overlay.

Staff Recommendation

Approval of the proposed amendments to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code as shown in Attachment II.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Craddock stated his concern is parking. He stated these areas are older neighborhoods with typically small driveways. He stated the change in parking requirements would increase street parking. Mr. Craddock stated staff made the comment vehicles are not used as much in those areas but there is actually not a lot of services available such as convenience stores or grocery stores or walkable areas to go to any facilities so residents may actually drive more. He stated he loved the whole plan and thinks it is a great idea and very unique.

Staff stated initially the plan called for greater reductions to parking requirements. There were different proposals for where parking could be used off site and how that could be counted as a part of a proposal but after hearing feedback from neighborhoods that shared some of Mr. Craddock's concerns about overflow parking into the street these were adjusted back 50% reduction and that is about one car per unit. He stated there is still a requirement that parking is provided on site but staff did not feel there was a need to require every unit to have two parking spaces knowing the neighborhood has less car dependent folks within these areas. Staff stated parking can become a very big eater of real estate and is one of those things that take away the opportunities for this housing to be established and staff believes this helps with a solution.

Ms. Kimbrel asked if staff could touch a little bit more about the nature of the sentiments of the community during the community engagement process.

Staff stated there was broad support of the idea for diversity in housing, giving people an option. He stated he refers to it as aging in place. The needs of people change, first is married without children, and then they decide to start a family and then retirement. Staff stated whatever kind of family living environment or preference that is needed there is a lot of support from the community that this plan could provide some of those options and alleviate some of the challenges that come with wanting to stay in the neighborhood and community. Staff stated affordability was another aspect and when there are a larger number of units that makes them more affordable. Staff stated compatibility is always a big concern of an existing neighborhood, the kind of style or character of a neighborhood and how that will be addressed. He stated this overlay is focused more on adding the different uses and allowing for additional uses. Staff stated there are other tools that can be used in tandem to accomplish things like design standards, whether that is an HP designation or the Neighborhood Character Overlay which looks at those design aspects.

Staff stated the residents that were supportive were aware of existing users in their neighborhood that already had these elements and liked that about their neighborhood. They liked that there was a diversity of housing already there and they felt like it added activity in the neighborhood and created a space for more people. Staff stated he agreed that when in other places, there were concerns about design or elements of design so staff made some adaptations to the draft by reducing the units down from 12 to 8 in response to survey results and neighborhood feedback. He stated in each of the community meetings they put the list of uses on the screen and asked everyone what they would like or dislike in their neighborhood. Staff stated over half of the people in attendance were supportive, with the larger apartment complexes being the most undesirable. He stated so limiting the number of units you could have on a lot really responded to the major concern of just oversized apartment complexes and multifamily projects coming in and taking over blocks of neighborhoods.

Mr. Reeds asked if staff has identified where existing multifamily already are within the area that were put in in the 1920s and 1930s in particular because they are sprinkled throughout so there is already a precedent which helps make your case. He asked how this plan looks along the river with the River Design Overlay

Staff stated the Zoning Code will defer to the most restrictive regulation when two overlays are in place so the design standards found in the River Design Overlay would still apply to anything that was also in the infill overlay. He stated the River Design Overlay already excludes detached homes like single family homes.

Mr. Reeds asked if mixed use included commercial.

Staff stated “yes”, they did not change any of the mixed use allowances at this time we have focused purely on residential housing types. He stated there was interest from the Heights neighborhood to talk about ideas for establishing mixed use areas within the neighborhood that might work for the corner shops that was mentioned earlier. Staff stated but for now the focus is on the housing types with the mixed use where it is allowed.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **REEDS**, the TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Blair, Covey, Craddock, Kimbrel, McArtor, Reeds, Shivel, Walker, Whitlock, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Adams, “absent”) to recommend **ADOPTION** of ZCA-19 per staff recommendation.

OTHER BUSINESS

4. Consider continuing remote TMAPC meetings for applicants and members of the public.

Staff stated City Council is not continuing any type of virtual meeting, they are meeting in person. She stated the County Board of Adjustment decided to not continue having their meeting virtual and the City Board of Adjustment has not yet decided. Staff stated from their perspective having meetings virtually will get more complicated in the City Council Chambers because we will have to bring our own equipment to make it possible. She stated on one hand you want to provide all the options you can for people to participate but you do not know how much it will be utilized now that in person meetings are possible.

Ms. Kimbrel asked if any of the elderly community had requested virtual.

Staff stated “no” with a pandemic older people in the community were the ones that were left out because they often are not really savvy on how to use the technology.

Mr. Blair asked how much of administrative burden is it to continue posting the link and providing the camera.

Staff stated it is just another few steps in our process and staff is happy to provide that option if it is needed.

Mr. McArtor stated he has gotten use to the technology used for meetings and going to court from his office is really helpful and he thinks continuing to give members of the public that option would be helpful as long as it is not too much trouble. He stated if it gets to the point that no one's taking advantage of it we could stop it then but he thinks the idea that more people can be involved is a wonderful thing.

Mr. Craddock stated the court system has dumped hundreds of 1000s of dollars into the courtrooms to allow that technology which is a really good thing and he is glad to hear that it has been a benefit. He stated the problem is people that are calling in do not have that equipment or does not understand what they need to do on the other end to attend the meetings so he is not a big fan because it is very distracting and it has definitely made the meetings a lot longer.

Ms. Kimbrel stated she likes being able to provide accommodations to the public in the community so she would be in favor of adding a statement on the website saying that we are going back to in person meetings but virtual accommodations can be made if requested. She thinks that this will allow some flexibility in addressing those accommodations.

Mr. Blair stated he agreed with that and thinks it helps hearing from applicants as well. He stated he recalls the hotel conversion project where the developers

attended Planning Commission from their office in Florida. They would not have had that opportunity under the old way of doing business. He thinks that flexibility really helps when we are dealing with busy professionals who have to be on a job site. Mr. Blair stated he thinks it is really helpful to have that option and he would like to continue it and if there is no participation then drop it.

Mr. Reeds stated he agrees with Mr. Blair and if it makes it easier for applicants to do business let us give them the option.

Mr. Covey stated he was going to vote no because the City Council has already done away with it. The County has done away with it and from an administrative view of running the meeting it is more than inconvenient when we have a very hot button issue with you know 30 plus participants on there where people cannot understand to mute their microphones or turn cameras on or turn cameras off. He stated or they do not understand which items are being called.

Mr. Whitlock stated we will probably have to revisit this in the fall, due to COVID. He stated no one has a crystal ball so we could be back in Zoom meetings by the fall. Mr. Whitlock stated we need to try to maintain transparency, but he agrees the meeting needs to be in person.

Mr. Craddock made a motion to discontinue remote meeting and resume in person meetings.

The motion failed with a 4-5-0 vote.

Mr. Reeds made a motion to continue to allow remote meetings as an option for applicants and members of the public.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **REEDS**, TMAPC voted **5-4-0** (Blair, Kimbrel, McArtor, Reeds, Shivel, “aye”; Covey, Craddock, Walker, Whitlock, “nays”; none “abstaining”; Adams, “absent”) to continue offering remote meetings as an option for applicants and members of the public to participate.

5. Commissioners' Comments

None

ADJOURN

TMAPC Action; members present:

On **MOTION** of **COVEY**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Blair, Covey, Craddock, Kimbrel, McArtor, Reeds, Shivel, Walker, Whitlock, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Adams, "absent") to **ADJOURN** TMAPC meeting of June 16, 2021, Meeting No. 2844.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 1:50 p.m.

Date Approved:

07-07-2021


Chairman

ATTEST: 

Secretary