



## Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

### Minutes of Meeting No. 2923

Wednesday, October 16, 2024, 1:00 p.m.

Tulsa City Council Chambers, 175 E. 2nd St., Tulsa, OK 74103

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the City Clerk’s and the County Clerk’s office on October 14, 2024 at 2:52 p.m.

**Members Present:** Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

**Members Absent:** Walker,

**Staff Present:** Austin Chapman, Nathan Foster, Susan Miller, Erin Roark, Kim Sawyer, Mark Swiney

**Speaker Key:**

- (+) indicates a speaker generally supportive of an item;
- (-) indicates a speaker generally opposed to an item; and
- (=) indicates a speaker generally neutral or who has questions about an item.

After declaring a quorum present, Vice Chair Zalk called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

### Reports

---

**Chairman’s Report:** Vice Chair Zalk welcomed Erin Roark, a new planner, to the City staff.

**Director’s Report:** None

### Approval of Minutes

---

**1. Minutes from Meeting 2922, October 2, 2024**

Motion: Approval of the minutes of Meeting 2922 from October 2, 2024.

Motion by: Whitlock    Second by: Shivel

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

## Consent Agenda

---

### 2. **Z-7140-SP-1j**

Location: West of Southwest corner of South Maybelle Place and West 85th Street South

City Council District: 2

Applicant: Terry L. Toole

**Action(s) Requested**: Minor Amendment to a Corridor Development Plan to reduce the minimum lot frontage requirements and permit a lot line adjustment.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is proposing a minor amendment to the corridor development plan to adjust the minimum lot width and permit a lot line adjustment.

The current development plan requires a minimum street frontage of 55 feet. The two lots covered by the minor amendment are already non-conforming to the required frontage.

The applicant is proposing a lot line adjustment which is illustrated on the attached exhibit. The proposal would result in one tract having a further reduced frontage while adding additional frontage to the second tract.

The proposed lot line adjustment would not create any additional lots and the proposed minor amendment would only apply to the lots under application. No other changes to the development plan are proposed. Lots will still conform to the minimum lot area requirements and new homes constructed on the lots would still be required to comply with all additional building regulations of the development plan.

The lots under application are uniquely shaped and located on a cul-de-sac.

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:

1. Z-7140-SP-1j is consistent with the provisions for administration and procedures of a corridor development plan in Section 25.040-E.
2. Z-7140-SP-1j does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the corridor development plan and is considered a minor amendment to Z-7140-SP-1.
3. All remaining development standards defined in Z-7140-SP-1 and subsequent amendments shall remain in effect.

With consideration given to the factors listed herein, staff recommends **approval** of the application.

## Comprehensive Plan Considerations

---

### **Land Use Plan**

The subject properties are designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents' daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

Surrounding Properties:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	CO/Z-7140-SP-1	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
East	CO/Z-7140-SP-1	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
South	CO/Z-7140-SP-1	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
West	CO/Z-7140-SP-1	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential

**Small Area Plans**

The subject properties are located in the West Highlands Tulsa Hills small area plan.

**Development Era**

The subject properties are in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking, community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks.

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None.

**Environmental Considerations**

Flood Area: The subject properties are not located within any designated flood areas.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 37%. Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

Parks & Open Space: N/A

**Zoning History**

Ordinance 11827, dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Ordinance 22170, dated December 18, 2009, rezoned the property from Agriculture (AG) to Corridor (CO).

**Speakers**

None.

**Property Description**

Lot 13 and 14 Block 7, Hyde Park at Tulsa Hills

**Commission Action**

Motion: Approve the minor amendment Z-7140-SP-1j, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Turner-Addison Second by: Shivel

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

DRAFT

## Public Hearing - Rezoning

### 3. **CZ-555** (County)

Location: East of the Northeast Corner of East 191<sup>st</sup> Street South and South Memorial Drive

County Commission District: 3

Applicant: STP Solutions, Inc.

**Action Requested:** Rezoning from AG to RS (Related to PUD-868) (Continued from September 4, 2024)

### **Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is requesting to rezone from AG to RS to permit a single-family subdivision.

A PUD (PUD-868) is being concurrently proposed with this rezoning to establish the allowable use and the bulk and area requirements. The lots within the PUD area are to provide a minimum of 0.5 acres per dwelling unit. The proposal lies within the Rural Agricultural designation of the Tulsa County Comprehensive Plan, which adopted the land use designations in place by the City of Bixby Comprehensive Plan, which envisions agricultural and large lot residential uses. This proposal, along with the accompanying PUD are compatible with this designation.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds that it is non-injurious to the surrounding proximate properties and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the anticipated future development pattern of the surrounding area, therefore;

With consideration given to the factors listed herein, staff recommend **approval** of the application.

### **Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

#### **Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as:

Rural Agricultural, defined as *“The Rural Agriculture designation denotes areas within the City of Bixby’s fence line, but not within the city limits, that have large tracts of land for agricultural purposes. Agricultural uses may also include large lot detached residential, accessory agricultural uses and structures to support agricultural uses. Improvements in this designation should be low impact and retain the rural character of the area.”*

#### Surrounding Properties:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
<u>North</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural</u>
<u>East</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural</u>
<u>South</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural / Single-Family</u>
<u>West</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural</u>

#### **Small Area Plans**

None

#### **Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: East 191<sup>st</sup> Street South is designated as a Secondary Arterial

Transit: None

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: A sidewalk gap is shown along 191<sup>st</sup> St S as well as a proposed signed bike route.

### **Environmental Considerations**

Flood Area: None

Parks & Open Space: None

### **Zoning History**

Resolution 98254, dated September 15 1980, established zoning for the subject property.

### **TMAPC Comments**

Mr. Whitlock asked staff if the road concerns from the last meeting had been addressed.

Staff stated he had not spoken with the applicant since last meeting.

The applicant was not present.

### **Speakers:**

(-) Stephen Gund, 18711 South Mingo Road, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that he lived east of the subject property, and he has 160 acres of land. He stated that the neighbors did not receive notice of any changes to the applicant's request since the last meeting and he stands by his comments previously made that the request for half acre lots would be too dense for the area. Mr. Gund stated that 191<sup>st</sup> Street is not equipped for the additional traffic. He stated that he was opposed to the request.

Mr. Shivel asked staff what the reason was for the continuance from the last meeting.

Mr. Hoyt stated the application was continued to allow the applicant to discuss larger lots with fewer homes with the property owner. Staff stated they had not received any correspondence or communication from the applicant.

Mr. Whitlock asked if proper notice had been sent out for the meeting today.

Staff stated because the application was continued at the previous meeting and there were no adjustments to the request, the continuance itself serves as notification for the next meeting per the state statute.

(-) Angela Wilson, 18624 South Mingo Road, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that she represented the Henderson Stockmeyer family and the forty other signatures that signed the petition that she brought to the first meeting. Those signatures represent about four thousand acres surrounding the subject property. She stated all those property owners want the property to remain agricultural zoned. Ms. Wilson stated the current roads cannot handle the additional traffic and the area does not drain properly. She stated because the subject property does not perk, they will need retaining ponds for sewage. Ms. Wilson stated this area is not in the Bixby 30-year plan for city services and she opposes this application.

(-) Ron King, 9002 East 191<sup>st</sup> Street, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that it was his understanding that the case was continued to allow the applicant to make some changes to his original request. He agreed that the narrow road and sewage would be issues, but he is also concerned that this change would affect the property values in the area.

### **TMAPC Comments**

Mr. Craddock stated that he was dissatisfied that the applicant did not reach out to anyone about any changes to the application. He stated the drainage in the area is a huge issue.

**Commission Action**

Motion: To deny the RS zoning.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

DRAFT

**4. PUD-868** (County)

Location: East of the Northeast Corner of East 191<sup>st</sup> Street South and South Memorial Drive

County Commission District: 3

Applicant: STP Solutions, Inc.

**Action Requested:** Planned Unit Development for a residential subdivision (Related to CZ-555) (Continued from September 4, 2024)

The applicant is requesting to rezone from AG to RS to permit a single-family subdivision.

A rezoning is being concurrently proposed with this PUD (CZ-555). The lots within the PUD area are to provide a minimum of 0.5 acres per dwelling unit. The proposal lies within the Rural Agricultural designation of the Tulsa County Comprehensive Plan, which adopted the land use designations in place by the City of Bixby Comprehensive Plan, which envisions agricultural and large lot residential uses. This proposal, along with the accompanying rezoning are compatible with this designation.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds that it is non-injurious to the surrounding proximate properties and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the anticipated future development pattern of the surrounding area, therefore;

With consideration given to the factors listed herein, staff recommend **approval** of the application.

**DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS**

**Public Road R/W:** 40'

**Minimum Lot Size:** 0.5 acres

**Building Height:** 35'

**Building Setback:**

**Front Yard:** 25'

**Rear Yard:** 20'

**Side Yards (all):** 10'

**Permitted Uses:** Residential Single Family

**Livability Space Per Dwelling:** 4000 sf

**Auxiliary Building Max. Size:** 1500 sf

**Maximum Number of Dwelling Units:** 10

**VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION**

The location of this project is approximately 1/2 mile East of Memorial Road. This major roadway will provide quick access for homeowners and emergency responders to the site. The proposed roadway will be a public hard surfaced road (concrete or asphalt) without curbs. Driving surface will be 22' in width and have bar ditches (both

sides of road) for conveyance of storm water to designed detention ponds. Exhibit A shows the proposed roadway alignment. Final roadway design will be approved by Tulsa County engineering and state Fire Marshal.

**INTENSITY OF RESIDENTIAL USES**

All 10 lots of North Wind Addition will be a minimum of 0.5 acres in size. Non-Residential uses will not be allowed.

**SCREENING AND LANDSCAPING**

Screening and Landscaping shall conform to Tulsa County Zoning Code regulations.

**SIGNS**

North Wind Addition shall have only one ground sign at the entrance of the subdivision. This sign shall comply with all Tulsa County codes for height, lighting and landscaping.

**All other standards per the Tulsa County Zoning Code requirements for the RS district.**

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan.**

The subject property is designated as:

Rural Agricultural, defined as *“The Rural Agriculture designation denotes areas within the City of Bixby’s fence line, but not within the city limits, that have large tracts of land for agricultural purposes. Agricultural uses may also include large lot detached residential, accessory agricultural uses and structures to support agricultural uses. Improvements in this designation should be low impact and retain the rural character of the area.”*

Surrounding Properties:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
<u>North</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural</u>
<u>East</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural</u>
<u>South</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural / Single-Family</u>
<u>West</u>	<u>AG</u>	<u>Rural Agricultural</u>	<u>Agricultural</u>

**Small Area Plans**

None

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: East 191<sup>st</sup> Street South is designated as a Secondary Arterial

Transit: None

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: A sidewalk gap is shown along 191<sup>st</sup> St S as well as a proposed signed bike route.

**Environmental Considerations**

Flood Area: None

Parks & Open Space: None

**Zoning History**

Resolution 98254, dated September 15 1980, established zoning for the subject property.

The applicant was not present.

**Commission Action**

Motion: To deny PUD-868.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

DRAFT

**5. Z-7792**

Location: North of the Northeast corner of East 49th Street South and South 72nd East Avenue

City Council: 5

Applicant: Vintage Housing Inc.

**Action(s) Requested**: Rezoning from OM with an optional development plan to RM-1

**Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is proposing to rezone the property from Office-Medium (OM) with and optional development plan, Z-7582, to RM-1 to permit the development of a multifamily senior living development.

The property currently contains the headquarters for Life Senior Services and the original development plan anticipated the development of the site with offices and supporting uses for the non-profit operation. The proposed multifamily development would not be permitted under the existing development plan, but there are several residential use types currently permitted including group living uses.

The rezoning is only proposed for the northern portion of the property which is currently vacant. The OM zoning and optional development plan would remain in effect for the area of the property that contains the existing non-profit offices.

The property is located on South 72<sup>nd</sup> East Avenue which is designated as a residential collector street. Collector streets in neighborhoods serve as a primary connection from the neighborhood to the arterial streets and can generally support higher density and different use types than standard residential streets. There is existing multifamily development to the east and south of this proposal.

The Neighborhood land use designation supports the implementation of additional housing types along collector corridors and where those building types already exist. The rezoning would be consistent with the recommendations for Neighborhood land use designations and with the development pattern in the surrounding area.

With consideration given to the factors listed herein, staff recommends **approval** of the application.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as neighborhood. **Neighborhoods** are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	RS-3	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
East	RM-1	Neighborhood	Multifamily Residential
South	OM/Z-7582 ODP	Neighborhood	Office/Non-Profit
West	RS-3	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential

**Small Area Plans**

The subject property is not located within any adopted small area plans.

**Development Era**

The subject property is in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking, community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: South 72<sup>nd</sup> East Avenue is designated as a residential collector street by the Major Street and Highway Plan. Residential collector streets require an ultimate right-of-width of 60 feet.

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: The property is not located adjacent to any transit lines. Regular route service is available along East 51<sup>st</sup> Street South.

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None.

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks are planned for all public street frontages and will be required to be constructed as part of any new development.

**Environmental Considerations**

Flood Area: The subject property is not located within any designated flood areas.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 11%. Preserving the limited existing canopy should be encouraged, as well as measures to increase the canopy through landscaping. Street-lining trees in particular should be encouraged to spread the benefit of the tree canopy to the pedestrian realm.

Parks & Open Space: N/A

**Zoning History**

---

Ordinance 11824, dated June 26, 1970, established RS-3 zoning for the subject property.

Ordinance 24515, dated January 3, 2021, rezoned the subject property from RS-3 to OM with an optional development plan.

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation. She stated that a neighborhood meeting was held, and she provided the staff the sign in sheets listing everyone that attended the meeting.

The applicant agrees with the staff recommendation.

**TMAPC Comments**

None

**Speakers**

None.

**Commission Action**

Motion: Recommend approval of the RM-1, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Hood

Second by: Shivel

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

**Property Description**

A tract of land being a part of Lot One (1), Block Eleven (11), PARK PLAZA SEVENTH AMENDED, an Addition in Tulsa County, City of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof, more particularly described as follows:  
COMMENCING at the Southeast corner of said Lot One (1); Thence N 00°06'25" W along the East line of said Lot One (1) (Basis of Bearing), a distance of 508.87 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING; Thence N 90°00'00" W a distance of 202.91 feet; Thence N 82°08'11" W a distance of 283.18 feet to a point on the West line of said Lot One (1); Thence along the West line of said Lot One (1), on a curve to the right with an arc length of 32.72 feet, a radius of 555.00 feet, a chord bearing of N 17°12'45" E, and a chord length of 32.71 feet; Thence along the West line of said Lot One (1), N 18°54'05" E a distance of 100.97 feet; Thence along the West line of said Lot One (1), on a curve to the left with an arc length of 138.57 feet, a radius of 542.36 feet, a chord bearing of N 11°34'55" E, and a chord length of 138.19 feet to the Northwest corner of said Lot One (1); Thence along the North line of said Lot One (1), N 90°00'00" E a distance of 412.73 feet to the Northeast corner of said Lot One (1); Thence along the East line of said Lot One (1), S 00°06'25" E a distance of 300.90 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.  
Said tract having an area of 129,286.3 Square Feet or 2.97 Acres, more or less.

## Other Business

---

6. Consider adopting a Resolution of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC), recommending for adoption an amended fee schedule for applications to the TMAPC and Board of Adjustment within the City of Tulsa.

**Action(s) Requested:** Adoption of the Resolution amending the fee schedule for applications to the TMAPC and Board of Adjustment within the City of Tulsa,

### Staff Recommendation

#### Item

Adopt amended fee schedule for **TMAPC applications** within the **City of Tulsa** and applications to the **City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment**.

#### Background

The Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC) and Tulsa City Council adopt application fees for Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC) and Board of Adjustment (BOA) application fees within the City of Tulsa. When fee revisions are proposed for applications within unincorporated Tulsa County, the County Commission is also an approving body.

Over the past 22 years, fees have been adjusted only a few times. Fees were slightly adjusted in 2002, and Subdivision fees were slightly modified in 2013. TMAPC fees related to zoning, as well as Board of Adjustment fees, were modified in 2016 to include several new categories and processes resulting from the adoption of the updated City of Tulsa Zoning Code. In 2018, fee revisions were adopted to reflect changes in the updated Tulsa Metropolitan Area Subdivision and Development Regulations.

When the Tulsa Planning Office moved to the City of Tulsa in July 2023, staff were asked to evaluate fees based on the full cost of processing an application. The proposed fee structure more accurately reflects the cost of processing applications from beginning to end. Another advantage of this proposed fee structure is the incorporation of flat fees that make it much clearer to applicants how much their application will actually cost, as opposed to the current approach with low base fees plus various additional fees for notices, etc. The total number of application fees are reduced from 68 fees with variables to 34 flat fees. The number of TMAPC fees will be reduced from 45 to 24, and the number of BOA fees will be reduced from 28 to 10. This provides a more transparent and customer-friendly approach.

Planning Office staff presented the proposed fees for discussion at the August 7, 2024, TMAPC Work Session. The proposed fee changes were posted on the Planning Office website on August 12, 2024:

<https://tulsaplanning.org/news/proposed-fee-changes/>. The Planning Office discussed the proposed amendments at a Municipal Roundtable event, including HBA, NAIOP, CCIM, and GTAR on August 13, 2024. The link was distributed via email by Partner Tulsa to 100+ Developer Roundtable email recipients on August 28, 2024. Subsequent to a TMAPC recommendation of proposed TMAPC/BOA fees, an ordinance amendment to Title 49 Administrative, Permit and License fees will be presented to City Council for consideration.

### TMAPC Comments

Mr. Craddock stated that he would be making the same comments as he did in the work session. He appreciates the volume of work that staff does, and they have done a fabulous job. Mr. Craddock stated that he has a fundamental problem with the appearance of growing government and then charging for that growth. He stated that trying to get market cost is hard. Mr. Craddock stated they want effective government and that means getting the best bang for their buck instead of efficient government which is spending the money faster. Mr. Craddock stated raising the rates as high as proposed and trying to get market value bothers him.

Mr. Zalk stated if it increases transparency and makes it easier for applicants to understand the fee schedule, he supports it. Mr. Zalk asked what portion of the fees are formally hidden fees that are now becoming transparent and what portion is an increase.

Staff stated the analysis that they did put the average cost for a rezoning application at \$1550.00 and that was an 83% recovery rate. He stated making that application \$1800 makes it a 97% recovery rate. Staff stated that none of the increases push the recovery rate over 100% but gets close to the actual costs so that the City is not subsidizing all the costs with taxpayer dollars. He stated costs have increased for such things as signs and increased printing and postage costs.

Mr. Whitlock asked how the increased fees would help the housing shortage in Tulsa.

Staff stated it would not help it or hurt it. She stated the fee schedule was sent to all the home builders and did not get any feedback.

Mr. Fugate asked when looking at these numbers were there any areas where the software would reduce operational costs.

Staff stated the software is not funded out of fees it is funded out of taxpayer money. She stated the software will allow applicants to pay for their applications online instead of coming to the Planning Office or mailing a check.

Ms. Turner-Addison thanked the staff for presenting the fee schedule changes in a work session because it helped her to understand why the fees are needed.

### **Commission Action**

Motion: Recommend adoption of the Resolution amending the fee schedule for applications to the TMAPC and Board of Adjustment within the City of Tulsa, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Zalk                      Second by: Shivel

Vote: 8-2-0

Ayes: Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Zalk

Nays: Craddock, Whitlock

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

7. **Proposed 2025 TMAPC Meeting Dates**



**Tulsa Metropolitan Area  
Planning Commission (TMAPC)**

**Proposed 2025 Schedule**

Regular meetings of the TMAPC are held on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 1:00 p.m. at One Technology Center, 175 E. 2nd St., City Council Chamber, 2nd Level, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Work sessions of the TMAPC are held as necessary, typically prior to regular TMAPC business, at One Technology Center, 175 E. 2nd St., in a room location to be announced at the time an agenda is posted.

<b>January</b> 8* 22*	<b>February</b> 5 19	<b>March</b> 5 19
<b>April</b> 2 16	<b>May</b> 7 21	<b>June</b> 4 18
<b>July</b> 2 16	<b>August</b> 6 20	<b>September</b> 3 17
<b>October</b> 1 15	<b>November</b> 5 19	<b>December</b> 3 17

\* January meetings were moved to 2nd and 4th Wednesday due to a holiday.

**Action(s) Requested:** Approve the 2025 calendar for TMAPC meeting dates.

**TMAPC Comments**

None

**Commission Action**

Motion: To approve the proposed 2025 TMAPC meeting schedule with the modification that the first meeting of January be move from January 1, 2025, which is New Years Day, to January 8, 2025 and the second meeting in January be move from January 15, 2025 to January 22, 2025.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Shivel

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

DRAFT

---

## **Other Business**

---

None

## **Commissioner Comments**

None

---

## **Adjournment**

---

### **Commission Action**

Motion: Adjourn

Motion by: Zalk                      Second by: Craddock

Vote: 10-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Rojas, Rosene Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock, Zalk

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Walker

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

DRAFT