Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

Minutes of Meeting No. 2910
Wednesday, March 20, 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 March 14, 2024 at 8:07 a.m.

**Members Present:** Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock,

**Members Absent:** Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk

**Staff Present:** Nathan Foster, Susan Miller, Kim Sawyer, Dylan Siers, Austin Chapman, 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, Chair Walker called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

**Reports**

**Chairman’s Report:** None.

**Director’s Report:** Ms. Miller reported on City Council actions and some upcoming informational items that will appear on the agenda under other business.

**Approval of Minutes**

1. **Minutes from Meeting 2909, March 06, 2024**

   **Motion:** Approval of the minutes of Meeting 2909 from March 06, 2024.

   **Motion by:** Shivel  
   **Second by:** Craddock

   **Vote:** 7-0-0

   **Ayes:** Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock

   **Nays:** none

   **Abstentions:** none

   **Absent:** Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
Consent Agenda

2. PUD-592-D-1
   Location: Northeast corner of South Harvard Avenue and East 41st Street South
   City Council District: 9
   Applicant: TriArch, Ethan Arch
   Action(s) Requested: PUD Minor Amendment to increase the allowable square footage and establish a setback from the south property line.

Detailed Staff Recommendation

The applicant is proposing a PUD Minor Amendment to increase the allowable square footage and establish a setback from the southern property line.

The proposed proposal for PUD 592-D-1 is located within Development Area B of PUD-592.

PUD-592-D was approved in 2021 and added the Religious Assembly use. This major amendment did not address any of the lot and building regulations. The lot and building regulations for this PUD come from PUD-592-C, which also state that PUD-592-D is located within Development area B. Development area B from PUD-592-C eventually became PUD-592-D.

The applicant has submitted a minor amendment application to increase the maximum building floor area for PUD-592-D, as well as establish setbacks from the southern property line. The proposed remodel of the building will not be making the footprint of the building much larger but will be adding a floor to the education wing, which is why the amendment is needed.

The changes made within this minor amendment can be found below. Changes will be italicized.

Development Area B (PUD-592-D)
   Current Maximum Building Floor Area: 19,295 SF

PUD-592-D-1
   Proposed Maximum Building Floor Area: 31,000 SF

   Southern Boundary Setback: 10' setback from property line.

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

Staff has reviewed the request and determined:
1) PUD-592-D-1 is consistent with the provisions for administration and procedures of a PUD in section 30.010-H.

2) PUD-592-D-1 does not represent a significant departure from the approved development standards in the PUD and is considered a minor amendment to PUD-592-D.

3) All remaining development standards defined in PUD-592-D and subsequent amendments shall remain in effect.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Local Center.

**Local Centers** serve the daily needs of those in the surrounding neighborhoods. This designation implies that the center generally does not serve an area beyond the nearby neighborhoods. Typical uses include commercial or retail uses that serve the daily needs of nearby residents. In order to introduce a regional trip generator, the entire local center designation should be amended to be Regional Center with significant input from all affected properties and nearby neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Local Center</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3/PUD-592-C</td>
<td>Local Center</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3/CS/PUD-761-B</td>
<td>Local Center</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Local Center</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are not within a small area plan.

**Development Era**
The subject property is in an area developed during the Early Automobile Era (1930s-50s), which retained a high degree of the connectivity from neighborhood streets to the arterial network, with mostly commercial, office, industrial, and other active uses along major streets and a mix of housing options and neighborhood-based uses like schools, churches, and libraries in the interior sections. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, commercial revitalization, compatibility of scale for neighborhood development, and transitions between commercial corridors and residential areas.
Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: Secondary Arterial

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: Multimodal Corridor

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Arterial Traffic per Lane: 2500-5000 per lane

Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: The subject properties not within a flood area

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 18%. 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

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff’s recommendation.

Speakers
None.

Property Description
Lot 2 Block 1, Forty-First Place, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Commission Action
Motion: Approve Consent Agenda item 2, per staff’s recommendation.
Motion by: Craddock Second by: Whitlock
Vote: 7-0-0
Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock
Nays: none
Abstentions: none
Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
Items 3 and 4 were continued to April 3, 2024.

**Public Hearing - Rezoning**

3. **CZ-551** (County)
   - **Location:** Northwest corner of South 48th West Avenue and West 41st Street South
   - **County Commission District:** 2
   - **Applicant:** Cody/Morgan LLC
   - **Action(s) Requested:** Rezoning from RS to CS *(INCOG staff requests a continuance to April 3, 2024)*

**TMAPC Comments**
None

**Commission Action**
- **Motion:** To continue item 3 to April 3, 2024.
- **Motion by:** Craddock  **Second by:** Shivel
- **Vote:** 7-0-0
- **Ayes:** Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock
- **Nays:** none
- **Abstentions:** none
- **Absent:** Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
4. **CZ-552** (County)
   - **Location:** Southwest corner of East 86th Street North and North Yale Avenue
   - **County Commission District:** 1
   - **Applicant:** AAB Engineering, LLC
   - **Action(s) Requested:** Rezoning from CS to RS (Related to West Estates Preliminary Plat)
   - **(INCOG staff requests a continuance to April 3, 2024)**

**TMAPC Comments**
None

**Commission Action**
- **Motion** To continue item 4 to April 3, 2024.
- **Motion by:** Craddock   **Second by:** Shivel
- **Vote:** 7-0-0
- **Ayes:** Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock
- **Nays:** none
- **Abstentions:** none
- **Absent:** Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
5. **Z-7761**
   Location: East of the northeast corner of South 145th East Ave. and East 41st Street South.
   City Council District: 6
   Applicant: Mark Capron
   Action(s) Requested: Rezoning from RS-4 to RS-5

**Detailed Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from RS-4 to RS-5 to permit higher density single-family residential development.

The application is consistent with several other rezoning requests that have been approved in the immediate area. There is existing RS-5 zoning to the northwest. Property immediately east of the subject property has been approved for RS-5.

RS-5 permits detached houses by right with a minimum lot width of 30’ and a minimum lot area of 3,300 square feet. The rezoning would permit more lots as part of future subdivisions. The rezoning would allow more lots to be served by the required public infrastructure required to be installed as part of any subdivision.

RS-5 is consistent with the land use designation for the property and 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 of an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access off a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-5/RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant/Single-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-5</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Small Area Plans
None.

Development Era
The subject property is in an area designated as future growth. Future growth areas consist of primarily undeveloped property and present opportunities to ensure the pattern of development is efficient and fiscally responsible.

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: East 41st Street South is designated as a secondary arterial. Secondary arterials require an ultimate right-of-way of 100 feet. Appropriate right-of-way dedications for public streets will be required as subdivision plats for the property are reviewed.

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: East 41st Street South is designated as a future multi-modal corridor. As development of the street occurs, improvements should anticipate future road users in addition to personal vehicles.

Transit: There are currently no transit facilities serving the immediate area.

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: N/A

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is shown at 48%. It is recommended that new developments incorporate additional trees to maintain or increase the tree canopy coverage. Trees serve as mitigation to both urban heat and stormwater runoff.

Parks & Open Space: There are currently no designated park areas in the vicinity. Open space will be required on each lot within any subdivision per the Tulsa Zoning Code.

Zoning History
Ordinance 11826, dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Z-7577, Ordinance 24494, dated December 13, 2020 changed the zoning of the subject property from RS-3 to RS-4

TMAPC Comments
The applicant indicated their agreement with staff’s recommendation.

Speakers
None.
TMAPC Comments
Ms. Turner-Addison asked if the required sign was posted on the subject property.

Mr. Foster said they would confirm that the sign was posted on the subject property.

Ms. Turner-Addison asked if all rezoning requests required a sign posting.

Mr. Foster confirmed that “yes” all rezonings require a sign posting.

Commission Action
Motion: Recommend approval of the RS-5 zoning, per staff’s recommendation.
Motion by: Craddock    Second by: Shivel
Vote: 7-0-0
Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock
Nays: none
Abstentions: none
Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk

Property Description
BEG SECR SW TH E18.40 N235 W30.18 N148.96 NW112.98 N670 W52.08 N170.01 E981.16 S1320.32 W840.55
POB SEC 22 19 12 27.055ACS, CROSSING AT BATTLE CREEK PHASE II BLOCKS 7-13, BATTLE CREEK PARK
PHASE II,
THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT
THEREOF
Items 6 and 11 were presented and voted on together.

6. **Z-7762**
   - **Location:** West of the northwest corner of South Evanston Avenue and East 75th Street South
   - **City Council District:** 2
   - **Applicant:** Tanner Consulting, LLC
   - **Action(s) Requested:** Rezoning from RS-1 to RS-1 with an optional development plan

**Detailed Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is proposing an optional development plan to permit private streets on the subject properties.

The current property consists of six separate tax parcels containing six detached houses. The existing lots do not comply with City of Tulsa zoning requirements due to the current configuration. The property owner is seeking to bring the existing homes into compliance by rezoning and platting the property.

If approved, the existing street would be required to be improved to City of Tulsa standards and permitted as a private street to be maintained by a designated homeowner’s association.

The properties are designated as “Neighborhood” by the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. The RS-1 zoning is consistent with the surrounding properties and only permits large-lot single-family detached homes.

With consideration given to the factors listed herein, staff recommends approval of the application subject to the development standards outlined below.

**Z-7762 Development Standards**

The project shall be developed in accordance with all applicable requirements of the RS-1 district of the Tulsa Zoning Code, except as noted herein.

**STREETS:** Streets may be public or private and gated. The existing street shall remain as a private street and shall be inspected by the City of Tulsa and the City of Tulsa Fire Department. Private streets are subject to the requirements of the Tulsa Subdivision and Development Regulations, Section 5-060.8.

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are not located within any adopted small area plan boundaries.

**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:** East 75th Street South is designated as a residential collector which requires an ultimate right-of-way dedication of 60 feet. Right-of-way dedications, if required, will be enforced during the subdivision platting process.

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** N/A

**Transit:** N/A

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** N/A

**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** N/A

**Environmental Considerations**
**Flood Area:** The subject properties do not contain FEMA or City of Tulsa regulatory floodplain.
Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 30-50%. 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 11828, dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

TMAPC Comments

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff’s recommendation.

Speakers

(+) Tom OLeary, 2630 E. 74th Street, Tulsa, OK 74136 asked if another access was going to be added.

(-) Richard Dent, 2624 E. 74th Street, Tulsa, OK 74136, was concerned about a second access being added.

(-) Brian Bigbie, 7319 S. Columbia Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74136, was concerned about a barbed wire fence on the subject property within the easement and he would ask that the owner remove that and ask that the owner bring the property into compliance with the Zoning Code.

The applicant addressed the concerns of the speakers. He stated the property would be cleaned up and brought into compliance with the Zoning Code and there would only be one access used and that is the existing circle drive.

Commission Action

Motion: Recommend approval of the RS-1 zoning with an optional development plan, per staff’s recommendation.

Motion by: Carr Second by: Shivel

Vote: 7-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk

Property Description

A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF “SOUTHERN HILLS ESTATES”, A RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCKS ONE (1), TWO (2), AND THREE (3) OF “LA-VELL HEIGHTS”, A SUBDIVISION OF A PART OF THE SOUTH HALF OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (S/2 NW/4) OF SECTION EIGHT (8), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST OF THE INDIAN MERIDIAN, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, SAID “SOUTHERN HILLS ESTATES” BEING A SUBDIVISION TO THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 1626); AND A PART OF THE EAST HALF OF THE
NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (E/2 NE/4 NW/4) OF SAID SECTION 8, SAID TRACT BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT SIX (6), BLOCK TWO (2) OF SAID "SOUTHERN HILLS ESTATES", THENCE NORTH 1°15'42" WEST AND ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 6, FOR A DISTANCE OF 279.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°36'20" EAST FOR A DISTANCE OF 157.00 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF LOT SEVEN (7) OF SAID BLOCK 2; THENCE NORTH 1°15'42" WEST AND ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 7, AND ITS EXTENSION, FOR A DISTANCE OF 340.51 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID E/2 NE/4 NW/4; THENCE SOUTH 88°39'00" WEST AND ALONG SAID SOUTH LINE, FOR A DISTANCE OF 110.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF "WOODRIDGE", AN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 3339); THENCE NORTH 1°05'49" WEST AND ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID "WOODRIDGE", FOR A DISTANCE OF 300.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF "ROCKWOOD HILLS POND AMENDED", A RESUBDIVISION OF "ROCKWOOD HILLS POND" AND AN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 4736); THENCE NORTH 88°38'59" EAST AND ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID "ROCKWOOD HILLS POND AMENDED", FOR A DISTANCE OF 466.21 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF "ROCKWOOD HILLS ESTATES", AN ADDITION TO THE COUNTY OF TULSA (NOW CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY), OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 2189); THENCE SOUTH 1°14'28" EAST AND ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID "ROCKWOOD HILLS ESTATES" AND ALONG THE WEST LINE OF "ROCKWOOD HILLS MANOR 2ND ADDITION", A SUBDIVISION IN TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 3141), FOR A DISTANCE OF 919.48 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF EAST 75TH STREET SOUTH AS PLATTED WITHIN "SOUTHERN HILLS ESTATES"; THENCE SOUTH 88°37'59" WEST AND ALONG THE NORTH RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF EAST 75TH STREET SOUTH, FOR A DISTANCE OF 513.75 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;

SAID TRACT CONTAINS 404,872 SQUARE FEET OR 9.295 ACRES.

THE BEARINGS SHOWN HEREON ARE BASED UPON THE WEST LINE OF "ROCKWOOD HILLS MANOR 2ND ADDITION", A SUBDIVISION IN TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 3141), THE BEARING BEING NORTH 1°14'28" WEST.
Item 7 was continued to April 17, 2024.

7. **CO-18**
   - **Location:** Northwest of the northwest corner of East 51st Street South and South 129th East Ave.
   - **City Council District:** 7
   - **Applicant:** Tulsa City Council
   - **Action(s) Requested:** Major Amendment to adopt a new Corridor (CO) development plan to permit a public safety center.

**Commission Action**
Motion: To continue item 7 to April 17, 2024.
Motion by: Craddock Second by: Shivel
Vote: 7-0-0
Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock
Nays: none
Abstentions: none
Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
Item 8 was continued to April 3, 2024.

**Public Hearing – Plats**

8. **West Estates** (County)
   - **Location:** Southwest Corner of East 86th Street North and North Yale Avenue
   - **County Commission District:** 1
   - **Applicant:** AAB Engineering
   - **Action Requested:** Preliminary Plat for Single-Family Subdivision (Related to CZ-552 rezoning)
   - (INCOG staff requests a continuance to April 3, 2024)

**Commission Action**

Motion: To continue item 8 to April 3, 2024.

Motion by: Craddock  
Second by: Shivel

Vote: 7-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
9. **Berryhill 41 (County)**  
   **Location:** Northeast corner of West 41st Street South and South 61st West Avenue.  
   **County Commission District:** 2  
   **Applicant:** Berry Hill Baptist Church  
   **Action Requested:** Minor Subdivision Plat for Commercial Development

**Staff Recommendation**  
This plat consists of 2 lots, 1 block on 6.85 ± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on March 7, 2024, and provided the following comments:

1. **Zoning:** Proposed lot conforms to the requirements of the CS district. Planning Services will provide comments prior to the final plat release.
2. **Address:** Approved as submitted.
3. **Transportation & Traffic:** Approved as submitted.
4. **Sewer/Water:** On-site sewage disposal via ODEQ approved system. Water service to be provided by the City of Tulsa. Any improvements to existing water lines must be approved through the City of Tulsa.
5. **Stormwater, Drainage, & Floodplain:** Approved as submitted.
6. **Utilities: Telephone, Electric, Gas, Cable, Pipeline, Others:** All release letters have been received.

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

The applicant indicated their agreement with the staff’s recommendation.

**Speakers**  
No speakers

**Commission Action**  
**Motion:** Approve the minor subdivision plat subject to the conditions provided by TAC and all other requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations.

**Motion by:** Shivel  
**Second by:** Craddock  
**Vote:** 7-0-0  
**Ayes:** Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock  
**Nays:** none  
**Abstentions:** none  
**Absent:** Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
10. **Indus Elite**  
Location: Northeast corner of East 11th Street South and South 129th East Avenue  
City Council District: 6  
Applicant: JR Donelson  
Action Requested: Preliminary Plat for new subdivision

**Detailed Staff Recommendation**

The plat consists of 2 lots, 1 blocks, ±8.09 acres. Staff recommends **approval** of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the following conditions provided on March 7, 2024 by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and all other requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations. A City of Tulsa release letter is required prior to final plat approval. TAC Conditions:

1. **Engineering Graphics**  
   - Submit subdivision control data sheet with the final plat.  
   - Add an engineer heading providing the name of the engineer, mailing address, phone number, CA number with renewal date, and an email address.  
   - In the Location Map add missing platted properties. Add I-44 to location map. Label all other land as “unplatted”.  
   - Provide graphically on the face of the plat the address disclaimer/caveat.  
   - Under the Basis of Bearings information include the coordinate system used. Provide a bearing angle preferably shown on the face of the plat.  
   - Graphically show all property pins found or set that are associated with the plat. Either have a legend entry showing the found or set symbology or label each location with text.  
   - Add signature block for officials to sign to the face of the plat.  
   - Provide on the face of the plat the date of the last survey site visit.  
   - Provide both a written and graphic scale on the face of the plat.

2. **Addressing**  
   - Block 1  
     - Lot 1: 1085 S 129TH E AVE or 12913 E 11TH ST S  
     - Lot 2: 855 S 129TH E AVE or 12912 E 7TH ST S

3. **Streets**  
   - Provide Limits of Access/No Access language in the Deed of Dedication  
   - Verify that ROW required by the Major Street and Highway Plan has been dedicated along both South 129th East Avenue and East 11th Street South, including any additional ROW required on 11th due to the intersection of two arterials.  
   - Provide a book and page of right of way dedication of East 11th Street South and South 129th East Avenue on the plat.

4. **Sidewalks (5-070)**  
   - Sidewalks are required along both street frontages and must be ADA compliant. 5’ sidewalks along the Arterials.
5. Stormwater Management
- Depending on use for lots, stormwater hazard mitigation may be required, including detention facilities or fee-in-lieu-of detention may be available based on the available public storm system which could be utilized along S 129th E Ave & E 11th St.

6. Sewage Disposal
- Sanitary sewer extension needed so Lot 2 of block 1 is not divorced from sewer.
- Depending on where the public sanitary sewer is located in relation to the lot split line for lots 1 and 2 a public main extension may be needed.

Comprehensive Plan Considerations

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Multiple Use by the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. Multiple Use areas are “Mostly Commercial or Retail Uses” which include restaurants, shops, services, and smaller format employment uses. This land use designation is most common in areas of the city from earlier development patterns, with Local Centers being more commonplace in newer parts of the city. For single properties that are commercial but surrounded by Neighborhood, Multiple Use is the preferred designation.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-2 and CH</td>
<td>Multiple Use and Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Portable Building Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-2, CO and CS</td>
<td>Employment and Multiple Use</td>
<td>Residential, Car sales, Business Service Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are not located within a small area plan.

**Development Era**
The subject property is located in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era. Beginning in the late 1950s and the 1960s major changes occurred to the urban form of Tulsa. Two significant interventions include the introduction of the Interstate Highway System and the annexation events in the 1960s that more than doubled the size of Tulsa. This area of Tulsa has developed simultaneously with the development of surrounding communities, such as Broken Arrow, Owasso, Jenks, and Bixby. Though the growth of this area has been consistent for more than 60 years, the vast majority of developable land has been developed, leading to a decline in the number of properties being built each decade since the 1970s.

**Transportation**
Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: None.
Arterial Traffic per Lane:

- Arterial Traffic - North (E Admiral Pl - 2,848 Vehicles per Lane)
- Arterial Traffic - East (S 145th East Ave - 2,513 Vehicles per Lane)
- Arterial Traffic - South (E 11th St S - 2,675 Vehicles per Lane)
- Arterial Traffic - West (S 129th East Ave - 3,547 Vehicles per Lane)

Environmental Considerations

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 10-20%. 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

TMAPC Comments

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff’s recommendation.

Speakers

None.

Commission Action

Motion: Approve the preliminary subdivision plat for Indus Elite, per staff’s recommendation.

Motion by: Humphrey  Second by: Craddock

Vote: 7-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
11. **Columbia Point**
   Location: West of the northwest corner of South Evanston Avenue and East 75th Street South
   City Council District: 2
   Applicant: Tanner Consulting, LLC
   Action Requested: Preliminary Plat for new subdivision

**Detailed Staff Recommendation**

The plat consists of 8 lots, 1 block, ±[Company Phone] acres. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the following conditions provided on March 7, 2024 by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and all other requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations. A City of Tulsa release letter is required prior to final plat approval. TAC Conditions:

1. **Engineering Graphics**
   - Submit subdivision control data sheet with the final plat.
   - Provide the individual lot addresses on the face of the plat.
   - In the Location Map change Esplanade Condominiums to Patio Square Addn. Walnut Creek should be Walnut Creek II. Remove land hook in location map.
   - Provide on the face of the plat the date of last survey site visit.
   - Under the Basis of Bearings information include the coordinate system used. Provide a bearing angle preferably shown on the face of the plat.
   - Graphically show all property pins found or set that are associated with the plat. Either have a legend entry showing the found or set symbology or label each location with text.
   - Graphically label the POB (Point of Beginning) on the face of the plat.

2. **Addressing**
   - Looking at the current street and address data to determine the street name. Will provide this information at a later date.
   - Addresses will be provided at a later date.

3. **Streets**
   - Private street shall be constructed to City Standards and permitted through the IDP process.
   - Sidewalks are required along all streets and must be ADA compliant. 5’ sidewalks along the Arterials and 4’ for residential sidewalks.

4. **Protection From Flooding and Other Natural Hazards**
   - No federal floodplains per FIRM 40143C0362L. No regulatory floodplains per CoT Atlas panel 52.

5. **Stormwater Management**
   - Subdivision development (existing houses make this ambiguous) would require runoff mitigation, per previous discussions, a connection to the 15” public line to the W could be
6. Sewer
   - Sewer main extension required for all lots as shown. IDP will be required for main extension.

7. Easements
   - Appropriate Easement may be required for any public infrastructure required on site.

Comprehensive Plan Considerations

Land Use Plan
The subject property is designated as a Neighborhood by the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. 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 of an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access off of a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>MPD-4</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans
The subject properties are not located within a small area plan.

Development Era
The subject property is located in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era. In the late 1950s and early 1960s the suburbs grew at a tremendous rate in the Tulsa metropolitan area. It was at this time that surrounding communities, such as Broken Arrow, began to grow at a rapid pace. At this time, the City of Tulsa annexed more than 100 square miles, and neighborhood subdivisions began to proliferate from the core of the city toward the suburban communities.

Transportation
Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: Street the property is accessed from is not classified.

Arterial Traffic per Lane:
Arterial Traffic - North (E 71st St S - 4,711 Vehicles per Lane)
Arterial Traffic - East (S Harvard Ave - 6,564 Vehicles per Lane)
Arterial Traffic - South (E 81st St S - 4,045 Vehicles per Lane)
Arterial Traffic - West (S Lewis Ave - 4,567 Vehicles per Lane)

**Environmental Considerations**
Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 30-50%.
Parks & Open Space: N/A.

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

**Speakers**
None.

**Commission Action**
Motion: Approve the preliminary subdivision plat for Columbia Point, per staff’s recommendation.
Motion by: Carr Second by: Shivel
Vote: 7-0-0
Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock
Nays: none
Abstentions: none
Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
12. NP36 North
   Location: Southwest corner of East 36th Street North and North Lewis Avenue
   City Council District: 1
   Applicant: John Droz
   Action Requested: Preliminary Plat for new subdivision

Detailed Staff Recommendation

The plat consists of 6 lots, 2 blocks, ±[Company Phone] acres. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the following conditions provided on March 7, 2024 by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and all other requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations. A City of Tulsa release letter is required prior to final plat approval. TAC Conditions:

1. Engineering Graphics
   - Submit subdivision control data sheet with the final plat.
   - In the plat subtitle add “City of Tulsa” before Tulsa County.
   - Provide the individual lot addresses on the face of the plat.
   - In the Location Map add missing platted properties. Remove the individual parcel/lot lines. Label all other land in the section as “unplatted”. Label and show the Gilcrease Expressway in the location map. Label the location of the plat in Location Map as either “project location” or “site”.
   - Under the Basis of Bearings information include the coordinate system used. Provide a bearing angle preferably shown on the face of the plat.
   - Graphically show all property pins found or set that are associated with the plat. Either have a legend entry showing the found or set symbology or label each location with text.
   - We prefer to see the plat tied to a section corner, half section, or quarter section. That being labeled graphically on the face of the plat as the POC (point of commencement) with a bearing angle and distance to the POB (point of beginning). All of this incorporated into a metes and bounds written legal description of the property.

2. Addressing
   - N WHEELING PL should be N WHEELING AVE.
   - Addresses will be provided at a later date.

3. Streets (transportation)
   - Provide Limits of No Access on the plat and the language within the Deed of Dedication. This note applies to 36th Street North and North Lewis Avenue.
   - Verify that ROW being dedicated by this plat along East 36th Street North complies with the Major Street and Highway Plan.
   - Verify that existing ROW along North Lewis Avenue and Mohawk Boulevard (as applicable) is compliant with the Major Street and Highway Plan.

4. Streets (fire)
-If cul de sac between Utica and 35th St N is dead ended, please ensure it is 96 ft diameter.

5. Sidewalks
   -Sidewalks are required along all streets adjacent to this plat and must be ADA compliant.
   -5’ sidewalks along the Arterials and 4’ for residential sidewalks.
   -Sidewalks around Lot 1, Block 2 are included in IDP 155643. Sidewalks across Mohawk frontage of Lot 3, Block 1 are existing.

6. Protection From Flooding and Other Natural Hazards (Floodplain)
   -FEMA zone AE 100yr floodplain is on site per FIRM panels 40143C0229L & 40143C0228L.
   -City of Tulsa Regulatory floodplain extends past FEMA boundary in limited locations, per City of Tulsa atlas panel 29. Plans do not show modification to floodplains.

7. Stormwater Management
   -Stormwater water hazard mitigation is addressed by Fee-in-lieu-of detention due to the projects’ location in the lower reach of the Dirty Butter Creek basin.

8. Water
   -Ensure hydrant coverage is consistent with IFC 2018.

9. Easements
   -Floodplain in L1B3 should be contained in an OD/E. How does exclave portion of L3B1 comply with perimeter easement and frontage requirements? A perimeter easement around the unplatted area intruding to L1B1 may be required.
   -Between Blk 1 Lot 2 and 3 change the 17.5’ U/E to a 30’ of WL/E “By This Plat or Separate Instrument” from the asphalt road to E Mohawk Blvd for maintaining the 8-inch water main line.
   -Confirm if water meter vault easements exist in the northeast area of Blk 1 lot 3 abutting the required 30’ WL/E but currently shown as a 17.5’ U/E and Lot 2 Blk 1 in the southeast area from E Mohawk Blvd. If these meter vaults exist label them “By This Plat or Separate Instrument” with book and page.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Employment by the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. The employment designation is intended to accommodate offices, warehousing and storage, manufacturing and assembly, and industrial processes. The “Industrial Site Suitability” map corresponds to the Employment land use designation and indicates where uses that are potentially incompatible with sensitive land uses are best suited to locate. This directs industrial uses to particular areas of the city while discouraging industrial in close proximity to Neighborhood areas.
Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RMH/AG</td>
<td>Park and Open Space/Employment</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3/AG</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans
The subject properties are the 36th Street North Corridor Small Area Plan which identified it as an area of employment and as the site of a proposed industrial park.

Development Era
The subject property is located in an area developed during the Early Automobile Era. The Early Automobile Era area includes those parts of the city that developed prior to and after World War II but prior to the major annexations of the 1960s. These neighborhoods developed during the rise of the automobile, but generally maintain a rectilinear street grid with homes on smaller lots.

Transportation
Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:

Arterial Traffic per Lane:
- Arterial Traffic - North (E 36th St N - 2,122 Vehicles per Lane)
- Arterial Traffic - East (N Lewis Ave - 3,368 Vehicles per Lane)
- Arterial Traffic - South (E Apache St - 2,057 Vehicles per Lane)
- Arterial Traffic - West (N Peoria Ave - 2,851 Vehicles per Lane)

Environmental Considerations
Parks & Open Space: N/A

TMAPC Comments
Mr. Craddock is concerned that the City is considering changing North Lewis from 4 lanes to 2 lanes going south. If this is true, he is concerned about adding additional truck traffic if these lanes are reduced.

Speakers
(-) Dr. Corinice Wilson, 1750 Mohawk BLVD, Tulsa, OK 74110, is opposed that an industrial area is allowed in a residential area. Other concerns include increasing traffic and no conversations with the neighbors regarding these changes.
(-) Charles Williams, 2103 Mohawk BLVD, Tulsa, OK 74110, is opposed because of the large trucks damaging the roads. He said the site plan that was approved was not being followed as far as the landscaping around Mohawk BLVD. and his property.
(-) **Jay R Steward**, 1922 Mohawk BLVD, Tulsa, OK 74110, is opposed because this is a residential area.

(-) **Julian Wilson**, 1750 Mohawk BLVD, Tulsa, OK 74110, is opposed to the development. He did not buy his home to have industrial located across the street from him.

Ms. Carr left at 1:50pm and returned at 1:52pm

Mr. Walker stated the zoning, and the use was approved at an earlier date and that this was the approval for the preliminary plat

Staff stated the zoning and use was approved in 2017. He stated that there are some non-conformity issues that are currently being addressed with the owner of the Muncie facility and staff expects to have that all worked out soon.

**Commission Action**

Motion: Approve the preliminary subdivision plat for NP36, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Humphrey    Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 6-1-0

Ayes: Carr, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock

Nays: Craddock,

Abstentions: none

Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk
Other Business

13. Consider adopting revised **TMAPC Policies and Procedures** (Continued from January 17, 2024, February 7, 2024 and February 21, 2024)

**Item**

Consider adoption of revised **Policies and Procedures of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission**

**Background**

The TMAPC Policies and Procedures document has been revised multiple times over the years to reflect the 2010 adoption of the City of Tulsa Comprehensive Plan (planitulsa); the 2016 adoption of the updated City of Tulsa Zoning Code; the 2018 update of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Subdivision and Development Regulations; and other procedural and organizational matters to name a few.

Since the last update to the Policies and Procedures in 2020, the Tulsa County Comprehensive Land Use Plan was adopted; the 2023 update to planitulsa was adopted; planning and zoning processes have evolved; and organization changes have resulted in City of Tulsa Planning Office moving to the City of Tulsa, while the planning for Tulsa County remained at INCOG.

The proposed revisions to the Policies and Procedures reflect these changes, most notably the updated processes to reflect the adoption of planitulsa and the inclusion of an amendment process for the Tulsa County Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The current version of the Policies and Procedures do not specifically address the County Comprehensive Plan, since, prior to October 2020, it was outdated and not readily utilized. Other changes are primarily proposed to clarify certain items and reflect existing practices.

Planning Office and INCOG staff presented the proposed revisions at the January 3, 2024, TMAPC Work Session. This Item was originally heard at the January 17th, 2024, TMAPC meeting and subsequently was continued three times to additional time for County review.

**Staff Recommendation**

Adopt the revised **Policies and Procedures of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission**

**TMAPC Comments:**

Mr. Craddock appreciates all the work that went into this document.

Ms. Turner-Addison was concerned about the statement in 5.2 Conflict of Interest, Item 3d that states, “In determining whether or not a Commissioner has a conflict of interest on any matter, each Commissioner shall have the sole discretion in making such determination for himself or herself”. Staff stated that has always been the practice. She said it is up to Commissioners to decide for themselves if they can be impartial or if the public would perceive this as a conflict.
Commission Action
Motion: Approve the TMAPC Policies and Procedures
Motion by: Walker    Second by: Shivel
Vote: 6-0-1
Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Walker, Whitlock
Nays: none
Abstentions: Turner-Addison
Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk

14. Commissioners’ Comments
None

Adjournment

Commission Action
Motion: Adjourn
Motion by: Walker    Second by: Craddock
Vote: 9-0-0
Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker, Whitlock,
Nays: none
Abstentions: none
Absent: Fugate, Hood, Robinson, Zalk

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.