



Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

APPROVED
Apr. 17, 2024

Minutes of Meeting No. 2911

Wednesday, April 3, 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 27, 2024 at 10:20 a.m.

Members Present: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker

Members Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Staff Present: Nathan Foster, Susan Miller, Kim Sawyer, Dylan Siers, Jeff Stephens

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 1:00 p.m.

Reports

Chairman’s Report: None

Director’s Report: Ms. Miller reported on City Council actions and special projects.

Approval of Minutes

1. **Minutes from Meeting 2910, March 20, 2024**

Motion: Approval of the minutes of Meeting 2910 from March 20, 2024.

Motion by: Shivel Second by: Craddock

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker,

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Consent Agenda

2. **Saint Francis Hospital South**

Location: Northeast corner of East 91st Street South and Highway 169

City Council District: 7

Applicant: Nathalie Cornett

Action(s) Requested: Request to extend preliminary Plat approval by 1 year. Preliminary plat was approved by TMAPC on April 6th, 2022.

Commission Action

Motion: To continue Consent Agenda item 2, to April 17, 2024.

Motion by: Walker Second by: Hood

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker,

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

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 (Continued from March 20, 2024)

Staff Recommendation

The applicant is proposing to rezone from RS to CS to permit Commercial Development on the subject tracts.

The applicant intends to develop the subject tracts into a commercial development that will be leased to various businesses. The site is located within the Neighborhood Center designation of the Tulsa County Comprehensive Plan. Neighborhood Center designated tracts exist to the West, East and South of the subject tracts. The proposed commercial development would be compatible with the Neighborhood Center Land Use designation.

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

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 Center. Defined as *“Small-scale, one to three story mixed-use areas intended to serve nearby neighborhoods with retail, dining, and services. They can include apartments, condominiums, and townhouses, with small lot single family homes at the edges. These are pedestrian-oriented places served by transit, and visitors who drive can park once and walk to number of destinations.”*

Surrounding Properties:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	RS	Existing Neighborhood	Single-Family
East	RS	Neighborhood Center	Single-Family
South	CS	Neighborhood Center	Single-Family
West	CS	Neighborhood Center	Commercial

Small Area Plans

None

Transportation

Major Street & Highway Plan: W 41st St S is designated as a Secondary Arterial, which includes a proposed 100 ft Right-Of-Way.

Transit: None

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: A sidewalk gap is shown on the GO Plan along W 41st St S. A signed on-street bike route is recommended.

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

None

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

Speakers

(-) Sandi Dittman, 4501 West 41st Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74107

(-) Sara Clary, 4118 S. 47th West Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74107

Rebuttal

Mr. Morgan, (applicant) stated that he agreed with staff's recommendation, he planned to put in a nice commercial use and he was sorry there were concerns.

Commission Action

Motion: Recommend approval of the CS zoning, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Walker Second by: Fugate

Vote: 8-1-0

Ayes: Carr, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker,

Nays: Craddock

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Property Description

LT 6 LESS S15 THEREOF FOR RD BLK 1; LT 5 LESS S10 THEREOF BLK 1; LT 4 LESS S10 THEREOF FOR RD BLK 1, PARKS HGTS, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

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) (Continued from March 20, 2024)

Staff Recommendation

The applicant is proposing to rezone from CS to RS to permit a residential subdivision.

The applicant intends to develop the subject tracts into a residential subdivision. A concurrent preliminary plat has also been submitted for this location, West Estates, which will establish the lots of the subdivision. The site is located within the Rural Commercial Land Use designation of the Tulsa County Comprehensive Plan. This proposal would be compatible with that designation as it is a less intense use than commercial development would be.

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

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 Rural Commercial. Defined as *“This designation provides for a mix of retail and service uses that are typically needed by residents in rural areas and surrounding agricultural operations. Developments in Rural Commercial designated areas may include a mix of uses, recognizing that separation of uses is not practical in a rural setting.”*

Surrounding Properties:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	CS	Rural Commercial	Vacant/Commercial
East	RE/AG	Rural Residential/Agricultural / Rural Commercial	Single-Family/Church
South	RE	Rural Residential/Agricultural	Single-Family
West	RE	Rural Residential/Agricultural	Single-Family

Small Area Plans

None

Transportation

Major Street & Highway Plan: N Yale Ave is designated as a Secondary Arterial, which includes a proposed 100 ft Right-Of-Way.

Transit: None

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: A sidewalk gap is shown on the GO Plan along N Yale Ave.

Environmental Considerations

Flood Area: None

Parks & Open Space: None

Zoning History

Resolution 183561, dated February 4, 2002, established zoning for the subject property.

TMAPC Comments

Mr. Craddock stated that the County Comprehensive Plan adoption of December 7, 2020, is in direct conflict with this request. Mr. Craddock stated that he would like to deny this request because of the County Comprehensive Plan to keep that area CS.

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

Rebuttal

Mr. Betcham, AAB Engineering, LLC stated that he had tried to sell the property for 5 years and did not feel it was viable as CS and he thought the use lended itself to RS more than CS. They reserved parcels to the north will be kept as CS that have frontage onto 86th Street as pad site development.

Commission Action

Motion: Recommend denial of the RS zoning.

Motion by: Craddock Second by: Fugate

Vote: 5-4-0

Ayes: Craddock, Turner-Addison, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey

Nays: Carr, Robinson, Shivel, Walker

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Property Description

A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN PART OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER (NE/4 NE/4) OF SECTION TWENTY-EIGHT (28), TOWNSHIP TWENTY-ONE (21) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID NE/4 NE/4; THENCE SOUTH 01°17'26" EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID NE/4 NE/4, A DISTANCE OF 401.28 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING SOUTH 01°17'26" EAST ALONG SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 920.27 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID NE/4 NE/4; THENCE SOUTH 88°38'50" WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID NE/4 NE/4, A DISTANCE OF 1010.36 FEET TO THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF U.S. HIGHWAY SEVENTY-FIVE (75); THENCE NORTH 02°35'51" EAST ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 315.34 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE FOLLOWING SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE ON A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1,345.84 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 10°11'01" EAST, A CHORD DISTANCE OF 353.13 FEET AND A CURVE DISTANCE OF 354.15 TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, ON A CURVE TO THE LEFT HAVING A RADIUS OF 113.79 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 19°32'38" EAST, A CHORD DISTANCE OF 11.10 FEET, AND A CURVE DISTANCE OF 11.10 FEET; THENCE NORTH 18°14'59" EAST ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, A DISTANCE OF 264.40 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°37'52" EAST A DISTANCE OF 826.35 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; CONTAINING 873,699 SQUARE FEET OR 20.06 ACRES.

5. Z-7763

Location: Multiple lots at the southeast corner of East 14th Street South and South 119th East Avenue

City Council District: 6

Applicant: Raul Saldivar

Action(s) Requested: Rezoning from RS-2 to AG-R

Staff Recommendation

The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject properties from RS-2 to AG-R to permit existing residential and agricultural uses.

The property under application would comply with the requirements of the AG-R district. The applicant has had one horse on the subject property since at least 2019. The City of Tulsa only permits agricultural animals in AG or AG-R districts. AG-R is intended to allow agricultural animals accessory to residential uses but does not permit principal agriculture uses that would be allowed in the AG district, such as horticulture nurseries and animal husbandry.

Horses kept on the subject property will be subject to the requirements outlined in Title 2 of the City of Tulsa ordinances. This includes requirements for spacing between horse enclosures and neighboring residences of a minimum of 100'. It also restricts the number of horses and other agricultural animals that can be kept on a single property. Horses are required to be registered with the City of Tulsa Animal Welfare department.

The AG-R zoning is consistent with the neighborhood land use designation by only permitting residential uses and accessory agricultural uses.

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-2	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
East	RS-2	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
South	RS-3	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
West	RS-2/RS-3	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential

Small Area Plans

The subject properties are located within the East Tulsa Phase I Small Area Plan (2005). There are no specific recommendations related to the subject properties; however, the plan did recommend the area as neighborhood as reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.

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: N/A

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 are not located in any designated flood areas.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 21%. 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 11812, dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

TMAPC Comments

Mr. Craddock asked how many animals and what type of animals are allowed in AG-R. He also asked if there were any calls or emails from concerned neighbors.

Staff stated 1 horse per acre, 6 adult chickens and rabbits would be allowed. He said regarding neighborhood calls, there were several calls from neighbors asking general questions and a few admitted they would often stop by and feed the horse.

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

Speakers

None

Commission Action

Motion: Recommend approval of the AG-R zoning, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Carr Second by: Turner-Addison

Vote: 8-1-0

Ayes: Carr, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker,

Nays: Craddock

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Property Description

Subdivision: ELM HURST (12875)

Legal: LT 3 BLK 10

Section: 08 Township: 19 Range: 14

Subdivision: ELM HURST (12875)

Legal: W1/2 LT 2 BLK 10

Section: 08 Township: 19 Range: 14

Subdivision: ELM HURST (12875)

Legal: LT 4 BLK 10

Section: 08 Township: 19 Range: 14

Subdivision: ELM HURST (12875)

Legal: W 1/2 LT 5 BLK 10

Section: 08 Township: 19 Range: 14

Lot 3, 4, the west 1/2 of lot 2, and the west 1/2 of lot 5, Block 10, Elm Hurst, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County State of Oklahoma.

6. Z-7764

Location: West of the northwest corner of East 31st Street South and South 87th East Avenue

City Council District: 5

Applicant: Ana de la Torre

Action(s) Requested: Rezoning from OL to CS

Staff Recommendation

The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject property from OL to CS to permit commercial uses at this location. The subject property is surrounded by single-family residences on all sides. The only access to the subject property is from East 31st Street South.

CS zoning would permit commercial uses currently prohibited by the OL district including animal services, small assembly and entertainment uses, commercial services, restaurants and bars, retail sales, and vehicle repair and maintenance.

Additional commercial uses at this location would be incompatible with the existing neighborhood areas that surround the subject properties. Staff has determined that the OL district is an appropriate intensity level given the context of the property and the proximity to surrounding homes.

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

Comprehensive Plan Considerations

Land Use Plan

The subject property is designated as multiple use. 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:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	RS-2	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
East	RS-2	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
South	RS-3	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
West	RS-2	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential

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 31st Street South is designated as a secondary arterial. Secondary arterials require an ultimate right-of-way dedication of 100 feet.

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: Multi-modal streets support commercial and residential development along major arterial streets. These streets align with the recommendations for on-street bicycle infrastructure establish in the 2015 GO Plan, and they should be evaluated for feasibility with regard to the reallocation of street space for bicycle facilities.

Transit: Tulsa Transit Route 300 runs east/west along East 31st Street adjacent to the subject property.

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks are in place along East 31st Street South.

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: The GO Plan calls for an on-street bike corridor along 31st Street in the area.

Environmental Considerations

Flood Area: The subject properties are not located in 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 11816, dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Z-7589 – Ordinance 24601, dated May 2, 2021, rezoned the subject property from RS-2 to OL.

Speakers

(-) Fay Shackle, 3025 S 86th East Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74129, was concerned about the negative impact a higher density zoning classification would have on her neighborhood. Currently the applicant has flags and handwritten signs on the property that are not allowed by code. If rezoning happens it will be harder to control what businesses are allowed on the property in the future.

TMAPC Comments

Ms. Carr asked if the applicant could get a Special Exception through the Board of Adjustment to allow the snack shop.

Staff said the property would need to be commercial zoning to allow that use. He stated that staff recommendation for denial is not about what is being done on the property today but more about what CS would allow in the future in a location that is surrounded by single family neighborhoods. He pointed out that the flags the applicant has on the property are not permitted signage and appear to be in the right-of-way along with other code enforcement issues that would need to be investigated.

Commission Action

Motion: To deny the CS zoning, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Craddock Second by: Shivel

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Property Description

Subdivision: UNPLATTED (99313)

Legal: S205 E230 W/2 SE SW LESS S50 FOR STREET SEC 13 19 13 .82AC

Section: 13 Township: 19 Range: 13

7. Z-7765

Location: Northeast corner of North Main Street and East Latimer Street

City Council District: 1

Applicant: Capital Homes Residential Group

Action(s) Requested: Rezoning from MX1-U-45, MX2-U-45, HNO, NIO to RS-5, HNO, NIO

Staff Recommendation

The applicant is proposing to rezone the subject properties from MX1-U-45 and MX2-U-45 to RS-5 to permit a continuation of single-family residential development in the area. The western portion of the property was rezoned to MX2-U-45 in January of 2022. The eastern portion was rezoned to MX1-U-45 in February of 2018. At the time, a mixed-use development was proposed for the property that was never developed. Detached single-family homes are not permitted in the MX districts that were previously adopted and a rezoning is required to permit new homes on the subject properties.

The land use plan designates these properties as neighborhood. The proposed RS-5 zoning aligns with the goals and recommendations of the neighborhood land use. It is also consistent with the zoning in the immediate area.

The RS-5 zoning is consistent with the goals of the Unity Heritage Neighborhood Plan.

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

Comprehensive Plan Considerations

Land Use Plan

The 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	RS-5/MX1-U-45	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
East	RS-4	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential
South	RS-4	Neighborhood	Elementary School
West	CS/RS-4	Neighborhood	Single-Family Residential

Small Area Plans

The subject properties are located within the Unity Heritage Neighborhoods Plan (November 2016). The requested rezoning aligns with the goals of the small area plan to provide quality neighborhood development and revitalize existing neighborhoods.

Development Era

The subject property is in an area developed during the Streetcar Era (1910s-30s), prior to the proliferation of automobiles, when streetcars facilitated growth beyond downtown. Land uses range from fully integrated to somewhat separated, on a half-mile grid, with a mix of housing options. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, commercial districts, and well-designed streetscapes.

Transportation

Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: On-Street Bicycle Corridor along North Main Street.

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: On-street bike lanes are planned for North Main Street and currently extend as far north as West King Street, one block south of the subject property.

Environmental Considerations

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

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area 13%. 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 11918, dated September 1, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Z-6373 – Ordinance 17817, dated November 12, 1992, rezoned portions of the property from RM-1 to RS-4.

Z-7179 – Ordinance 22557, dated November 11, 2011, rezoned portions of the property from RS-3 to RM-3 and CS.

PUD-786 – Ordinance 22556, dated November 11, 2011, adopted PUD-786 for the subject properties.

Z-7426 – Ordinance 23854, dated February 10, 2018 rezoned the eastern portion of the property to RS-5.

Z-7427 – Ordinance 23855, dated February 10, 2018, rezoned the western portion of the property from RM-3 and CS to MX1-U-45

PUD-786-A – Ordinance 23853, dated February 10, 2018, abandoned PUD-786 on the subject properties.

Z-7634 – Ordinance 24757, dated January 23, 2022, rezoned the eastern portion of the property to MX2-U-45

TMAPC Comments

Mr. Hood stated it is unfortunate to see this property to go back to single family from mixed use.

Speakers

None.

Commission Action

Motion: Recommend approval of the RS-5, HNO and NIO zoning, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Craddock Second by: Turner-Addison

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker,

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Property Description

- 1) Lots Four (4) and Five (5), Block Eighteen (18), BURGESS HILL ADDITION, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof. (1110 N. Boston Ave.)
- 2) Lot Six (6), Block Eighteen (18), BURGESS HILL ADDITION, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof. (1104 N. Boston Ave.)
- 3) Lot Seven (7), Block Eighteen (18), BURGESS HILL ADDITION, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof. (1101 N. Main Ave.)
- 4) Lot Eight (8), Block Eighteen (18), BURGESS HILL ADDITION, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof. (1107 N. Main Ave.)

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) (Continued from March 20, 2024)

Speakers

None.

Commission Action

Motion: Recommended approval of a Continuance to May 1, 2024, per applicants' request.

Motion by: Walker Second by: Craddock

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Craddock, Turner-Addison, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Carr, Robinson, Shivel, Walker

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Public Hearing – Modification of the Subdivision and Development Regulations

9. LLA-550

Location: Southeast corner of East 27th Street South & South Florence Avenue

City Council District: 4

Applicant: John Libby

Action(s) Requested: Modification of the Subdivision and Development Regulations Section 10-060.6-C

Staff Recommendation

The application LLA-550 is a lot line adjustment where the lot line between lot 4 and lot 5 is being moved 7 feet to east.

During the review process the applicant received comments regarding the sanitary sewer extension. Tract 1 as it sits does not have access to sanitary sewer. The proposed lot adjustment moves the lot lines farther from the sanitary sewer main. The lot has sewer access through an easement.

The proposed lots comply with our zoning code bulk and area requirements.

The applicant has requested a modification to Section 10-060.6-C of the *Subdivision and Development Regulations* which would require the applicant extend sanitary sewer service to the lots. The home on the property does have access to the sanitary sewer.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the modification to Section 10-060.6-C of the *Subdivision and Development Regulations*.

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-2	Neighborhoods	Residential
East	RS-2	Neighborhoods	Residential
South	RS-2	Neighborhoods	Residential
West	RS-2	Neighborhoods	Residential

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: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: N/A

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: N/A

Arterial Traffic per Lane: N/A

Environmental Considerations

Flood Area: The subject properties not within a flood area.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 20%-30% 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

TMAPC Comments

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

Speakers

None.

Commission Action

Motion: Recommend approval of the modification of the Subdivision and Development Regulations Section 10-060.6-C for LLA-550, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Carr Second by: Hood

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

Other Business

10. **ZCA-29** Informational item to present and discuss proposed zoning code amendments to add provisions for roadside attractions in the Route 66 overlay district

Staff Recommendation

ZCA-29, proposed zoning code amendments to add provisions for roadside attractions in the Route 66 overlay district

The City Council initiated amendments to the Route 66 Overlay to include provisions for roadside attractions on January 31, 2024 (see attached draft). Route 66 Overlay was adopted by City Council in 2018 and applied to all portions of Route 66 with the exception of downtown (see attached maps). The zoning code states: *The Route 66 overlay establishes zoning regulations and incentives intended to ensure the enhancement, development, and revitalization of the authentic Route 66 through the promotion of historic and historically inspired signage, especially neon, along and adjacent to the two alignments of Route 66 in Tulsa. The regulations are generally intended to guide the character of both public and private development as it occurs along Route 66.*

The initial purpose of the overlay was focused signage and allows greater sign allowances for neon signs. To assist in implementation of the overlay, the neon sign grant program began in 2019 and has resulted in approximately 60 grants totaling \$396,719 in grants, with a total investment of \$1,133,000 in neon signs along the route.

Significant private investment has occurred along Route 66 over the past 5 years and property owners are enhancing the route through more than just neon signage, including new businesses and roadside attractions. Currently, the zoning code does not address roadside attractions and typically sign standards are applied to these structures. As the sign budget for the site is fully utilized, a variance is required to increase the amount of signage on the site, even though roadside attractions do differ from traditional signage. As a result, there is a need to consider amendments to the zoning code to establish criteria and a process for roadside attractions within the Route 66 overlay.

At this meeting, the Planning Commission is asked to review and comment on the proposed zoning code amendments. The public hearing to consider the amendments will be held on May 1, 2024.

TMAPC Comments

Mr. Walker asked if the businesses along this route were informed of this change and are they in support.

Staff stated the Route 66 Commission has shared this proposal broadly. He said if this proposal were to move forward there would be additional public engagement with owners along the route.

Mr. Craddock asked if the CBD District was included in this amendment.

Staff stated when the Zoning Code was adopted in 2016 there was resistance from downtown property owners to allow overlays in the downtown area. So, there is a prohibition on overlays downtown.

Mr. Hood asked if the Route 66 Commission would be charged with reviewing and determining if something was a roadside attraction.

Staff stated the Route 66 Commission would be reviewing and determining if the application qualifies as a roadside attraction and does it fit within the Route 66 plan.

Mr. Fugate asked how the sign grants are paid for.

Staff stated Vision Tulsa funds that were allocated to Route 66.

Speakers

None.

11. Commissioners' Comments

None

Adjournment

Commission Action

Motion: Adjourn

Motion by: Walker Second by: Craddock

Vote: 9-0-0

Ayes: Carr, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Robinson, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Walker

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Whitlock, Zalk

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.