



Approved  
Jul. 2, 2025

# Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission

## Minutes of Meeting No. 2939

Wednesday, June 18, 2025, 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 June 11, 2025 at 2:47 p.m.

**Members Present:** Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

**Members Absent:** Rosene Robinson, Walker

**City Staff Present:** Jeremy Banes, Nathan Foster, Erin Roark, Susan Miller, Kim Sawyer, Jeff Stephens

**County Staff Present:** Kendal Davis, Sherri Tauber

### 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 Hood called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

## Reports

---

**Chairman’s Report:** Mr. Hood thanked Mat Zalk for his service on the Planning Commission.

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

## Approval of Minutes

---

### **1. Minutes from Meeting 2938, June 4, 2025**

Motion: Approval of the minutes of Meeting 2938 from June 4, 2025.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

## Consent Agenda

---

**None**

## Public Hearing – Rezoning

---

*Review and possible recommendation of approval, approval with modifications, denial, or deferral of the following:*

### **2. Z-7818**

Location: Multiple properties south and east of the southeast corner of West 39th Street South and South Tacoma Avenue

City Council District: 2

Applicant: Zac Lindsey

**Action Requested:** Rezoning from RS-3 to IL

### **Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is proposing to rezone multiple properties from RS-3 to IL to permit office/warehouse development. The subject properties are adjacent to other IL-zoned properties to the east, west, and south. The existing IL zoning extends all the way to West 41<sup>st</sup> Street and South Tacoma Avenue.

There is existing residential and industrial zoning to the north of the subject property, but the majority of the development in the area is consistent with the requested industrial zoning.

IL is the lowest intensity industrial zoning district and requires all industrial activities to take place within enclosed buildings. Off-site impacts such as noise, odors, and dust are prohibited in the IL district.

The proposed IL zoning aligns with the land use designation of employment. The land use recommendations for the broader area anticipate that future development will consist of industrial uses including warehouses, light manufacturing, and employment uses with a transition away from residential.

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 employment. **Employment** 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:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	RS-3/IL	Employment	Residential/Industrial
East	IL	Employment	Industrial
South	IL	Employment	Industrial
West	IL	Employment	Industrial/Highway 75

**Small Area Plans**

The subject properties are located within the Southwest Tulsa Neighborhood Plan area which was adopted in 2009. The plan area has limited recommendations for the subject property and focuses on improvements to the Southwest Boulevard/Route 66 corridor. The plan did recognize the presence of industrial uses and supports additional industrial at this location.

**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: None

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: The Cherry Creek trail is located to the east of the subject properties, but not adjacent. This is an existing trail that utilizes the Cherry Creek corridor and connects West 41<sup>st</sup> Street to Philpott Park.

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 27%. 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 11822, dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

**TMAPC Comments**

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

**Speakers**

None.

**Commission Action**

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

Motion by: Humphrey      Second by: Turner-Addison

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

**Property Description**

PRT LT 20 BEG NEC TH W80 SE273.79 N261.5 POB AND W. 1/2 LT 3 AND W.65 LT.4 LESS BG SWC LT.4 TH N.115 SE 125.58 W.50 TO BG. AND E.65 LOT 4 AND LT 6 LESS BEG SWC LT 6 TH N411.5 E80 SE96.5 TO EL TH S329.15 TO SECR LT 6 TH W130 POB, ALL IN BLOCK 6, INTERURBAN ADDITION, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Item 3 was continued to July 16, 2025

**3. CZ-567**(County)

Location: North of the Northwest corner of E 161<sup>st</sup> St South and S Elwood Ave

County Commission District: 3

Applicant: Monty Bradford

**Action Requested:** Rezone subject property from AG to RS-1 **(Staff requests continuance to July 16, 2025)**

**Commission Action**

Motion: To continue CZ-567 to July 16, 2025.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Shivel

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

Items 4 and 5 were presented together.

#### **4. CZ-566** (County)

Location: Northwest corner of E 171<sup>st</sup> St S and S Lewis Ave

County Commission District: 3

Applicant: AAB Engineering, LLC

#### **Action Requested**

Rezone subject property from AG to RS-3 (Related to Adeleine Hills plat)

#### **Staff Recommendation**

The applicant is requesting to rezone 38.48 acres from AG to RS-3 to a permit a single-family subdivision and the applicant has provided a preliminary plat for consideration.

The Preliminary Plat for the proposed subdivision (Adeleine Hills) illustrates 54 lots and 5 blocks. The lots within the subdivision are larger than ½ acre in size, but the minimum lot width shown is 125 feet which is consistent with the provision of an RS-1 district.

The proposal lies within the rural land use designation of the Tulsa County Comprehensive Plan, which adopted the land use designations by the City of Glenpool Comprehensive Plan. This proposal is compatible with this designation. Staff have reached out to the City of Glenpool who have no comments or objections to the proposal.

Staff has reviewed the request and finds that the proposed large lot residential development is non-injurious to the surrounding proximate properties and may be consistent the expected development pattern in the area however, the Glenpool Plan that was adopted in 2017 continues to illustrate this area as Rural which is not consistent with the RS-3 request. RS-3 zoning allows a minimum lot size of 6900 square feet which is not appropriate in the Rural vision for the unincorporated areas of Tusa County in the Glenpool planning area.

The land use text in the comprehensive plan recognizes that some residential development may be an allowed use in the Rural Land use area and the concept plan provided with the Adeleine Hills plat may be appropriate in the rural category. The preliminary plat illustrates an appropriate concept, however considering the land use designation and lack of public sanitary sewer service staff does not recommend approval for RS-3 zoning. However, staff recommends approval of RS-1 zoning.

With consideration given to the factors listed herein, staff recommend **approval** for RS-1 zoning designation.

#### **Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

##### **Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as: Rural

Designation Description: The Rural land use designation consists of lands that are sparsely developed, with mainly agricultural and very low-density residential as the primary uses. This category provides its residents with the choice of relative seclusion within the countryside and away from a more developed setting. Glenpool has extensive rural lands within its city limits. relative to cities that have this mostly beyond their jurisdiction, except in areas that have been annexed for eventual development, or to preserve rural character through the protections afforded by agricultural zoning.

Floodplain areas may also retain their rural character over the long term given their unsuitability for any intensive land development.

Future land use designation considerations:

*If the zoning is changed staff will support future land use designation changes in the area to include the Residential category. That category is typically comprised of single-family neighborhoods of varying lot sizes and represents the lowest intensity of all the use categories outside of Agricultural Districts. Dwelling unit densities within the Residential category generally range from 2 to 5 units per acre but density can be as little as 1 or fewer per acre. Planned Unit Developments may also be found in the Residential land use category and may contain various intensities of residential housing. In most cases, the Residential use category is buffered from higher intensity uses such as Commercial with the Transitional use district.*

Surrounding Properties:

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

**Small Area Plans**

None

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: S Lewis Ave: Secondary Arterial / E 171<sup>st</sup> St S: Primary Arterial

Transit: None

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

**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. Bulmash asked if the applicant was in favor of the RS-1 instead of the RS-3 zoning.

**Applicant**

Alan Betchan, AAB Engineering, LLC, PO Box 2136, Sand Springs, OK 74063, stated that AAB Engineering, LLC, was in support of the RS-1 request. The plat that is attached to CZ-566 is half acre, rural with septic system tract projects and AAB intended to change their request to RS-1.

Mr. Craddock asked if there was a requirement for any onsite detention.

Mr. Betchan stated that there is one onsite detention pond and there is an existing pond to the west that is being modified for onsite detention. The rest of the property that goes around that pond and goes back down to 171<sup>st</sup>

Street is the Phase 2 of this project that is under contract. It has not been completed and that is why the request is not made over all the projects. The pond is on the remainder tract that is in Phase 2, there is a detention easement that has been secured across that agreement. Regardless of the completed agreement, the detention easement will give adequate drainage. This will be 54 lots in the first phase.

### **Speakers**

**(-) Brooke Morgan**, 16757 South Lewis Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that her lot is right across from the entrance to this location. Her family has lived there for three years and loves living in the country. The water runs off the hill at this location and goes over the road into their yard. They had to buy sandbags to keep the water away from their house. If you add cement to this, and homes to this tract, it is going to make the water situation worse. Her family has not seen any plans to keep this water out of this front yard and home. She stated that they have a pond, but the run-off from these homes with fertilizer is going to go straight into their pond where they fish. Ms. Morgan explained that they want to keep this area country. Her husband, Jason Morgan, submitted a letter to the commissioners and hopefully, he will be there in time to submit it. Ms. Morgan stated that the number of homes that are to go in takes away from the feeling of country in the area. The way the engineer has designed the site currently is that the entrance and exit are right across from her driveway. Car lights will go straight to her home.

**(-) Valerie Coble**, 16591 South Lewis Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that their home on the north side of the pond. Ms. Coble and her husband are at this meeting to ask the commissioners to deny the RS zoning and keep it AG to match the existing landscape of their street. There are ninety acres of this that sit on a fifty-foot hill and spans west toward Peoria. The developer confirmed with her that the first 38 acres will have 54 homes and in six months they will begin Phase 2 with another fifty-four homes. The total will be 108 homes, not just the 54 homes. These many homes will cause a considerable amount of traffic increase in this area. Ms. Coble stated that they live in an established neighborhood 4 to 20 acre lots and their community raises the following concerns:

1. Water: The steep elevation change that changes 40-foot elevation changes over a 40-foot distance off the west side of Lewis. This hill is literally 50-foot above elevation from the east side of the road on Lewis. It is a 1 to 1 ratio for elevation change. It is another 10-foot drop-off on the east side of the road where their houses are. The storm water run-off for all the properties east of Lewis will increase exponentially with the number of houses and less soil surface area to absorb the water. The plat currently shows no detention pond to collect the water running down this hill to Lewis. This will lead to more cracks in their driveways and potential damage to their homes. The pond Mr. Betchan keeps referring to is on the west side and on the top of the hill. There will be 108 aerobic tanks saturating the ground with "poop" water. Combined with storm water will run downhill directly on her neighbor's property, into the pond, and this pond is fished by the neighbors, friends, and families. This is the area's wildlife water source as well. Her neighbors have chickens and a garden, and her family has an organic garden that they have gone to a lot of trouble building and they do not want to contaminate this area.

2. Safety: Increased Traffic, Driving Incidents and Risk, Crime and Law Enforcement Protection.

Ms. Coble spoke with the Tulsa County Sheriff's Office who stated that they have no law enforcement units assigned across this portion of Tulsa County. All units have been assigned to North and West Tulsa County. They do have a rover unit which typically has one to two officers assigned during the day. These two officers take calls are assigned to all Tulsa County and not designated to South Tulsa County. More homes and neighborhoods will bring more crime, increased traffic of 400 or more vehicles traveling through the area every day. They will be battling home construction vehicles for 5 to 10 years. The wildlife and the steep hill are a concern.

In closing, Ms. Coble is pleading with the commissioners to take their concerns to heart. Please leave this rural and agricultural. They would like the developer to redesign this neighborhood to 4-10 acre lots.

(-) **Tyler Coble**, 16591 South Lewis Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that he would continue from where his wife Valerie left off. Increased traffic and the risk that comes with such a heavy increase concern him, along with the construction vehicles that will impact this area. The roads will need attention and repairs as these numbers increase.

1. Wildlife: There are a ton of deer, turkeys, coyotes, occasionally bob cats, and the risk of hitting wildlife will be undeniable. Last year, someone hit a deer in front of their home. He and his wife were responsible for having a private company pick the dead animal up, since they are outside the city limits. The cost will fall on the property owners. Blind steep hills, large drop offs, potholes, ice and snow, Lewis Avenue between 151<sup>st</sup> and 171<sup>st</sup> is very steep with large drop offs which causes problems during ice and rain. Buses stop directly on Lewis at the bottom of the hill. Children walk down Lewis and there will be many more teenagers driving fast through this area, putting the children at risk.

In closing, Mr. Coble was pleading with you the planning commissioners to take their concerns to heart and respect their existing community, their agricultural condition, and leave this area as AG zoned land.

(-) **Kenneth Haddock**, 16530 South Lewis Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that he lives on the west side of the street near the development. Mr. Haddock is also on a hill, and he has 5-acres. His ditch is full of water from run-off, so putting these many houses on that small area is going to create a tremendous problem with storm water. There is going to be a lot of concrete, drives, roads, and all of this is going to cause problems. Mr. Haddock explained that he would not object to 4 to 5 acre lots on flat level ground. The traffic will be a huge problem. He recently went from 61<sup>st</sup> Street, down Memorial Drive to 151<sup>st</sup> Street and it took him almost two hours. 99% of the time, he was driving 1 MPH because of the traffic. Memorial Drive needs to be widened. This addition would be compatible with the current situation if they went to 4 acre lots.

(-) **Marilyn Rains**, 16500 South Lewis Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that she also lives on the west side of Lewis on 4-acre lots and they have a ton of water standing in their yard. Their land is rock and clay. Septic smell comes up randomly until the land dries out.

Traffic is a large concern. Ms. Rains is in total agreement with her neighbors and would like to see these to be larger lots offered.

(-) **Jace Morgan**, 16757 South Lewis Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, 74008, stated that he would read his father's comments to the commissioners. His mother is Brooke Morgan, and his father is Jason Morgan. The Morgan home is directly across from the proposed development. Mr. Morgan presented evidence regarding the significant and pre-existing drainage issue that affects their property. An issue which will be exacerbated should this rezoning be approved and the proposed development proceed without comprehensive and effective mitigation.

1. Stormwater: Jace Morgan stated that his family's property has experienced regular and substantial problems from storm water run-off originating from the hillside directly across the street, the land slated for this development. Even though some work has been performed by Tulsa County to address this issue, it is not intermittent or merely an inconvenience. It is a persistent problem anytime it rains. Jace's father has photographed and videoed evidence which he is prepared to submit clearly showing the flow of water across Lewis Avenue and onto his property even during moderate rain events. The introduction of a large neighborhood will undeniably increase the impervious surface area leading to a dramatic increase in storm water run-off. This is a fundamental principle of hydrology. More roofs, more driveways, more streets, and less natural absorption means more water. That water will seek the path of least resistance which is currently evidence directed onto his property. Jace's father has previewed the preliminary plans for the proposed development and while he understands there may be general storm water management proposals, he has seen no specific detailed and independently verified plans that adequately address the pre-existing flow of water onto his property. The burden of this development impact should not fall on existing homeowners. Therefore, Jace respectfully submits that approving this re-zoning without a robust independently peer reviewed and legally binding commitment to comprehensive storm water

management specifically designed to mitigate the existing and anticipated drainage on his property would be a dereliction of duty and would cause irreparable harm to his home and quality of life. He urged the commissioners to consider this evidence and ask for a development plan that genuinely respects the existing conditions and the well-being of the surrounding community.

2. Traffic volume: Regarding new traffic generated by new development, he explained that Lewis Avenue is already struggling with significant degradation and maintenance challenges. Adding potentially hundreds of new daily vehicle traffic will only exacerbate the existing problems. This will create unsafe conditions and an unsustainable burden on our infrastructure. The population that uses Lewis Avenue daily is keenly aware of its state. There are routine potholes, crumbling edges, and uneven surfaces. Maintaining Lewis Avenue is an already a constant challenge and the current infrastructure is not equipped to handle the significant increase in vehicle traffic this development will bring. The County will face an increased financial burden to keep Lewis Avenue is even minimally functional. This cost will fall on the taxpayers. Safety issues from these roads will cause more problems. Jace urged the Planning Commission to consider these serious infrastructure limitations and reject this proposal.

3. Car lights: Jace commented that headlights shining directly into his home will disrupt the privacy of his family's home. The traffic noise will disrupt the peace and quiet of their homes as well.

**Rebuttal:**

Mr. Betchan, stated that the primary concerns will be worked on as they work with the civil engineering. The first step for them is securing the zoning and ensure that is an entitlement use of the property. Then they proceed with the plat and the engineering documents. One of the standards that clearly must meet with Tulsa County is documenting that they have no adverse impact on surrounding properties documenting that they have peak flow meets or reducing the peak flow of the design points is a significant portion of what this includes. Mr. Bethan is looking at shifting storm water so basically moving the ridge so that more water would go to the main pond. There will be less storm water coming down the hill to offset the decrease in impervious areas. Mr. Betchan commented on the existing infrastructure issues along Lewis Avenue and has already added a secondary detention facility along the front that will be on Lewis Avenue as part of that development. Every lot will meet every standard of Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for onsite septic treatment and use. The reality of that is that homebuilders are not using traditional leach fields frequently anymore. DEQ encourages them to stick to aerobic systems where pre-treatment is required and is a much more robust system. He explained that he was very respectful of the neighbors. This is a light touch for development with the least density that economically viable in development today.

Mr. Betchan commented that this is a good project with high value homes, and it is the type of rural development that should be encouraged when looking at the housing shortage and different demographics that they are trying to meet. The water infrastructure is there; they will meet the necessary storm water requirements and will grade the site to make it meet all the requirements in mitigating the impact that they have on the downstream properties.

Mr. Fugate stated that in projects that Mr. Betchan (AAB Engineering) has been involved with in the past have similar issues that the neighbors are dealing with. There is a very good chance that AAB will help alleviate this issue.

The speaker stated that the reason that they chose to add a secondary detention facility is because of this issue. It was the right thing to try to minimize the some of that impact and reduce those peak run-off rates. That is their standard, but they were trying to go above and beyond the standard as it is crossing there.

Mr. Humphrey asked if AAB had a recommendation from the City of Glenpool or if he had had a conversation with them.



Vote: 6-2-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Fugate, Hood, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: Craddock, Humphrey

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

**Property Description: CZ-566**

A TRACT OF LAND LOCATED IN PART OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION THIRTY (30), TOWNSHIP SEVENTEEN (17), RANGE THIRTEEN (13), OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION THIRTY (30); THENCE SOUTH 88°51 '05" WEST ALONG THE NORTH LINE THEREOF, A DISTANCE OF 745.32 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTH 01°10'12" EAST A DISTANCE OF 836.39 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°50'.21" EAST A DISTANCE OF 695.32 FEET TO A POINT 50.00 FEET WEST OF THE EAST LINE OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4); THENCE SOUTH 01°10'12" EAST 50.00 FEET WEST OF AND PARALLEL TO SAID EAST LINE, A DISTANCE OF 485.33 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 88°50'11 "WEST A DISTANCE OF 728.42 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4 SE/4); THENCE SOUTH 01°10'12" EAST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 660.83 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 88°50'58" WEST A DISTANCE OF 347.14 FEET; THENCE NORTH 35°05'50" WEST A DISTANCE OF 670.64 FEET; THENCE NORTH 54°54'1 0" EAST A DISTANCE OF 150.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 35°05'50" WEST A DISTANCE OF 360.73 FEET; THENCE NORTH 54°54'1 0" EAST A DISTANCE OF 140.72 FEET; THENCE NORTH 01°10'14" WEST A DISTANCE OF 394.74 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 88°49'46" WEST A DISTANCE OF 65.41 FEET; THENCE NORTH 01°10'14" WEST A DISTANCE OF 360.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88°49'46" EAST A DISTANCE OF 126.48 FEET; THENCE NORTH 01°10'14" WEST A DISTANCE OF 209.93 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4); THENCE NORTH 88°51 '05" EAST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE, A DISTANCE OF 653.60 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. CONTAINING 1,668,828 SQUARE FEET OR 38.31 ACRES MORE OR LESS. LEGAL DESCRIPTION BASIS OF BEARINGS IS THE OKLAHOMA STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM (ZONE 3501 NORTH) WITH THE NORTH LINE OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) BEING NORTH 88°51 '05" EAST.

## Public Hearing – Plats

---

### **5. Adeleine Hills Plat** (County)

Location: Northwest corner of E 171<sup>st</sup> St S and S Lewis Ave

County Commission District: 3

Applicant: AAB Engineering, LLC

**Action Requested:** Preliminary Subdivision Plat for a single-family development (Related to CZ-566)

### **Staff Recommendation**

North of the Northwest of East 171st Street South and S Lewis Ave

This plat consists of 54 lots, 5 blocks on ± 38.48 acres, each lot is half an acre (21,780 sf).

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, and provided the following comments:

1. **Zoning:** Proposed lots conform to the requirements of the RS-3 district. Planning Services will provide comments prior to final plat release.
2. **Addressing:** INCOG will assign addresses. Include assigned addresses on the face of the final plat and provide address disclaimer.
3. **Transportation & Traffic:** Final street construction plans must be approved by the County Engineer and installed prior to final plat release.
4. **Sewer/Water: Sewer** is onsite septic systems. Water service is provided by Creek County Rural Water District #2. All requirements of the district must be met for final plat approval.
5. **Stormwater, Drainage, & Floodplain:** Stormwater is handled via on site barrow ditches and an onsite detention facility. There is no floodplain on the property. Plans for stormwater and drainage must be approved by the Tulsa County Engineer and improvements must be in place prior to final plat approval. Provide access to reserve area for maintenance.
6. **Utilities: Telephone, Electric, Gas, Cable, Pipeline, Others:** All utilities indicated to serve the site must provide a release prior to final plat approval. Provide a Certificate of Records Search from the Oklahoma Corporation Commission to verify no oil & gas activity on the site.
7. **Tulsa County Engineering:** Need temporary turnarounds for stub streets and new reserve areas part of the Plat for stormwater detention.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the preliminary subdivision plat subject to the conditions provided by TAC and all other requirements of the Subdivision and Development Regulations. Tulsa County release is required prior to final plat approval.

### **Commission Action**

Motion: Recommend approval Adeleine Hills preliminary subdivision plat per staff recommendation.

Motion by: Bulmash                      Second by: Fugate

Vote: 7-1-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: Humphrey

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

## **6. Maybelle Villas II**

Location: South of the southeast corner of West 81st Street South and South Maybelle Avenue

City Council District: 2

Applicant: Wallace Design Collective

**Action Requested:** Extension of a Preliminary Plat Approval (Preliminary plat originally approved on 06/16/2022)

### **TMAPC Comments**

Ms. Turner Addison asked how many extensions could be granted on a plat.

### **Staff Comments**

Staff stated that it was at the discretion of the commission. He stated the reason there is an expiration date built into preliminary plans is to ensure that if in that timeframe from when an original preliminary plat is approved and they get to a final plat approval, if any of the regulations have changed or requirements have changed, they would have an opportunity to re-review and apply those rules.

### **Applicant Comments**

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

### **Speakers**

None.

### **Commission Action**

Motion: Approve the Extension of the preliminary subdivision plat to June 18, 2026 for Maybelle Villas II, per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Turner-Addison

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

## **7. Stratford Ridge**

Location: East of the southeast corner of East 11th Street South and South 161st East Avenue

City Council District: 6

Applicant: AAB Engineering, LLC

**Action Requested:** : Preliminary Plat Approval and a modification of Section 5.030 Table 5-1 of the Subdivision and Development Regulations to permit greater block lengths.

### **Staff Recommendation**

The plat consists of 109 lots, 7 blocks, ±31.5 acres. Staff recommends **approval** of the preliminary subdivision plat and modification of Section 5.030 Table 5-1 of the Subdivision and Development Regulations to permit greater block lengths subject to the following conditions provided by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), all other requirements of the Subdivisions Regulations. Staff finds that the proposed preliminary subdivision plat complies with all applicable regulations with the exception of the requested modification. A City of Tulsa release letter is required prior to final plat approval. TAC Conditions:

**Zoning:** Property is zoned RS-3 with PUD-737, the intended use and proposed lot layouts meet the standards of that district.

### **Engineering Graphics**

- Submit subdivision control data sheet with the final plat.
- Remove contours on the final plat submittal.
- Provide the individual lot addresses on the face of the plat.
- In the Location Map remove the label "Lynn Lane Elementary School". Label all other land in the section as "unplatted".
- Provide graphically on the face of the plat the address disclaimer/caveat.
- 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.
- If available provide the northing/easting coordinates associated with the benchmark location. This would be greatly appreciated. Not a required comment.
- If E 11th Pl S, E 12th Pl S, and E 13th St S going to connect to a future development to the west, please add notes to the face of the plat stating "Future Street Extension".

### **Addressing**

- Add the addresses provided in the TAC comments to the plat.

## **Article 5 of the TMAPC Subdivision and Development Regulations: Design and Improvements**

### **Required Infrastructure and Public Improvements (5-020)**

- Required public infrastructure improvements include water and sanitary sewer extension, stormwater runoff management including private detention, streets, driveways, sidewalks, and ADA compliance. The designs for this infrastructure been reviewed and approved under the IDP Permit process under IDP#051004-2019 after five submittals (07/20/2023). Addendum 1 was approved at first submittal. Permits were issued on 09/15/2023.

### **Blocks Lengths (5-030.3)**

- Applicant is requesting to extend the allowed block lengths per the attached request. Staff finds the existing development surrounding the subject property makes shorter block lengths or midblock connections undesirable and impractical.

### **Streets (transportation) (5-060)**

- No comments.

**Streets (fire) (5-060)**

- All roads for fire access will be required to maintain a minimum of 20’ in width (TJH) All roads for fire access will be required to support 88,000 pounds per Title 14 (TJH)
- If gates will be used across fire access roads, refer to 2018, IFC, Appendix D for gate requirements

**Sidewalks (5-070)**

- Sidewalks are required along all streets.

**Protection From Flooding and Other Natural Hazards (Floodplain) (5-090)**

- There are no regulatory floodplains on the site per CoT Atlas panel 50 or FEMA FIRM panel 40143C0385M.

**Stormwater Management (5-100)**

- Designated stormwater detention is approved along with public storm sewer collection under the IDP permit process #051004

**Sewage Disposal (5-130)**

- IDP 51004 has been approved.

**Water Supply (5-130)**

- Refer to 2018, IFC, Appendix B and C for fire flow and fire hydrant requirements. IDP 51004 -20220 approved.

**Easements (5-150)**

- No Comments.

**Streets and Stormwater**

- No comment.

**Deed of Dedication:**

- Legal to comment after submittal of Final Plat.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as 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.

Surrounding Properties:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Existing Zoning/Overlay</u>	<u>Existing Land Use Designation</u>	<u>Existing Use</u>
North	RS-3/ PUD-737	Neighborhood	Vacant
East	RS-3/ PUD-737	Neighborhood/ Multiple Use	Vacant
South	RS-3/ PUD-737	Neighborhood	Vacant
West	RS-3/ PUD-737	Neighborhood	Detached house

**Small Area Plans**

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

**Development Era**

The subject property is located in an area to be developed during the Future Growth Era. These areas of the city have yet to developed beyond agricultural uses and present opportunities to ensure the pattern of development is efficient and fiscally responsible. The two primary regions that have yet to develop are the northwest corner of

the city, which is all located within Osage County and where the Gilcrease Expressway will connect, and the far east area of the city from roughly 145th E Ave. to beyond the Creek Turnpike.

## **Transportation**

### Major Street & Highway Plan:

- East 11<sup>th</sup> street South: Secondary Arterial. Right-of-way to be dedicated as a part of this plat.

### Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: None available.

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None.

### Arterial Traffic per Lane:

North (E 11th St S - 1,485 Vehicles per Lane)

East (S Lynn Lane Rd - 2,013 Vehicles per Lane)

South (E 21st St S - 1,789 Vehicles per Lane)

West (S 161st East Ave - 617 Vehicles per Lane)

## **Environmental Considerations**

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 30-50%. For areas on the map with between 20% and 50% canopy coverage, 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.

## **Applicant Comments**

The applicant indicated their agreement with staff's recommendation.

## **TMAPC Comments**

Mr. Bulmash asked how many lots were being proposed.

Staff responded that there were 109 lots.

## **Speakers**

None.

## **Commission Action**

Motion: To approve item 7, including approval of the modification of Section 5-030, Table 5-1, of the Subdivision and Development Regulations to permit greater block lengths, subject to the conditions detailed in the staff report, all per staff recommendation.

Motion by: Hood                      Second by: Shivel

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

---

## Public Hearing – Comprehensive Plan Conformance

---

8. Consider adopting a resolution of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission determining that **The Crutchfield Neighborhood Economic Development Project Plan** is in conformance with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and recommend its approval to the City of Tulsa

### **Staff Recommendation**

Adopt a resolution of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission determining that the Crutchfield Neighborhood Economic Development Project Plan **is** in conformance with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and recommend its **approval** to the City of Tulsa.

### **Background**

The Oklahoma Constitution authorizes special financing tools to assist with the development or redevelopment of areas determined by a city, town, or county to be unproductive, undeveloped, underdeveloped, or blighted. The Local Development Act provides those tools and guidelines limiting their use to areas where investment, development, and economic growth are difficult but possible if the Act is used.

One of the Act's tools is tax increment financing, which allows a city, town or county to direct the apportionment of an increment of certain local taxes and fees to finance public project costs in order to stimulate development in the defined area. The ad valorem taxes and sales tax increments are generated by the project(s) in the increment district. The increment district is established by the development and approval of a project plan, which specifies the project area, the boundaries of the increment district, the objectives for the project area, the activities to be carried out in furtherance of those objectives, and the costs.

The Project Plan seeks to provide an economic structure and funding mechanism authorized by the Act for a substantial portion of the public investment necessary to implement the priorities and goals identified in the Crutchfield Small Area Plan ("Small Area Plan") and to generate additional private investment throughout the Project Area. Public investments are planned to include approved public infrastructure, and development financing assistance. The Project Plan authorizes a revenue sharing formula to support the Tulsa Public Schools (Independent School District NO. I-1). Funding for these public investments will be generated primarily by the implementation of multiple Increment Districts.

**The Crutchfield Neighborhood Economic Development Project Plan is a TIF.** The Project Area is the area in which project activities will take place and project expenditures may be made. The Project area is generally located east of US Highway 75 and Inner Dispersal Loop, east of N Utica Avenue, south of E Pine Street, and north of Interstate 244.

### **TMAPC Comments**

None

### **Speakers**

None

**Commission Action**

Motion: To adopt a resolution of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission determining that **The Crutchfield Neighborhood Economic Development Project Plan** is in conformance with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and recommend its approval to the City of Tulsa.

Motion by: Turner-Addison Second by: Shivel

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

---

## Public Hearing – Zoning Code Amendments

---

**9. ZCA-33** Consider amendments (ZCA-33) to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code related to the historic preservation (HP) permit requirement for accessory structures and the 30-day approval timeline for HP permits in the following sections: Section 70.070, HP Permits, Section 70.070-B, Exemptions, and Section 70.070-E, Meeting and Final Decision—Preservation Commission.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Consider amendments (ZCA-33) to the City of Tulsa Zoning Code related to the historic preservation (HP) permit requirement for accessory structures and the 30-day approval timeline for HP permits in the following sections: Section 70.070, HP Permits, Section 70.070-B, Exemptions, and Section 70.070-E, Meeting and Final Decision—Preservation Commission.

### **Background**

The preservation commission requested initiation of the amendments and recommended draft language on November 14, 2024. The planning commission (TMAPC) initiated ZCA-33 on December 18, 2024. Staff presented an earlier draft of the amendments at a TMAPC work session on February 5, 2025.

#### Accessory Structures & Buildings

Within historic preservation (HP) overlay districts, an HP permit is required for most exterior changes made to a property. Currently, the zoning code exempts all detached accessory structures located outside of the street yard from preservation commission review. This means that accessory structures, including buildings, fences, walls, swimming pools, and similar features, can be built, demolished, or altered in rear and interior side yards without any oversight by the preservation commission. The Tulsa Preservation Commission is concerned about the potential impact of large accessory structures, primarily accessory dwelling units (ADUs), on the integrity of Tulsa's HP overlays as new ADUs increase in scale and frequency within historic neighborhoods.

Accessory buildings are common in historic districts. Historic neighborhoods dating to the early 1900s, like many in Tulsa, contain detached garages and secondary living quarters. When accessory buildings are converted or expanded, their important architectural features could be destroyed, altered, or obscured. When demolished, significant historic resources could be lost altogether. Construction of new accessory buildings has the potential to distract from the continuity of the district, if their scale and design are incompatible with the surrounding buildings. When combined, all these treatments of accessory buildings have the potential to make a visual impact on the entire neighborhood.

These proposed changes would require an HP permit and preservation commission review of detached accessory structures if they are over 8 feet in height and visible from the street. The changes also clarify that temporary landscape features are exempt from review.

#### Review Timeline for HP Permits

Currently, the preservation commission has 30 days following the receipt of a complete HP permit application to decide on the application, unless the applicant requests or agrees to an extension. If no action is taken within 30 days, the application is automatically approved. The preservation commission and its HP Permit Subcommittee, which reviews more complex HP permit applications prior to commission review, both meet twice monthly with application deadlines one week prior to the meeting to ensure efficient review of applications. On average, HP permits are reviewed and decided on well within the 30-day time frame in the zoning code. However, the requirement creates issues with complex applications, like new construction, that may require revisions and multiple reviews by the subcommittee. The 30-day requirement also creates an issue when an applicant does not attend the preservation commission meeting in which their application is reviewed. Instead of continuing the item

to the next scheduled meeting, the commission often must act on the application without complete information from the applicant.

These proposed changes would extend the preservation commission's review timeline to 30 business days and would allow the preservation commission to continue an item to the next regular meeting if an applicant fails to attend the meeting in which their application is reviewed.

### **Outreach Efforts**

Since the work session, all property owners within HP overlays were sent an annual letter inviting them to two neighborhood meetings, which were held on February 25, 2025 (19 attendees), and March 6, 2025 (24 attendees). Staff received feedback on the amendments during those meetings and through a follow-up survey (12 responses). Staff updated the proposed amendments based on feedback from historic property owners and presented the updated amendments at a preservation commission meeting on May 1, 2025. In addition to the required notice published in the newspaper, the current draft has been shared on the planning office and preservation commission websites and emailed to interested parties.

### **Staff Recommendation**

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

### **Speakers**

(-) Brian Whitehurst, 316 E. 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Tulsa OK 74120, is opposed to the proposed 30 business days for Preservation Commission to make a decision on an application. He stated this would almost double the waiting time. He stated residents were also opposed to the change that would require an HP permit and preservation commission review of detached accessory structures if they are over 8 feet in height and visible from the street. This change, if not in the original budget, could make a homeowner give up on the project altogether. Mr. Whitehurst stated he has heard the excuse that the more complex projects take more time but the applicant can always agree to more time for the review.

(-) Tracy Hull, 1555 Swan Drive, Tulsa, OK 74120, is concerned about the proposed required historic preservation permit review for accessory structures or buildings located in the street yard or over eight feet in height and visible from the street and would encourage the commission not to approve that part of this proposal. She stated this stems from the issue of people building ADUs in historic neighborhoods that are really tall and really out of character, and there is already a process for approving these. Ms. Hull stated she does not want to see any more requirements put on repairing garages. She asked that this just apply to new structures, because anyone building a new ADU in an HP District knows how expensive it will be with respect to the historic preservation overlay. Ms. Hull stated she has no problem with the proposed timeline part of the amendment.

### **Staff Comments**

Staff stated the intention of this proposal was not to double the time for review. She stated the proposal would only add about two weeks to the timeline and that it would incorporate the option for a second preservation commission meeting if needed. Staff stated the important thing is just the ability, if an applicant is not present, to be able to move it to the next meeting and still be within the timeline.

Mr. Craddock asked if currently, someone had a one-story garage or ADU and they wanted to increase the height would they be required to go through any HP process.

Staff stated not unless it is in the street yard. She stated there is only one case from recent years where they demolished a detached garage and built a two-story ADU and the only reason that came before the preservation commission was because it was on a corner lot and just barely in the street yard.

Mr. Bulmash asked if this proposed change would apply if you were just repairing the garage but not making any changes.

Staff stated emergency repairs to stabilize the structure is exempt but a repair or replacement would require staff approval.

Mr. Hood stated the HP zoning in these historic neighborhoods were meant to protect the historic integrity of the neighborhoods. He stated if you could see it from the street you had to comply with the HP zoning but you didn't have to do that with a garage or an ADU. He stated what they are trying to do is to ensure that whatever is getting built in the neighborhoods is still sensitive to the architecture and to the historic quality of these neighborhoods.

### **Commission Action**

Motion: Recommend approval Of ZCA-33 related to the historic preservation (HP) permit requirement in the following sections: Section 70.070, HP Permits, Section 70.070-B, Exemptions, to add: 7. Installation of temporary landscape features not affixed to the ground, such as bird baths, non-masonry landscape edging, raised planting beds not on permanent foundation, and lawn or patio furniture; per staff's recommendation.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

Motion: Recommend approval of ZCA-33 related to the historic preservation (HP) permit requirement for Section 70.070-E, Meeting and Final Decision—Preservation Commission keeping the 30-day approval timeline for HP permits and adding the preservation commission to take action within the 30 days of receipt of a complete permit application is deemed to constitute approval unless the applicant requests or agrees to an extension of the 30 day period or unless the applicant fails to attend the meeting in which the application is considered.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 7-1-0

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

Nays: Bulmash

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

Motion: To deny ZCA-33 related to the historic preservation (HP) permit requirement for accessory structures for HP permits in the following sections: Section 70.070, HP Permits, Section 70.070-B, Exemptions, 4. Accessory structures or buildings.

Motion by: Craddock      Second by: Whitlock

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

## **Other Business**

---

None

## **10. Commissioner Comments**

None

## **Adjournment**

---

### **Commission Action**

Motion: Adjourn

Motion by: Fugate            Second by: Shivel

Vote: 8-0-0

Ayes: Bulmash, Craddock, Fugate, Hood, Humphrey, Shivel, Turner-Addison, Whitlock

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Absent: Rosene Robinson, Walker

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:38 p.m.