

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 2743

Wednesday, April 5, 2017, 1:30 p.m.

City Council Chamber

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

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Adams	Krug	Foster	VanValkenburgh, Legal
Carnes	Shivel	Hoyt	
Covey		Miller	
Dix		Sawyer	
Doctor		Ulmer	
Fretz		Wilkerson	
Millikin			
Reeds			
Walker			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Tuesday, April 4, 2017 at 1:15 p.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Covey called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

REPORTS:

Chairman’s Report:

Director’s Report:

Ms. Miller reported on City Council and Board of County Commission agendas and the actions taken. Ms. Miller stated there would be a work session before the April 19, 2017 TMAPC meeting at 10:30am. Kirk Bishop will be at that work session and have a brief presentation on the BRT Land Use Study highlighting the final recommendations and review. Kirk will also lead discussion on the Subdivision Regulations and the Landscape Ordinance. Ms. Miller stated there will also be a short progress report on the Downtown Area Master Plan.

1. **Minutes:**

Minutes of March 15, 2017, Meeting No. 2742

Approval of the minutes of March 15, 2017 Meeting No. 2742

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, the TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug, Shivel "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of March 15, 2017, Meeting No. 2742.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters under "Consent" are considered by the Planning Commission to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. Any Planning Commission member may, however, remove an item by request.

2. **LC-874** (Lot-Combination) (CD 2) – Location: North and west of northwest corner of West 91st Street South and South Union Avenue
3. **LS-20973** (Lot-Split) (CD 1) – Location: North of the northwest corner of East 36th Street North and North Peoria Avenue (related to LC-875)
4. **LC-875** (Lot-Combination) (CD 1) – Location: North of the northwest corner of East 36th Street North and North Peoria Avenue (related to LS-20973)
5. **LS-20975** (Lot-Split) (County) – Location: North of the northeast corner of South 45th West Avenue and West 49th Street South (related to LC-876)
6. **LC-876** (Lot-Combination) (County) – Location: North of the northeast corner of South 45th West Avenue and West 49th Street South (related to LS-20975)
7. **LS-20976** (Lot-Split) (CD 7) – Location: North of the northeast corner of South Memorial Drive and East 101st Street South
8. **LC-877** (Lot-Combination) (CD 4) – Location: East of the northeast corner of South Yorktown Avenue and East 24th Street South
9. **LC-878** (Lot-Combination) (CD 4) – Location: East of the northeast corner of South Lewis Avenue and East 28th Street South
10. **LS-20949** (Lot-Split) (CD 8) – Location: North of the northwest corner of East 116th Place South and South New Haven Avenue (related to LC-837)

11. **LC-837** (Lot-Combination) (CD 8) – Location: North of the northwest corner of East 116th Place South and South New Haven Avenue (related to LS-20949)

12. **PUD-215-16 KKT Architects** (CD 8) Location: Northwest corner of South 77th East Place and East 87th Street South requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to allow dynamic display sign

Mr. Covey stated Item 13 has been withdrawn by the applicant

13. **PUD-564-A-1 Andrew Shank** (CD 5) Location: West of the northwest of corner South 86 East Avenue and East 28th Place South requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to add outdoor advertising as a permitted principal use **(withdrawn by applicant)**

14. **PUD-550-6 Mark Capron** (CD 5) Location: Northwest of South 91st East Avenue and East Skelly Drive requesting a **PUD Minor Amendment** to revise landscape and lighting requirements

14.A **LS-20974** (Lot-Split) (County) Location: North of the Northwest corner of East 86th Street North and North Yale Avenue

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to **APPROVE** Items 2 to 12 and items 14 and 14A

Ms. Millikin read the opening statement and rules of conduct for the TMAPC meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

15. **CPA-59** (CD 2) Location: South of the southeast corner of West 71st Street and South Elwood Avenue requesting to amend the Land Use designation from “**Employment**” to “**Existing Neighborhood**” and amend the Stability and Growth designation from an “**Area of Growth**” to an “**Area of Stability**” on approximately 52.14 acres located south of the southeast corner of West 71st Street and South Elwood Avenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

I. PROPERTY INFORMATION AND LAND USE REQUEST

<p>Existing Land Use: <i>Employment</i> Existing Stability and Growth designation: <i>Area of Growth</i></p>
--

<p>Proposed Land Use: TMAPC initiated: <i>New Neighborhood</i> Recommendation: <i>Existing Neighborhood</i></p> <p>Recommended Stability and Growth designation: <i>Area of Stability</i></p>
<p>Location: S of the SE corner of W. 71st St. and S. Elwood Ave.</p>
<p>Size: 52.14 acres or 13 parcels</p>

A. Background

The land use assigned for this area at the time of adoption of the 2010 Tulsa Comprehensive Plan is *Employment*, with a Stability and Growth Map designation of *Area of Growth*. The subject area is in west Tulsa, on the eastern edge of the boundary of the West Highlands/Tulsa Hills Small Area Plan, which was adopted in 2014. This small area plan was initiated in response to development pressures in a previously agricultural area. The small area plan attempts to balance future development with existing aesthetics and open space while ensuring that transportation and related systems are enhanced. The map designations of *Employment* and *Area of Growth* for this area were not changed through the small area planning process.

The thirteen (13) parcels subject to the amendment zoned AG with mostly residential uses, are located between a utility substation on the north, City of Tulsa facilities to the east, and the new Jenks elementary school (under construction) to the south. On a parcel within the area subject to the amendment request, TMAPC recently denied a request to change zoning from Agricultural (AG) to Commercial General (CG) with an optional development plan (Z-7366) to allow a dog boarding and training facility. While considering this request and in response to feedback from neighborhood residents and property owners at the public hearing, TMAPC expressed concerns about the Comprehensive Plan's land use designation of *Employment* for the subject property and adjacent properties.

From this discussion, TMAPC directed staff to evaluate the appropriateness of this land use designation and the possibility of changing it to *New Neighborhood* through an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

B. Existing Land Use and Growth Designations (Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and West Highlands/Tulsa Hills Small Area Plan)

“**Employment** areas contain office, warehousing, light manufacturing and high tech uses such as clean manufacturing or information technology. Sometimes big-box retail or warehouse retail clubs are found in these areas. These areas are distinguished from mixed-use centers in that they have few residences and typically have more extensive commercial activity.

Employment areas require access to major arterials or interstates. Those areas, with manufacturing and warehousing uses must be able to accommodate extensive truck traffic, and rail in some instances. Due to the special transportation requirements of these districts, attention to design, screening and open space buffering is necessary when employment districts are near other districts that include moderate residential use.”

“The purpose of **Areas of Growth** is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

Areas of Growth are found throughout Tulsa. These areas have many different characteristics but some of the more common traits are close proximity to or abutting an arterial street, major employment and industrial areas, or areas of the city with an abundance of vacant land. Also, several of the Areas of Growth are in or near downtown. Areas of Growth provide Tulsa with the opportunity to focus growth in a way that benefits the City as a whole. Development in these areas will provide housing choice and excellent access to efficient forms of transportation including walking, biking, transit, and the automobile.”

C. Recommended Land Use and Growth Designations

“The **Existing Residential Neighborhood** category is intended to preserve and enhance Tulsa’s existing single family neighborhoods. Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill projects, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of

the zoning code. In cooperation with the existing community, the city should make improvements to sidewalks, bicycle routes, and transit so residents can better access parks, schools, churches, and other civic amenities.”

“**Areas of Stability** includes approximately 75% of the city’s total parcels. Existing residential neighborhoods, where change is expected to be minimal, make up a large proportion of the Areas of Stability. The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small scale infill projects. The concept of stability and growth is specifically designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life. The concept of stability and growth is specifically designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life.”

D. Zoning and Surrounding Uses:

E. Applicant’s Justification:

Location	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use Designation	Area of Stability or Area of Growth	Existing Use
North	AG	<i>Employment</i>	Growth	utility substation, vacant land, self-storage facility
South	OL/PUD-742	<i>Employment</i>	Growth	Jenks school (under construction)
East	AG	Employment	Growth	City of Tulsa sewage treatment facilities
West	RM-O/RS-3 /PUD-738, AG	New Neighborhood	Growth	S. Elwood Ave., apartments (under construction) and large lot residential

As part of the amendment application, the applicant is asked to justify their amendment request. Specifically, they are asked to provide a written justification to address:

1. How conditions on the subject site have changed, as well as those on adjacent properties and immediate area;

2. How changes have impacted the subject site to warrant the proposed amendment; and;
3. How the proposed change will enhance the surrounding area and the City of Tulsa.

The TMAPC (applicant) initiated a land use amendment on February 1, 2017, directing staff to look closer at specific factors impacting the area that may warrant a land use change. When staff first presented the item to TMAPC for initiation, a *New Neighborhood* land use designation was suggested based on other similar properties in the surrounding area. However, since then, new information has resulted in a staff recommendation of *Existing Neighborhood* and *Area of Stability* designations on the subject properties. The following section summarizes justification for the proposed amendment.

F. Staff Summary:

The Comprehensive Plan recognizes that when conditions and markets change, consideration of plan amendments would be appropriate. Land use map designations proposed and adopted in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan considered zoning (existing and pending), land uses that were current at that time, and a forward look to a future development pattern in the area that could support the City's long-range (20 to 30 years) vision for the future.

The following factors indicated a potential for more intense uses in the future, and thus supported the *Employment* land use designation and *Area of Growth* on the Growth and Stability Map when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2010:

- Few residences on large lots
- AG zoning, typically a legacy condition that pre-dates urbanization within the City
- Relative proximity of a busy regional airport (Jones) to the south. Airports and complementary businesses generate employment opportunities.
- OL (Office-Low) zoning on property to the south. The Jenks Elementary School now under construction was not anticipated at the time.
- Proximity to the City of Tulsa sewage treatment facilities (drying beds), not generally considered a compatible land use near residential areas. These facilities are separated from the subject area by severe topography, dropping from west to east, toward the Arkansas River and no obvious street connections to the east.
- Utility substation to the north
- Commercial properties on 71st Street (also to the north)

Similar large-lot properties on the east side of S. Elwood were designated *New Neighborhood* (also in an *Area of Growth*), based on residential zoning (RM-3/RM-0/PUD-738) south of 71st Street and new subdivisions (Stonebrooke) at

81st Street. Currently, a large multi-family residential development is under construction south of the southwest corner of 71st and Elwood.

A few important factors warrant consideration of a Comprehensive Plan amendment in the subject area. First, the existing property owners acknowledge that the area is growing and changing, but have expressed the desire to maintain the stability of their residential neighborhood. The desires and concerns expressed by the neighborhood were the impetus for the TMAPC consideration to initiate this land use review. The following sections provide further details on neighborhood discussion since the initiation of this proposed amendment.

Community Engagement

To engage more residents in this discussion, the City of Tulsa scheduled a public meeting/listening session for 6 to 7 p.m. on Tuesday, March 7, 2017, at the SummerHill Suites at Tulsa Hills, 1521 W. 80th Street S. Invitations were mailed to all property owners within the subject area and those within 300' of the subject area.

Because portions of the subject properties were included in West Highlands/Tulsa Hills Small Area Plan boundary, a courtesy invitation was extended to members of the Citizen Advisory Team via e-mail. City Councilor Jeannie Cue also invited constituents in the area.

Public Meeting: March 7, 2017

Based on sign-in sheets, approximately 30 persons (including staff and Councilor Cue) attended the meeting. Seven (7) directly affected property owners attended the meeting as shown in shaded areas on the map (See Attachment 6). Staff presented a PowerPoint presentation providing planning context (i.e., comprehensive planning, land use designations and how they differ from zoning), and references to the West Highlands/Tulsa Hills Small Area Plan.

As they considered TMAPC's suggested amendment to *New Neighborhood*, attendees reviewed the Comprehensive Plan's "building blocks" (also in the PowerPoint presentation) that illustrate concepts anticipated by land use designations of *Employment*, *New Neighborhood*, and *Existing Neighborhood*.

Staff clarified that any new development in the area *not allowed by AG zoning* would require rezoning, which in turn would be subject to notification of property owners and a public process similar to what occurred with Z-7366.

A general discussion between attendees and staff comprised the remaining half of the meeting. The primary development concern expressed by residents in the area - regardless of land use designations -

was traffic on S. Elwood Avenue, with expectation of delays and hazards upon completion of the elementary school, multi-family construction near 71st Street and the Titan Sports complex on 81st Street. They noted that S. Elwood Avenue also provides an outlet for traffic to avoid congestion at 81st Street and Highway 75.

Attendees and property owners echoed the sentiments of speakers at the Z-7366 public hearing, stating their preference for this area to remain unchanged for the near future.

Regarding land use designations for the subject area, attendees asserted the following positions in response to TMAPC's proposed amendment to the land use plan:

- No support to retain the *Employment* designation
- No support for *New Neighborhood*, as they would not embrace new suburban-style development envisioned by this designation.
- Overwhelming support to change the land use designation to *Existing Neighborhood*.

This is a unique situation in that areas of low density with AG zoning designations were not typically assigned as *Existing Neighborhoods* or *Areas of Stability* when the Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 2010; however, it is not unprecedented. Of the 29,390 acres of AG zoned land within the City of Tulsa, 1,786 acres of 6% of that land are designated in the Comprehensive Plan as *Existing Neighborhood* and an *Area of Stability* (See Attachments 7-9).

Regarding changed conditions, the current Jenks elementary school under construction on the southern boundary of the subject area was not envisioned at the time of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 2010. When the zoning was changed from AG to OL/PUD-742 in 2007, the intent was for an office park, which would have been more in line with a larger *Employment* area. However, a major amendment to the PUD was approved in 2015 that altered the development potential of this site to an elementary school. A school use is complementary to the neighborhood and will support the stability of existing residences located nearby.

Another factor that may not have been taken into full consideration is the severe topographical change between the subject properties and the City of Tulsa sewage treatment facilities to the east. Because of the topography, heavily wooded nature of the eastern portions of the subject properties, and lack of connections to the City of Tulsa property, potential negative impacts resulting from that use are significantly mitigated.

G. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the *Existing Neighborhood* and *Area of Stability* designations for the subject area.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Covey asked Ms. Miller if the yellow on page 15.13 of the packet represented the neighbors attending the neighborhood meeting.

Ms Miller answered “yes”.

Mr. Covey asked if all that attended were in favor of the existing neighborhood classification.

Ms. Miller replied “yes”, everyone at the meeting including those who did not live in the neighborhood were in favor of the Existing Neighborhood designation.

Mr. Covey asked if there were citizens that participated in the Small Area Plan at the meeting.

Ms. Miller stated “yes”, there were a few of those in attendance. There were 30 people total and everyone was in favor of Existing Neighborhood.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Anthony Snapp 7515 South Elwood Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74132

Mr. Snapp stated he represents himself, his father-in-law and a neighbor who all live in the neighborhood but was unable to attend the meeting because the notice came the day of the meeting. Mr. Snapp stated they are in agreement with the classification of existing neighborhood.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to **APPROVE** CPA-59 per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

16.LS-20971 (Lot-Split) (County) – Location: South of the Southwest corner of East 161st Street and South Harvard Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Lot-Split proposal is to split an existing AG (Agriculture) tract into three tracts. Tract 3 of the resulting tracts will meet the Bulk and Area requirements of the Tulsa County Zoning Code. On March 21, 2017 The County Board of Adjustment granted a Variance of the minimum lot width from 150’ to 149’ for Tract 1 and Tract 2.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on March 16, 2017 and had no comments.

The proposed lot-split would not have an adverse affect on the surrounding properties and staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the lot-split and the waiver of the Subdivision Regulations that no lot have more than three side lot lines.

Mr. Dix asked if the Lot-Splits are before TMAPC because of exceeding the lot lines.

Ms. Ulmer stated "yes".

Mr. Dix asked if a mutual access agreement would prevent this from happening.

Mr. Wilkerson stated every zoning classification in the city or county requires street footage of 30 feet wide so applicants have to go to the Board of Adjustment and ask for a waiver of the frontage requirement or come to TMAPC to ask for relief from the Subdivision Regulations that no lot have more than three side lot lines.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug, Shivel "absent") to **APPROVE** LS-20971 per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

17. Titan Sports (CD 2) Modification to previously approved Authorization for Accelerated Release of a Building Permit, Location: East of the northeast corner of East 81st Street South and South Elwood Avenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant has requested that the Planning Commission authorize the City of Tulsa to issue building permits prior to the filing of a final plat. The platting requirement on this property was the result of Board of Adjustment action approving the proposed use on the property. A preliminary plat for the project was approved on October 19, 2016. Infrastructure Development Plans (IDP) have been submitted to the City of Tulsa and are currently under review.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on February 16, 2017 and provided the following information:

- Earth change permits have been processed and approved by Development Services.
- Water line extension plans have been submitted and are being reviewed as a part of the IDP.
- The subject property is partially located within the Hager-Creek 100 year (1% annual chance) floodplain and entirely within the Arkansas River 500-year floodplain. The project area is shown as being protected from the 1% annual chance flood by two separate levees. The Hager Creek Levee and any associated easements should be clearly and accurately shown on building permit plans with base flood and water surface elevations labeled.
- Given that the proposed access to the facility must cross flood-prone areas, an alternative access outside the floodplain should be provided to ensure safety of access to the property in times of flooding for ordinary and emergency vehicles.

A meeting was held on Tuesday February 21, 2017 with representatives of the City of Tulsa, the Tulsa Airport Authority, and the project consultants. As a part of the project, a private drive will be constructed between the north property line and East 71st Street that will be partially funded by the City of Tulsa and provide service to City of Tulsa facilities located south of East 71st Street. The applicant has made modifications to the proposed site plan to accommodate concerns of the Tulsa Airport Authority and is continuing to work closely with the Tulsa Airport Authority as the project progresses. No objections were raised to the authorization of an accelerated release of a building permit.

Staff recommends **approval** of the accelerated release of a building permit.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

Applicant's Comments:

Ricky Jones 5323 South Lewis Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74105

The applicant stated they are working with the legal department at the City of Tulsa and Development Services to get up and running with this project. Mr. Jones stated they are going to dedicate the right-of-way by separate instrument if not by the plat. Mr. Jones stated he is okay with the safe guard the no occupancy permit be issued until this has been done.

Mr. Dix asked if staff approved of the separate instrument right-of-way dedication.

Mr. Foster answered "yes".

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug,

Shivel “absent”) to **APPROVE** the “Titan Sports” modification to previously approved Accelerated Release of a Building Permit per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

18.Z-7192 (CD 9) Plat Waiver, Location: North of the northwest corner of East 49th Street South and South Harvard Avenue

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The platting requirement for this property is being triggered by a rezoning approval (Z-7192) in 2012. The property has been previously platted.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on March 16th, 2017 and the following items were determined:

1. All required right-of-way has been dedicated and is in place.
2. Necessary easements are all in place and no additional easements will be needed at this time.
3. A Change of Access has been approved by TMAPC and filed of record with Tulsa County to align newly proposed access with previously filed plat.
4. The property is currently shown to be located in the City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain and partially located within a FEMA floodplain. Any proposed development within the regulatory floodplain must meet the floodplain development requirements of the City of Tulsa Revised Ordinances, Title 11-A and Title 51 as well as city drainage standards. Any proposed changes to the floodplain boundaries or flood elevations will be subject to Floodplain Map Revisions.

Staff recommends **approval** of the plat waiver.

TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Foster stated he would like to provide emphasis on item number four in the staff recommendation the property is currently shown to be located in the City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain and partially located within a FEMA floodplain. Mr. Foster stated that included with the staff recommendation is some guidance and notification to the applicant that as a part of the applicants process of obtaining permits they will be faced with the floodplain ordinances for the City of Tulsa and be required to mitigate those floodplain issues.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff’s recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to **APPROVE** Z-7192 Plat Waiver per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

19. A Gathering Place for Tulsa (CD 4 & 9) Preliminary Plat, Location: East and west of Riverside Drive between East 26th Street South and East 34th Street South

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The plat consists of 5 lots, 2 blocks on 72.63± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on March 16th, 2017 and provided the following conditions:

1. **Zoning** – The majority of the property is zoned AG (Agriculture) with other portions being zoned RM-3 (Residential Multifamily – 3) and RS-3 (Residential Single Family – 3). Development standards for the park are regulated by Planned Unit Development 799 which was approved in August of 2013.
2. **General Development** – Remove the following items from final plat submittal:
 - a. Pond boundary
 - b. Underground sanitary & storm sewer
 - c. Edge of roadway
 - d. Boat house
 - e. As-built building & bridge
 - f. Lodge
 - g. Proposed bridge
 - h. Conservation & mitigation areas
 - i. PUD boundary
 - j. Meander line
3. **Engineering Graphics** - Add tic marks to all line segments to show the end of one bearing and distance and the beginning of the next. Ensure all curve data is shown on the plat. Make sure that the line type used is

indicative of a boundary line. Provide an overall legal description of the Plat boundary for "A Gathering Place for Tulsa" on the first two sheets. Then a sheet that specifically addresses the legal description for the properties of the Gathering Place and the City of Tulsa and then two sheets that specifically address the legal description of the property description for the City of Tulsa and Tulsa County. One Existing Subdivision name is mislabeled, "Riverdale Plaza" is shown by the County Assessor as "Riverside Plaza". Basis of Bearing needs to have the complete State Plan Coordinate System title which was used for this Plat. Also add the bearing used i.e. "North line of the Southeast Quarter of Section 13 being N88°49'13"E..." Show the dimensions for each lot. Remove "Phone Number:" (or add the number) for each Owner listed on the Plat. Missing the Subdivision Control Data Sheet.

- 4. Floodplain** – Portions of the subject property are located within the Arkansas River, Swan Creek, and Crow Creek floodplains. All delineated floodplain boundaries including, City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain, FEMA Floodplain (Zone AE), and FEMA Floodway should be clearly and accurately shown on the plat with the base flood/water surface elevations labeled. A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA is required to follow CLOMR Case #15-06-3735R and for any additional proposed development within the FEMA floodplain and Floodway.

Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:

None Requested

Staff recommends **approval** of the preliminary plat as submitted subject to the conditions provided by the Technical Advisory Committee and all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug, Shivel "absent") to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Plat "A Gathering Place for Tulsa" per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

20. Cottages at Cedar Ridge (CD 7) Preliminary Plat, Location: West of the southwest corner of East 96th Street South and South Garnett Road

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The plat consists of 1 lot, 1 block on 18.96± acres.

The Technical Advisory Committee met on March 16th, 2017 and provided the following conditions:

1. **Zoning** – The property is zoned RM-3 (Residential Multifamily – 3) with an optional development plan (Z-7350). Approved optional development plan standards must be included with final plat. It is recommended that proposed utility lines at the south end of the property be relocated outside of designated landscaping/screening areas to avoid conflict with development standards.
2. **General Development** – Add metes and bounds to the RWE. Add metes and bounds as necessary to 15' storm easement. Clarify public/private portions of water, sewer, and storm water lines. Public lines must be located in appropriate easements. Obstructions located within public rights-of-way or easement will require approval of a separate agreement.
3. **Engineering Graphics** – Submit Subdivision Control Data Sheet with final plat. Identify all platted subdivisions in the location map and clearly label with subdivision name. Provide north arrow for location map. Remove contours on final plat. Add “State of” before Oklahoma in the plat subtitle. Graphically show all found or set property pins associated with the plat. Provide/state basis of bearings between two known points and clarify basis of bearing language. Label lot graphically with address. List blocks and reserve areas under plat statistics. Change the bearing angle from the POC to read N 00°03'00”W, not S 00°03'00”E.
4. **Transportation & Traffic** – Provide Limits of No Access along East 96th Street South. Provide 5' sidewalks and access ramps and ensure connectivity with any existing sidewalks. Provide standard plat covenants for driveways and LNA. Driveways should be 24'-36'. 25' radius. 2% slope for sidewalk through driveways. Provide ROW dimension for East 96th Street South.
5. **Fire** – Fire hydrants will be required every 500' on all roads fronting the development if they are not already in place. Gated entry will require

KNOX access.

6. **Water & Sewer** – Separation distance of 5’ required between carport edges and waterline easement edges. Define “green area” overlapping RWE along the south property line. Sanitary sewer main should be placed in the U/E along the north property line instead of the ROW. Internal mains should either be placed in easements or designated as “private”.

7. **Floodplain** – Portions of the subject property are located within the Haikey Creek floodplain. All delineated floodplain boundaries including City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain, FEMA Floodplain (Zone AE), and FEMA Floodway should be clearly and accurately shown on the plat with the base flood/water surface elevations labeled.

Waivers of Subdivision Regulations:

None Requested

Staff recommends **approval** of the preliminary plat as submitted subject to the conditions provided by the Technical Advisory Committee and all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff’s recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to **APPROVE** the Preliminary Plat “Cottages at Cedar Ridge” per staff recommendation.

* * * * *

21. CZ-454 Eddie Carson (County) Location: Southwest corner of West 191st Street South and Highway 75 requesting rezoning from **AG** to **CH**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: CZ-454

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT: The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from AG to CH in order to permit the marketing of the site for potential commercial and minor industrial uses, including a movie theater or warehousing.

DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

CZ-454 is non injurious to the existing proximate properties and;

CH zoning is consistent with the anticipated future development pattern of the surrounding property therefore;

Staff recommends Approval of CZ-454 to rezone property from AG to CH.

SECTION II: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: The site is located within the US 75 Corridor District of The City of Glenpool Comprehensive Plan. The City of Glenpool Comprehensive Plan states that highway and tourist commercial development should be concentrated in the US 75 Corridor.

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: N/A

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: N/A

Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: W. 191st St. S. is a Secondary Arterial

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: None

Special District Considerations: None

Historic Preservation Overlay: None

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Staff Summary: The site is currently vacant land.

Environmental Considerations: None

Streets:

<u>Exist. Access</u>	<u>MSHP Design</u>	<u>MSHP R/W</u>	<u>Exist. # Lanes</u>
Highway 75	Freeway	Per ODOT	4
West 191 st Street South	Secondary Arterial	100 feet	2

Utilities:

The subject tract has municipal water and sewer available.

Surrounding Properties:

Location	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use Designation	Area of Stability or Growth	Existing Use
North	AG	N/A	N/A	Vacant
South	AG	N/A	N/A	Vacant
East	CS	N/A	N/A	Vacant
West	AG	N/A	N/A	Vacant

SECTION III: Relevant Zoning History

ZONING RESOLUTION: Resolution number 98254 dated September 15, 1980, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property:

No relevant history.

Surrounding Property:

No relevant history.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MILLIKIN**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug, Shivel "absent") to **APPROVE** CZ-454 rezoning from **AG** to **CH** per staff recommendation.

Legal Description for CZ-454

The Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4 NE/4) of Section Ten (10), Township Sixteen (16) North, Range Twelve (12) East of the Indian Base and

Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U.S. Government Survey thereof, LESS AND EXCEPT a strip, piece, or parcel of land lying in the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (NE/4 NE/4) of said Section Ten (10), Township Sixteen (16) North, Range Twelve (12) East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said parcel of land being described by metes and bounds as follows: BEGINNING at a point 24.75 feet West of the East line and 24.75 feet South of the North line of said NE/4 NE/4; thence South on a line parallel to and 24.75 feet West of the East line a distance of 1297.5 feet to a point on the South line of said NE/4 NE/4; thence West along said South line a distance of 76.7 feet; thence N 0°22'W a distance of 1297.5 feet to a point 24.75 feet South of the North line of said NE/4 NE/4; thence East on a line parallel to and 24.75 feet South of said North line a distance of 75.7 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

* * * * *

Mr. Covey stated item #22 has been withdrawn by applicant

22. CZ-455 Erik Enyart (County) Location: East of the southeast corner of East 161st Street and South Lewis Avenue requesting rezoning from **AG** to **RE**

* * * * *

23. Z-7379 Erik Enyart (CD 9) Location: North of the northeast corner of South Columbia Avenue and East 53rd Street South requesting rezoning from **RS-2** to **RS-3**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

SECTION I: Z-7379

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:

The proposed zoning is necessary to support two single family residential lots on this property. The expected lot configuration will be larger than RS-3 minimums.

DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

RS-3 zoning is consistent with the New Neighborhood land use vision in the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan and,

RS-3 rezoning as requested by Z-7379 is consistent with the existing proximate properties. Redevelopment plans as part of Planned Unit Development 295-A (north) and PUD 499 (southwest) have been previously approved but not

redeveloped. Density and lot configuration allowed on those tracts could be much smaller than RS-3 zoning requested and,

Z-7379 is consistent with the anticipated future development of the surrounding properties therefore;

Staff recommends Approval of Z-7379 to rezone property from RS-2 to RS-3.

SECTION II: Supporting Documentation

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: The New Neighborhood land use designation anticipates appropriate infill development. Rezoning at this location will create an opportunity to provide additional users to connect with the existing utility and street infrastructure.

Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: New Neighborhood

“The New Neighborhood residential building block is comprised of a plan category by the same name. It is intended for new communities developed on vacant land. These neighborhoods are comprised primarily of single-family homes on a range of lot sizes, but can include townhouses and low-rise apartments or condominiums. These areas should be designed to meet high standards of internal and external connectivity, and shall be paired with an existing or New Neighborhood or Town Center.”

Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Growth

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

Areas of Growth are found throughout Tulsa. These areas have many different characteristics but some of the more common traits are close proximity to or abutting an arterial street, major employment and industrial areas, or areas of the city with an abundance of vacant land. Also, several of the Areas of Growth are in or near downtown. Areas of Growth provide Tulsa with the opportunity to focus growth in a way that benefits the City as a whole. Development in these areas

will provide housing choice and excellent access to efficient forms of transportation including walking, biking, transit, and the automobile.”

Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: None

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: None

Small Area Plan: None

Special District Considerations: None

Historic Preservation Overlay: None

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Staff Summary: The site is nearly flat with several large trees and historically has been occupied with one home. At the time of the staff report the lot was empty.

Environmental Considerations: Staff recommends establishing a tree protection plan to help integrate new construction in to the neighborhood. Otherwise there are no known considerations that affect site development.

Streets:

<u>Exist. Access</u>	<u>MSHP Design</u>	<u>MSHP R/W</u>	<u>Exist. # Lanes</u>
South Columbia Place	None	50 feet	2

Utilities:

The subject tract has municipal water and sewer available.

Surrounding Properties:

Location	Existing Zoning	Existing Land Use Designation	Area of Stability or Growth	Existing Use
North	RS-2 with PUD-295-A overlay. The PUD was approved with 58 foot wide lots and 6500 sq ft of lot area minimums adjacent to Z-7379.	New Neighborhood	Growth	No homes but the private street infrastructure has been installed years ago.

East	RS-2	Existing neighborhood	Stability	Single family residential
South	RS-2	Existing neighborhood	Stability	Single family residential
West	RS-2 and RS-2 with PUD 499 overlay (allowed 3 lots on a private street)	Existing neighborhood	Stability	Single family residential

SECTION III: Relevant Zoning History

ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 11823 dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property:

No relevant history.

Surrounding Property:

BOA-17901 January 13, 1998: The Board of Adjustment approved a Variance of the required side yard from 10 ft. to 5.5 ft. to allow for an addition to an existing dwelling, on property located at 5311 S. Columbia Ave. and southwest of subject property.

PUD-295-A November 1996: All concurred in approval of a proposed Major Amendment to a Planned Unit Development, on a 5± acre tract of land, to increase the original PUD by adding three adjoining residential lots to allow single-family homes, additional parking for the existing townhouses, and a water retention facility, on property located south of the southeast corner of East 51st Street South and South Columbia Place.

PUD-499 June 1993: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 1± acre tract of land for three single-family dwelling with private drive and common area, on property located north of the northwest corner of S. Columbia Pl. and E. 53rd St. S. and just southwest of subject property, across S. Columbia Pl.

BOA-14446 April 16, 1987: The Board of Adjustment approved a Variance of the setback from the centerline of E. 53rd St. from 55 ft. to 33 ½ ft. to allow for an addition to an existing dwelling unit; per plot plan; subject to no enclosure of carport, on property located at 5304 S. Columbia Pl. and southwest of subject property.

PUD-295 October 1982: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 1.75± acre tract of land for 21 townhomes with conditions on

property located south of the southeast corner of East 51st Street South and South Columbia Place.

Z-5518/ PUD-257 October 1981: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning from RS-2 to OM and a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 3+ acre tract of land for an office development, on property located on the southeast corner of E. 51st St. and S. Columbia Pl.

PUD-266 September 1981: All concurred in approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development on a 8.9+ acre tract of land for Brittany Square, 18,000 square foot office building, 212 apartment unit development and a club house on property located on the south side of East 51st Street at South Delaware Place and abutting south and west of subject property.

Applicant's Comments:

Ricky Jones 5323 South Lewis Avenue, Tulsa, OK 74105

Mr. Jones stated the purpose is to create two lots. Mr. Jones stated in the old days planning commission looked at three things when property was rezoned, the Comprehensive Plan, the existing zoning patterns and the existing developing patterns. Mr. Jones stated if the old zoning code were in place the applicant would apply for a PUD on this property. Mr. Jones stated he believes this project is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with existing development patterns. Mr. Jones stated as an old planner he looks at this as spot zoning because there is no other RS-3 around this project and that bothers old timers like him. Mr. Jones stated without the PUD mechanism there is not a graceful way to do what he needs to do with this property, other than rezone to RS-3.

Mr. Dix asked Mr. Jones if he was going to try to put two houses on this lot.

Mr. Jones answered he is going to file a lot split and split the lot running east and west and create one house on the north and one on the south.

Mr. Dix asked Mr. Jones if he was bringing a drive down the north lot line.

Mr. Jones answered, "no" they are splitting it right down the middle and this would meet and exceed RS-3 bulk and area requirements. Mr. Jones stated both houses will face South Columbia.

Mr. Dix asked Mr. Jones if anything has been done to the lots to the north of this development.

Mr. Jones stated, "no".

Mr. Dix stated he is getting a funny feeling about all the blue on page 23.10 going back into the neighborhood. Mr. Dix stated in any other area of town area residents would be protesting. Mr. Dix stated why we did that in the Comprehensive Plan is the question.

Mr. Jones stated he couldn't answer that but what he is proposing is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as drawn.

Mr. Reeds asked Mr. Jones if he would be willing to help propose a tool to replace the PUD option.

Mr. Jones stated there is one in place. The optional development plan or the mandatory development plan, possibly that would be a way to go but it's not as easy and graceful as a PUD. Mr. Jones stated in this case straight RS-3 zoning is the answer. Mr. Jones stated he knows staff doesn't like to hear it but he is a fan of PUD's.

Mr. Reeds responded that he likes the optional development plan because it allows for more flexibility for everyone.

Ms. VanValkenburgh stated applicants can't use an optional development plan to loosen the requirements, you can only further restrict them so the optional development plan would not have been helpful under these circumstances.

Mr. Carnes stated he drove out to proposed development site and when the lot split is completed the lots will be the size of most of the other lots in the area.

Ms. Miller stated the issue's staff sees over and over with PUD's is that in a neighborhoods like the applicants it is more honest if the development standards are RS-3 to call it RS-3 than to call it a PUD and give it RS-3 development standards. Ms. Miller stated the issue with PUD's was that they didn't give neighbors a sense of what could happen in their community or next to their property. Ms. Miller stated that in her opinion spot zoning is an antiquated term. There are things that are not consistent with the neighborhood but we are moving more towards integration of uses where they are appropriate.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Zach Viuf 218 East 25th Street, Tulsa, OK 74114

Mr. Viuf stated he is representing John McGraff and PUD-295 and PUD-295A which is the area to the north of the subject location Mr. Viuf stated that they were required to install a storm water retention pond. Mr. Viuf is concerned that if the lot is split and two houses are built this would add density to a 24 inch RCP pipe on Columbia Place. Mr. Viuf is planning to do a plat to match the current PUD and wants to make sure this project doesn't adversely affect his plat.

Mr. Dix asked Mr. Viuf if there were storm sewers in this area.

Mr. Viuf answered, "yes"

Mr. Dix asked Mr. Jones if the storm water was going into the storm sewers.

Mr. Jones stated the project will have no on site detention unless required by Development Services. Mr. Jones stated the drainage from this project will not go into Mr. Viuf's system. Mr. Jones stated it will be handled privately and worked out by Development Services. Mr. Jones stated there is some storm sewer in the area but it is sparse in this area.

Mr. Viuf stated the 24 inch storm sewer system that goes down Columbia Place was not adequate enough to do the development Mr. Viuf wanted to do originally so development services made Mr. Viuf add the retention pond.

Mr. Dix stated city engineering would take care of the sewer issue.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to **APPROVE** Z-7379 rezoning from **RS-2** to **RS-3** per staff recommendation.

Legal Description for Z-7379

LOT 7, BETHEL UNION HEIGHTS, A SUBDIVISION OF THE EAST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (E/2 NE/4 NW/4) OF SECTION THIRTY-TWO (32), TOWNSHIP NINETEEN (19) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF (PLAT NO. 695), CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA. SAID TRACT CONTAINS 40,229 SQUARE FEET OF 0.924 ACRES.

* * * * *

24. Z-7380 April McConell (CD 4) Location: Northeast corner of West Admiral Boulevard and South Gilcrease Museum Road requesting rezoning from **RS-3** to **CS** (**Staff requests continuance to May 3, 2017**)

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to **CONTINUE** Z-7380 to May 3, 2017 per staff recommendation.

OTHER BUSINESS

25. New CIP Projects, FY 2018-2022 - Approve based on the finding that the new capital improvement projects for the Capital Improvement Plan, Fiscal 2018-2022 are in conformance with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Item: Public hearing approving new capital improvement projects for the Capital Improvement Plan, Fiscal Year 2018-2022.

Background

The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), containing recommended capital projects for the next five years, is a tool to implement the Comprehensive Plan. State Statutes provide that once a comprehensive plan has been adopted, no capital

project shall be constructed or authorized without approval of its location, character and extent by the Planning Commission.

City departments generated the list of new capital improvements in the plan. The City of Tulsa prepares an annual Capital Improvement Plan that is published with the fiscal year budget. The Planning Commission generally reviews any new additions proposed for inclusion in the proposed capital plan before the draft budget and capital plan are published.

Staff Analysis

TMAPC staff reviewed the new proposed Capital Improvement Plan projects for consistency with the City of Tulsa's Comprehensive Plan. In general, the improvements listed are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

A new CIP projects summary is attached. Below is a summarized list of those items, including: the name of requesting Department, the project name, the item number(s) that correspond with the attached chart, and staff comments regarding relationship and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

- **Equipment Management**

- 1) Install Solar Panel Systems at EMD Facilities

Staff Comments: *This proposed project is consistent with the vision in the Comprehensive Plan for efficient building design on p. LU 24.*

“Efficient Building Design

New buildings in Tulsa will be designed to be more energy efficient and have a lighter touch on the environment than those of today. Buildings should be designed with Tulsa's climate in mind, to make use of passive solar heating during the winter, energy-efficient cooling in the summer, and efficient lighting year-round. Many new homes should include sustainable features, such as solar water heaters, non-toxic building materials, and solar energy systems, where applicable. This approach to energy savings and design will help create buildings that are less costly to maintain.”

- **Fire Department**

- 2) Fire Department Fitness Testing Facility

- 3) Fire Station 34 near 3300 S. 177th E. Ave

- 4) Roofing replacement Fire Department

Staff Comments: *The proposed Fire Department projects primarily focus on system upkeep and rehabilitation/maintenance of existing facilities. Although no specific guidance is provided in the Comprehensive Plan, the projects will contribute to public safety and maintenance of existing City facilities.*

- **Gilcrease Museum**

- 5) Office Renovation
- 6) Storage Building
- 7) Test and Balance Mechanical Upgrades

Staff Comments: *These proposed projects represent improvements to an existing museum in the City of Tulsa and are consistent with the Plan's focus on enhancing education and improving Tulsan's quality of life.*

- **Information Technology**

- 8) One Technology Center, Compstat, Police Courts, Convention Center
- 9) Roofing replacement Telecommunications Department

Staff Comments: *These proposed projects are related to rehabilitation and system upkeep and are generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's direction on infrastructure maintenance.*

- **MTTA**

- 10) Bus Stop Signs
- 11) Electric Shuttle System

Staff Comments: *These projects involve maintaining and enhancing the existing transportation system through strategic investments and promoting multiple transportation choices for citizens. Also, an electric shuttle system would provide a "green" alternative transportation mode which is in line with Land Use Priority 5.*

- *Land Use Priority 5 (Ensure that areas of growth benefit from high quality sustainable development*

Goal 15— Tulsa is a leader in sustainable development.

Policies to support this goal include:

- *15.1 Promote significant sustainable projects.*
- *15.2 Establish goals for reducing the city's and region's carbon footprint. (p. LU 86)*

- **PAC**

- 12) Chapman Music Hall Constellation and PA System Renovation
- 13) Tulsa Performing Arts Center Exterior Door Replacement and Repair

Staff Comments: *The proposed improvements to the Performing Arts Center (PAC) is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's understanding of the downtown core as Tulsa's "...most intense regional center of commerce, housing, culture and entertainment." (p. LU 31)*

- **Parks**

- 14) Page Belcher and Mohawk Golf Course Facilities Roof Replacement/Repair
- 15) Zoo Complete Roof Renovation/Renovation Package
- 16) Expanded Parking Lot and Improved Mohawk Park Entry
- 17) Pathways/Service Roads/Staff Parking Lot

Staff Comments: *Based on the below and similar policies regarding parks, the proposed projects are in conformance with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan.*

- *Parks, Trails and Open Space Priority 5 (Improve Access and Quality of Parks and Open Space)*

Goal 14 – Parks and recreational facilities are updated to address changing needs and desires.

- *Policy 14.1 Add comfort and convenience features to parks.*
- *Policy 14.2 Identify parks components that need to be updated or replaced and develop a schedule, budget and methodology to complete improvements.*
- *Policy 14.4 Identify Parks throughout the City for upgrade and develop an action plan to accomplish upgrades. (p. PA 29)*

- **Police**

- 18) Police Courts Building

Staff Comments: *The proposed Police Courts building project focuses on rehabilitation and maintenance of existing facilities. Although no specific guidance is provided in the Comprehensive Plan, the projects will contribute to public safety and maintenance of existing City facilities.*

- **Public Works**

- 19) Engineering Services Roof Replacement
- 20) Roofing replacement Surface Drainage and Vegetation
- 21) Fred Creek 73rd & Harvard Bridge Replacement
- 22) Admiral Place Sidewalk-7300 to 8900 E. Admiral Place
- 23) Creek Turnpike and Memorial Drive Interchange Safety improvements
- 24) Lewis Avenue-51st to 61st St. South Sidewalks

- 25) Lewis Avenue-81st to 91st St. South Sidewalks
- 26) Memorial Drive-31st to 61st St. South Sidewalks
- 27) Peoria and 36th St. N. Intersection Improvements
- 28) Traffic Studies and Data Collection
- 29) W. 51st Street South Sidewalk-3300 West to 2500 West 51st St. South
- 30) Woodland Hills Mall Access Road-68th St. S.
- 31) 71st St. Lift Station Electrical Upgrades
- 32) Southside WWTP Electrical Upgrades
- 33) Southside WWTP Digester MCC Replacement
- 34) Sodium Hydroxide Storage and Feed System Upgrade
- 35) Powdered Activated Carbon Feed System Upgrade
- 36) AB Jewell WTP Improvements-Residuals Improvements Phase 2

Staff Comments: *The above projects are primarily maintenance/improvements and generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s direction on infrastructure. Several of the above items are for construction of sidewalks, which are widely supported throughout the Comprehensive Plan. These projects further many of the Land Use, Transportation and Parks, Trails and Open Space priorities, goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan.*

- **Tulsa Convention Center**

- 37) BOK & CBC-Food & Beverage Improvements
- 38) CBC-Resurfacing the Exhibit Hall Floors at the Cox Business Center

Staff Comments: *These proposed projects represent maintenance/improvements to the Cox Convention Center and BOK Center and contribute to the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and Downtown Master Plan by enhancing quality of life, economic development, educational and cultural opportunities for Tulsa’s citizens.*

Staff Recommendation

Approve based on the finding that the new capital improvement projects for the Capital Improvement Plan, FY 2018-2022 are in conformance with the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, “aye”; no “nays”; none “abstaining”; Krug, Shivel “absent”) to recommend **APPROVAL** of the new capital improvement projects for the Capital Improvement Plan, FY-2018-2022 per staff’s recommendation.

* * * * *

26. TMAPC's Appointee to the River Parks Authority

Matt Meyer River Parks Authority Executive Director

Mr. Meyer stated that the current Appointee is moving to Chicago and there is 2 years left on his 3 year term. Mr. Meyers stated the gentleman being considered today Marvin Jones, is being recommended by the executive committee of River Parks Board.

Mr. Covey stated this is a TMAPC Appointee position. Mr. Covey stated that normally the chairman appoints to the other committees but in this case River Parks Authority indenture states the appointee has to be approved by the majority of TMAPC. Mr. Covey introduced Mr. Jones.

Mr. Jones stated he has been in Tulsa since 2001 and currently is working with a company called Blue Fin. Mr. Jones stated his goal is to continue to give back to the Tulsa community.

Mr. Dix asked staff how Mr. Jones would be the TMAPC representative.

Mr. Covey stated he would be a TMAPC appointee. Mr. Covey said it is a person appointed by the TMAPC but it doesn't say it has to be a TMAPC member. Mr. Covey stated he would like to point out that all the other appointee positions are TMAPC board members. Mr. Covey stated the current appointee was not a TMAPC board member and he was appointed by Mr. Walker when he was chairman.

Mr. Meyer stated in the 14 years he has been at River Parks he does not recall a TMAPC member serving on River Parks board.

Mr. Dix stated he wasn't trying to be difficult, he was just trying to understand. If it was a TMAPC representative what association does the appointee have with TMAPC.

Ms. Miller stated she talked with her boss Rich Brierre of INCOG and asked about the representation. Mr. Brierre told Ms. Miller the River Parks Authority board has 3 county appointee's and 3 city appointee's and the intent when that was created was to create an odd number and have a neutral person. Ms. Miller stated someone appointed by the TMAPC, someone not from the city or county, would be that 7th appointee.

Mr. Dix asked if the appointee is a voting member of the board.

Ms. Miller stated "yes".

Mr. Dix asked if the appointee reports back to TMAPC on important issues.

Mr. Meyer stated not in the past but if TMAPC would like them to do that they could. Mr. Meyer stated all the meetings are open to the public.

Ms. VanValkenburgh stated the River Parks appointee isn't perceived as a TMAPC representative. They are being appointed by TMAPC because it is a co-operative planning commission that involves the city and the county. Ms. VanValkenburgh stated that is her assumption.

Mr. Meyers stated he believes that is how the River Parks trust indenture was set up 43 years ago.

Mr. Covey stated he didn't know Mr. Jones or Mr. Meyer was going to be here today and had put this on the agenda to have the discussion that is happening now and have to Mr. Jones and Mr. Meyer come back at a later date but they are here.

Ms. Millikin stated Mr. Jones would be finishing Mr. Carter's term that has 2 years left of the 3 year term. Ms. Millikin stated she would be happy to nominate Mr. Jones and this discussion could be considered again in 2 years.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MILLIKIN**, the TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug, Shivel "absent") to **APPROVE** item 26, **appointment of Marvin Jones to the River Parks Authority.**

* * * * *

27. Commissioners' Comments

Ms. Millikin would like to thank Mr. Jones for his willingness to serve and stated he has a stellar resume.

* * * * *

ADJOURN

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DIX**, TMAPC voted **9-0-0** (Adams, Carnes, Covey, Dix, Doctor, Fretz, Millikin, Reeds, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Krug, Shivel "absent") to **ADJOURN** TMAPC meeting 2743.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.

Date Approved:

Chairman

ATTEST: _____

Secretary