

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1556
Wednesday, May 22, 1985, 1:30 p.m.
City Commission Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Carnes Connery Draughon Higgins, 2nd Vice- Chairman Kempe, Chairman VanFossen Wilson, 1st Vice- Chairman Woodard	Harris Paddock Young	Frank Gardner Holwell	Linker, Legal Counsel

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor on Tuesday, May 21, 1985, at 12:40 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Kempe called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

MINUTES:

On **MOTION** of **CONNERY**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of May 8, 1985, meeting No. 1554.

REPORTS:

Chairman's Report:

Chairman Kempe advised she had no report, but announced that the Public Hearing pertaining to FD mapping would commence at 4:00 p.m. in the Assembly Center. Mr. Gardner clarified that the Public Hearing would commence in the City Commission Room, but would be recessed and reconvened in the Assembly Hall of the Assembly Center if there were too many people for the City Commission Room.

5.22.85:1556(1)

Staff Recommendation -- PUD #398

The subject tract has a net area of .8 acres and is located at the southeast corner of South Fulton and East 48th Street. The applicant is proposing to develop a medical/dental office PUD in a RM-1 zoning district. The zoning request, now pending as Z-6038, was originally submitted for OL, but revised for an RM-1 office PUD at the suggestion of the TMAPC. The tract has 180 feet of frontage on Fulton and 200 feet of frontage on East 48th. The proposed Outline Development Plan indicates two points of access from Fulton. No access should be granted to this tract from East 48th Street. It is recommended that only one point of access be allowed on Fulton in the form of a two-way drive on the south side of the proposed building. This would eliminate one curb-cut on Fulton and further remove the office traffic from the adjacent residential area. The Plan Text states that the development for the planned one-story office building will be in two phases of 5,000 square feet each for a total floor area of 10,000 square feet. Phase I will be constructed on approximately the south 90 feet of the tract and a parking lot will be constructed in the rear of the building. A 10-foot landscape buffer is indicated on the south boundary and a similar 10-foot buffer is recommended along the east boundary. It is further recommended that a 6-foot solid screening fence be required along the north side of the parking lot with landscaping on the north side which faces the residences on the north side of East 48th Street. The landscape buffer should also be extended along the north side of the proposed building. The north building facade should be constructed of similar materials to the front of the building and building elevations should be required as an element of the Detail Site Plan review to assure maximum compatibility of this development which is in the interior of and adjacent to a residential area.

The Staff is supportive of the PUD and requested RM-1 underlying zoning with the above noted conditions of approval, and finds the proposal to be: (1) consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; (2) in harmony with existing and expected development of the area; (3) a unified treatment of the development possibilities of the site and (4) consistent with the stated purposes and standards of the PUD Chapter of the Zoning Ordinance.

Therefore, the Staff recommends APPROVAL of PUD #398, subject to the following conditions:

(1) That the applicant's Outline Development Plan and Text be made a condition of approval, unless modified herein.

(2) Development Standards:

Land Area (Gross):	1.058 acres	46,086 sq. ft.
(Net):	0.826 acres	36,000 sq. ft.

Permitted Uses: Use Unit 11, Offices and Studios, except drive-in bank facilities.

Z-6038 & PUD #398 (cont'd)

	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Recommended</u>
Maximum Floor Area:	10,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Maximum Floor Ratio:	.22	.22
Minimum Building Setbacks:		
From Centerline of E. 48th St.	50 feet	50 feet
From Centerline of S. Fulton	50 feet	50 feet
From South Boundary	17 feet	25 feet
From East Boundary	90 feet	90 feet
Maximum Building Height:	One-Story	One-Story
Minimum Off-Street Parking:	40 spaces	1-space per each 250 sq. ft. of floor area.
Minimum Landscaped Open Space:	Not Specified	15%*
Signage:		As required in Section 1130.2(b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

* A 10-foot landscape buffer and screening fence shall be required along the south, east and north boundaries. The landscape buffer on the north shall be placed along the north side of the 6-foot solid screening fence which shall be required along the north parking lot perimeter. This buffer shall also be extended along the north face of the building.

(3) That elevation drawings shall be submitted with Detail Site Plans showing the character and construction of a building facades to be consistent with the front of the building and of a comparable character with adjacent residential development permitting only wood and masonry exteriors.

(4) That parking lot and exterior lighting shall be directed downward and away from adjacent residential areas.

(5) That all trash and utility areas shall be screened from public view.

(6) That a Detail Site Plan shall be submitted to and approved prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

Z-6038 & PUD #398 (cont'd)

- (7) That a Detail Landscape Plan and Detail Sign Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the TMAPC and installed prior to the granting of an Occupancy Permit.
- (8) That no access shall be permitted on East 48th Street and only one curb-cut allowed on Fulton south of the proposed building.
- (9) That no Building Permit shall be issued until the requirements of Section 260 of the Zoning Code have been satisfied and approved by the TMAPC and filed of record in the County Clerk's office, incorporating within the Restrictive Covenants the PUD conditions of approval, making the City of Tulsa beneficiary to said Covenants.

Applicant Comments:

Mr. McDaniel informed he is the owner of the subject property and requested that the Commission approve the application for rezoning. Mr. VanFossen asked Mr. McDaniel if he was aware of the changes recommended by Staff and he informed he was and advised that the changes were acceptable.

Mr. Snow informed he was representing the dentists who wished to develop the property. He advised that, even though it was not required, the water runoff would be carried to the front of the property so that it wouldn't run further downstream. He advised he had a problem with one curb cut on Fulton and asked if the curb cut was for one or two buildings.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Gardner informed that the recommendation is for one entry within the project instead of the proposed two entrances and exits. Mr. Snow advised that two curb cuts were needed because of the large setback on the north boundary. Mr. Gardner informed Staff was concerned about minimizing the number of openings onto Fulton and advised that the Planning Commission could review this question in the Detail Site Plan.

Mr. Snow informed that Planning Commission should have received a letter from the owners of condominiums who were in support of the proposed zoning and Staff advised that the letter was in the case file.

Chairman Kempe requested that Ms. Wilson, Acting Secretary for the TMAPC, read both letters received from the neighborhood. The letter from the Treehouse Condominium Homeowners' Association advised that the homeowners were concerned about additional water runoff onto their property. The other letter was from the owners of the duplexes which about the subject property and advised they were in support of the proposal, but requested that no additional entries be permitted onto East 48th Street.

Z-6038 & PUD #398 (cont'd)

Mr. Snow informed he had spoken with members of the Treehouse Homeowners' Association, who had requested that he contact the Secretary of the Association. He contacted the Secretary and was advised that the homeowners were concerned about the effects of additional water runoff. He advised that he discussed the plan for water drainage and since he had heard nothing further, he felt the plan was sufficient.

Interested Party:

Steve Clark, Attorney

Address: Suite 100, Tulsa Union Depot

Mr. Clark informed that he was representing the Fulton South Homeowners' Association who had previously been in favor of the application. He advised that the homeowners preferred only one curb cut, and were supportive of Staff's Recommendations.

Ms. Wilson asked if the Homeowners' Association was in favor of the proposal only if there is one curb cut. Mr. Clark advised that the Association had written the letter favoring the proposal prior to the PUD, but the homeowners would prefer only one curb cut.

Mr. VanFossen asked if a wider drive could be considered if only one curb cut was approved. Mr. Gardner informed that a divided driveway in the center of the road could be a possibility and the question of the drive could be considered in the Detail Site Plan.

Mr. VanFossen asked if the setback could be revised to allow some flexibility. Mr. Gardner informed that the 50' setback from the centerline of East 48th Street could be reduced to not less than 35' from the centerline and the minimum building setback from the south boundary could be reduced from 25' to 10'.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present — Z-6038 and PUD #398

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that the following described property be rezoned **RM-1**, as recommended by Staff:

Legal Description — Z-6038

The North 180' of the West 200' of Lot 14, Block 2, ALLEN'S SUBDIVISION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present — PUD #398

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **APPROVE PUD #398**, as recommended by Staff, but permitting only one curb cut on Fulton Avenue south of the proposed building, permitting the minimum building setback from the centerline of East 48th Street to be not less than 35'

Z-6038 & PUD #398 (cont'd)

and permitting the minimum building setback from the south boundary to be changed from 25' to 10'.

Legal Description — PUD #398

The North 180' of the West 200' of Lot 14, Block 2, ALLEN'S SUBDIVISION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No. Z-6046	Present Zoning: CG & RS-3
Applicant: Baker (Horn, et al)	Proposed Zoning: CH
<u>Location: NW/c of Admiral Blvd. & Urbana</u>	

Date of Application: April 8, 1985
Date of Hearing: May 22, 1985
Size of Tract: +/- .5 acre

Presentation to TMAPC by: Jay Baker, Attorney
Address: 1850 S. Boulder

Phone: 587-1168

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 3 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Medium Intensity — No Specific Land Use—Corridor District.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the requested CH District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation

Site Analysis — The subject tract is approximately .5 acres in size and located at the northwest corner of Urbana Avenue and Admiral Blvd. It is non-wooded, flat, contains two, single-family dwellings and an outdoor advertising sign and is zoned CG and RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis — The tract is abutted on the north and east by various commercial activities zoned CH, on the south by I-244 zoned RS-3 and on the west by single-family dwellings zoned RS-3.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary — CG zoning was requested and approved by all on the east 1/2 of the subject tract.

Conclusion — Presently, the row of RS-3 zoned dwellings along Admiral Boulevard make up an island of residential surrounded by either CH zoning or the expressway. It is clear to see that this area is in transition from residential to commercial.

When CH zoning is compared to CG zoning, it can be seen that uses permitted are quite similar. The major difference is the unlimited floor

Z-6046 (cont'd)

area (height) and no building setback requirement in the CH district. Although the abutting property is zoned CH, the Staff is of the opinion that there are probably very few "high intensity" commercial uses; instead, existing adjacent uses would fit more into the CG designation.

Based on the Comprehensive Plan and Section 700.4 of the Zoning Code, "Purposes of the CH Commercial High Intensity District," the Staff cannot support CH zoning and therefore, recommends DENIAL of CH zoning. The Staff feels CG zoning is more appropriate for the area and recommends APPROVAL of CG zoning for the subject tract based on existing land use and physical facts.

Applicant Comments:

Mr. Baker informed he felt CH zoning was the appropriate classification for the subject property since properties to the south and north are zoned CH. He advised that CG zoning would place a hardship on selling the subject property and he did not feel that CH zoning would create problems for anyone in the neighborhood.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Baker what he wanted to do with the property that wouldn't be permitted under CG zoning. Mr. Baker advised that there was no specific request for the property at this time, but that the owners felt they wanted the best possible zoning classification.

Mr. Gardner advised that although CH zoning currently exists in the area, in 1970 an attempt was made to downzone much of the CH to CG, but this was not done. He also advised that CH requires offstreet parking and 25' setbacks would be required on the south and east and noted that Staff didn't feel it would be in the best public interest to put buildings out to the street.

Mr. Carnes noted that if CG zoning was approved, the applicant could return later with a PUD which could permit uses such as would be permitted under CH zoning.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughton, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to recommend to the Board of City Commissioners that **CH** zoning be **DENIED** on the following described property, but that it be **rezoned CG**, as recommended by Staff:

Legal Description:

Lots 114 through 115, inclusive, RODGERS HEIGHTS ADDITION to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

Application No. Z-6047
Applicant: Loop
Location: 7600 E. 31st Street

Present Zoning: RS-3
Proposed Zoning: CO & FD

Date of Application: April 8, 1985
Date of Hearing: May 22, 1985
Size of Tract: +/- 7 acres

Presentation to TMAPC by: David Loop
Address: Box 1113, Tulsa

Phone: 494-2731

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan:

The District 5 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject property Low Intensity — No Specific Land Use.

According to the "Matrix Illustrating District Plan Map Categories Relationship to Zoning Districts," the requested CO District is not in accordance with the Plan Map.

Staff Recommendation:

Site Analysis — The subject tract is approximately 7 acres in size and located at the southwest corner of 31st Street and the I-44 Freeway. It is partially wooded, gently sloping, contains a single-family dwelling and outdoor advertising sign and is zoned RS-3.

Surrounding Area Analysis — The tract is abutted on the north and west by residential single-family subdivisions zoned RS-3 and on the south and east by I-44 zoned RS-2.

Zoning and BOA Historical Summary — The Staff recommended denial of medium intensity zoning on the subject tract in 1982.

Conclusion — Based on the Comprehensive Plan, which does not designate the subject tract Corridor, and the existing land use and zoning patterns, the Staff cannot support CO zoning on the subject tract. Negative impacts on the abutting residential areas would be too great, i.e., lights, noise, traffic, late-hour activity, signs, intense commercial activities, etc.

Therefore, the Staff recommends DENIAL of the requested CO zoning.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. VanFossen asked if Staff could describe the FD line pertaining to this property in connection with the FD map which was included in the agenda packet and Mr. Gardner informed he didn't have that information, but noted that under the Comprehensive Plan the area could be considered for OL zoning without having to amend the Plan.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Loop informed that he is the owner of the subject property and noted that the zoning on this property is based on a plan which was adopted at a time when CO zoning was not available. He advised that OL zoning had been granted on this site but the ordinance had not been advertised because he had been unable to find a developer. Although OL could still be developed on the site, he did not feel it would be economically feasible due to poor economic conditions in the office market. He also advised that he needed CO zoning for sale purposes. Mr. Loop informed that approximately 40% of this property could be included in the FD zoning, but that the City had said the entire property could be developed with onsite detention.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Kempe asked Mr. Loop if he had seen the FD determination on this property and he advised that he hadn't, but that it would probably be zoned FD where the creek runs through the property.

Interested Parties:

Charles E. Williams	Address: 7464 E. 30th Place
Ray McCollum	3135 S. 76th E. Avenue
Judy Hartleben	7716 E. 30th Place
Paula Dahl	3132 S. 76th E. Avenue

Mr. Williams informed he was representing 40 people from the neighborhood who met on April 16 to discuss the proposed zoning. He opposed the proposed zoning because it would create more traffic problems in the area of 31st and Memorial, he felt the proposed zoning would be inappropriate due to the nearby residences zoned RS-3 and it would not be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. He also noted there are flooding and drainage problems on the site.

Mr. McCollum informed that there is a plan to widen Skelly Drive which might require taking some of the land. He advised that if part of the property is zoned FD and part taken for the expressway, there wouldn't be much left.

Ms. Hartleben presented a list of signatures (Exhibit "A-1") from people who had attended the neighborhood meeting opposing the rezoning.

Ms. Dahl informed that all of the area is low intensity residential uses and the applicant had not advised what specific use would be made of the property. She also noted that it appeared there would be a monetary gain if the zoning was approved.

Applicant Rebuttal:

Mr. Loop informed there would be a monetary gain because the property was being utilized as an investment. In regard to widening of Skelly Drive,

Z-6047 (cont'd)

he informed there would be no additional land taken. He informed that flood zoning would require a legal description and based on the ability to move dirt already on the site, he would be willing to work with the City to determine what portion should be zoned FD. He also noted that the entire tract would be developable at the present time, according to the City Engineer.

Mr. Loop advised that the area falls within a CO expressway corridor, but based on the Comprehensive Plan drawn up in 1970 when CO zoning was not available, it is not listed as CO. He also noted that the people who purchased homes in the area knew the property was undeveloped and must have known something would be developed on the site. He advised that he intended to read into the minutes the uses permitted within the CO zoning classification.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Gardner informed that the development guidelines were approved in 1974 and CO zoning was included as part of the guidelines. The Comprehensive Plan was not drafted until after those guidelines were approved. This area had the potential for CO, because adjacent areas consisted of low-intensity residential, the guidelines did not apply.

Mr. VanFossen noted that this flooding is a consideration for this property which has been considered for rezoning on several occasions since 1958. Although something other than residential would probably be developed on the site, he felt CO zoning would not be appropriate.

Instrument Submitted: Sign-in Sheet from Neighborhood Meeting (Exhibit "A-1")

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **DENY CO** zoning on the following described property:

Legal Description:

Beginning at a point 35' South and 99' East of the NW corner of the E/2 and the NW/4 of the NE/4 of Section 23 T19N-R13E, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma: Thence East along the South line of East 31st Street 834.01' to a point on the NW boundary line of Interstate Highway 44, thence in a Southwesterly direction 1,197.05' to a point 99' East of the East boundary line of the E/2 of the NW/4 of the NE/4 of said Section, thence North along the East boundary line of MAGNOLIA TERRACE ADDITION 797.79' to the point and place of beginning, containing some 7 acres more or less.

5.22.85:1556(11)

Application No. Z-6048 & PUD #395
Applicant: Carter (Tastemakers)
Location: 85th & Harvard Avenue

Present Zoning: AG
Proposed Zoning: RM-1

Date of Application: April 10, 1985
Date of Hearing: May 22, 1985 (cont'd to June 19, 1985)

Chairman Kempe informed that a timely request had been received to continue this case to June 19, 1985.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present — Z-6048 and PUD #395

On **MOTION** of **WILSON**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE consideration** of **Z-6048** and **PUD #395** until Wednesday, June 19, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. PUD #396
Applicant: Ewing
Location: NE corner of 211th and Sheridan

Present Zoning: (RE)

Date of Application: April 10, 1985
Date of Hearing: May 22, 1985 (cont'd to June 5, 1985)

Chairman Kempe informed that a timely request had been received to continue this case to June 5, 1985.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE consideration** of **PUD #396** until Wednesday, June 5, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Application No. Z-6049 and PUD #397
Applicant: Moody (61MM Ltd.)
Location: S. side of E. 61st Street; 1/2 mile E. of Memorial

Present Zoning: RS-3, RD, RM-1
Proposed Zoning: RD, RM-1

Date of Application: April 11, 1985
Date of Hearing: May 22, 1985 (cont'd to June 5, 1985)

Chairman Kempe informed that a timely request had been received to continue this case to June 5, 1985.

TMAPC Action: 7 members present

On **MOTION** of **HIGGINS**, the Planning Commission voted 7-0-0 (Carnes, Connery, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE consideration** of **Z-6049** and **PUD #397** until Wednesday, June 5, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Z-6052 (cont'd)

in accordance with the stated purposes, specifically enumerated in Section 1000.2.

It is important to note that if adopted, FD zoning will replace the current zoning of the various areas being considered in this application. Previously, parts of Tulsa were zoned FD as an overlay district; however, the Ordinance was subsequently amended (January 10, 1978, Ord. #14018) to require a specific FD Floodway Zoning District. FD zoning has been routinely approved as specific rezoning requests have been processed. Properties in the FD District will continue to be subject to the requirements and reviews necessary to obtain a Floodplain Development Permit and Earth Change Permit, as well as the FD requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Storm Water Management and Hydrology Departments will be in attendance at the TMAPC and City Commission to present the technical considerations relevant to this application and assist in answering questions from the Commission and the public. The Rules and Regulations Committee of the TMAPC also met on May 15, 1985, to consider the concept of FD zoning and matters pertinent to these provisions of the Code.

The Staff recommends that FD zoning be adopted for the Mingo Creek Tributaries and Main-stem as revised and recommended by the Storm Water Management and Hydrology Departments of the City of Tulsa.

Applicant Presentation:

Mr. Williams informed that he is on loan from the City Legal Department to the new Stormwater Management Department, whose purpose it is to develop methods for drainage control, to provide a comprehensive plan for flood control within the City and to minimize losses from stormwater runoff. He presented a background of the flooding issue and advised that he and other Stormwater Management personnel held neighborhood meetings with people in the Mingo Creek area and answered questions in regard to the proposed FD mapping.

Mr. Williams showed slides which indicated what regulations apply to a particular parcel of land. He showed a slide of the regulatory floodplain within Mingo and Joe Creeks and advised that anyone with development activities within these areas is affected by the Ordinance. If a developer desires to develop within these areas, he must obtain a floodplain permit. He advised that the ordinance adopted in 1977 was a complex set of many regulations which effect drainage, erosion control within the City and deal with the floodplain concept. He defined floodplain and regulatory floodplain. Floodway is defined as the channeling of the water course and includes those portions of a floodplain reasonably required to carry the discharge of the regulatory flood. A floodway is a regulatory concept which is generally considered to be a smaller area than a floodplain and is the most hazardous area which is needed for the water to flow through.

Mr. Williams informed that the Corps of Engineers had been studying Mingo Creek for some time. The City has utilized their plan for the main stem and has been developing its plan for the Mingo tributaries.

The Stormwater Management Program is designed to stop flooding problems from worsening; analyze the problems and identify solutions; develop an overall plan with priorities; obtain adequate funding; and design and construct drainage facilities.

The City prioritized the flooding issue by looking at information in regard to flooding in recent years -- FEMA FD designation -- and reviewed, identified and counted the number of structures involved in this flooding. The problem of water drainage is the highest priority of the Stormwater Management Dept. and the money spent depends on how bad the problem is in an area. Mr. Williams advised that major emphasis would also be placed on maintenance of drainage facilities.

Through this public hearing, the Stormwater Management Dept. proposed to reduce the hazards of floods by restricting and prohibiting new uses within the floodway and requiring that uses which are permitted in the area be protected as much as possible. In order to protect occupants of an area, the land subject to flooding would be identified by engineering studies. This information would be provided to individuals and the City would make certain that subsidized flood insurance is available. Any proposed change in the water flow would be regulated under this program.

Mr. Hays presented a general overview of the planned drainage projects and how floodway zoning is done. He cited several projects which have been funded and several drainage facilities which have been completed, but noted that several sites which have been funded and approved could take up to five years to be built. He advised that some planned facilities have not yet been funded. He also advised that the Master Drainage Plans had been reviewed and FD zoned areas defined by taking into account buildings and building locations. He noted that water travelling down a creek often separates and travels in different directions. FD is defined as the area where water actually flows.

Mr. Williams advised that a handout had been made available to the Commission and the public which answered many of the questions posed in the neighborhood meetings. He reviewed these questions and answers and requested that the TMAPC conduct the hearing, but make no recommendation at this time. He further requested that the Commission continue the case to July 17, at which time more accurate information and maps should be available.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson asked if the map was accurate and if it had been amended as a result of the neighborhood meetings. Mr. Williams informed it had been amended somewhat, but not significantly.

Mr. VanFossen advised he was reluctant to listen to an item for which there was no presentation and noted that interested persons could send a letter to Mr. Williams regarding their concerns.

Mr. Williams informed that his department had consulted with the people and they have asked if the proposed FD mapping is a foregone conclusion and it was felt that it would be important to have this hearing in order to allow the people go on record about their concerns.

Mr. VanFossen informed he felt this was inappropriate and he did not feel that a six-week continuance was enough time to make the necessary amendments. Mr. Williams advised that he disagreed and that the City wanted to relate to the people that it had not closed its mind to the lines on the map and is interested in public input in order to make a final recommendation to the TMAPC. He also advised that it was his feeling this was the most effective way of getting public input. He further advised that the City would like to have the best possible information when the maps are adopted and would like to have approximately 90 days in which to change the maps after their adoption and noted that it would be the City's responsibility to make the change if it was a mistake by the City.

Mr. Draughon noted that it appeared the City's prime concerns are for the future buyers and developers and advised that his concern is for the people currently in the floodplain and stated that the plans are an arbitrary devaluation of homes in the area. Mr. Williams informed that appeared to be the consensus of people in the area, but the City's plan was not an arbitrary one since it was based on the Master Drainage Plan (MDP) that designates the most hazardous areas. The MDP's were done with a great deal of engineering study and thought. On the issue of devaluation of property values, Mr. Williams informed he was open to evidence and advised that the effects he had seen in Tulsa did not support the contention that zoning property FD devalued property. He further advised that the City couldn't be arbitrary or capricious, but must identify the flooding problems in order to keep things from getting worse.

Chairman Kempe informed that there were 64 signatures on the sign-in sheet of people who wished to speak on the issue. Mr. VanFossen informed that in consideration of the number of people listed, he felt a two to three-minute time limit would be sufficient for a speaker to make his presentation. It was suggested that more time, possibly six minutes, could be allocated to those persons representing organizations.

TMAPC Action: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 7-1-0 (Carnes, Draughon, Higgins, Kempe, VanFossen, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Connery, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to limit presentations to three minutes per person for individuals and six minutes for those persons representing a group.

Interested Parties:

Richard Cloud	Address: 8940 E. 33rd Pl.
Norman Ramsey	3235 S. 93rd E. Ave.
Polly Lawyer	2909 S. 86th E. Ave.
John Moody	4100 BOK Tower
John Townsend	9043 E. 26th Court
John Hedin	3712 S. 142nd E. Ave.
William Inglis	3914 S. 93rd E. Ave.
Andy Pyron	2844 S. 137th E. Ave.
Debbie Atteberry	3633 S. 106th E. Pl.
Mac E. Griggs	3325 S. 115th E. Ave.
Carolyn Allen	3113 S. 115th E. Ave.
Jerry Hoover	3308 S. 115th E. Ave.
Dolores J. Fennell	3677 S. 106th E. Ave.
Joe Francis	4130 S. 104th E. Ave.
Noel Welch	11608 E. 35th St.
John Carmichael	8817 E. 46th Pl.
Mike Fagan	3318 S. 118th E. Ave.
E. B. Brown	3911 S. 111th E. Ave.
John Robinson	3944 S. 93rd E. Ave.
Lawrence Landiss	3807 S. 93rd E. Ave.
David Rich	2140 S. Harvard
Gail Runnels	10 E. 3rd St.
Ron Meek	8735 E. 28th Pl.
Greg Frye	9212 E. 60th
Robert Anderson	3703 S. 93rd E. Ave.
Gus Lewis	9503 E. 25th
John Flowers	3313 S. 188th E. Ave.
Ray Horner	9169 E. 37th Court
Murray Robinson	3836 S. 134th E. Ave.
Al Doss	14324 E. 32nd
Keryl Doss	14324 E. 32nd
Charles Hardt	9726 E. 42nd
R. W. Cash	9220 E. 39th
Gary Rice	9200 S. 39th E. Ave.
L. L. Fincannon	1116 S. 77th E. Ave.
George Krepps	3326 S. 93rd E. Ave.
Paul Pertuit	8530 E. 37th Pl.

Mr. Cloud advised that Mr. Williams had answered several of his questions, but advised he was not concerned about future development, but was concerned about current problems. He requested that the proposed zoning be denied until it includes a plan for correction and advised there needed to be some protection from increasing water runoff from current developments.

Mr. Ramsey informed that his property abuts Mingo Creek and he has requested that the Creek be cleaned out since early 1970. He advised that the homeowners could get together to clean it out, but noted that the City has also added debris.

Ms. Lawyer informed that she had contacted a flood insurance company and after the City submits new flood maps, the insurance rates would be

reduced and she felt that is when the homes should be taken out of the FD designation. She advised that she had contacted FEMA and the Stormwater Management Dept and was told her property was located in a bad floodzone and the City would send her some maps. She indicated that FEMA had said the City was trying to make FD more strict than FEMA requirements. She asked how long properties would be in this situation and advised she had been told it could possibly be from two to five years. She further noted she didn't know whether to believe FEMA or the City in regard to the FD mapping. Ms. Wilson asked her if she meant she had spoken with FEMA officials and she informed she had spoken with the Mr. Miller, an engineer with FEMA.

Mr. Moody informed he is an attorney and was representing himself and Messrs. George Day, Harold Williams and Don Wills. He presented a letter (Exhibit "B-1") to Mr. Williams which stated his property had not flooded. Mr. Moody expressed concern about the mapping procedure for zoning properties with less than 640 acres of drainage area FD; this would mean zoning many new properties from Residential to FD and a non-conforming status. He requested that the Commission review whether it could change the zoning of any land where the drainage area is less than 640 acres. He advised that his clients were not opposed to zoning property within the 100-year floodplain in areas of 640 acres or more, but were opposed to adoption of the new criteria in basins of less than 640 acres.

Mr. Hedin asked why the area in question was singled out for such stringent treatment under FD and advised he didn't feel the area near his home meets the criteria since there has been no flooding there. He further advised that the nearest area which had flooded was located on 34th Street, about three blocks from his home.

Mr. Inglis advised he had a problem with the procedures for the proposed mapping. He advised that his property was flooded last year, but it was the first time in over 20 years. Every time it rains, there is more water travelling down the drainage system and advised that for the same amount of rain, there is more runoff. He noted that there is a bridge being rebuilt on 41st Street to accommodate five times more water than it did before. He also noted that there is a natural detention pond on the far side of 41st Street and the contractor is digging out a drainage ditch and making it 12' deep as opposed to the 3' depth it was before. He advised he had heard that a four-story office building was to be built on the site. Mr. VanFossen asked him where he had gotten the information in regard to the size of the waterway and he informed that some of his neighbors had spoken with the bridge contractor.

Mr. Pyron was representing the Brookhollow Neighborhood Action Committee and noted that most of the residences in this area are included in the FD zoning. He presented a letter (Exhibit "B-2") to the Commission which listed problems in the area such as no consistent maintenance for the creek, poisonous snakes, trees, etc.

Ms. Atteberry informed she lives in the Shannon Park Addition and advised that the City wouldn't give any specific information on what effect the proposed zoning would have on the homeowners. She presented signed petitions (Exhibit "B-3") from the neighborhood and requested they be allowed to review the impact and changes and make input prior to the rezoning. She advised that the Corps of Engineers had stated there would be maps available in September and she felt the Stormwater Management Dept. would not be ready for input in July. She advised that the area in which she lives has not flooded and felt there would be a stigma if it was rezoned.

Mr. Griggs informed he is a resident of the Briarglen Subdivision and advised that he felt the proposed zoning was a step in the right direction, but first the drainage channels need to be cleaned out and money allocated to maintain and repair the channels.

Ms. Allen informed she is a resident of the Briarglen Subdivision and advised that there has been extensive commercial development in the area and the creeks have grown from small streams to rivers. She advised that there appears to be a discrepancy between commercial and residential in the proposed FD zoning in that it excludes the commercial development at the intersection of 31st and Garnett. She requested that the FD zoning be redesigned and that a responsible design be placed on future development. She also requested adequate maintenance of water drainage channels and increased fees for developers who pay the fee-in-lieu of detention.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Williams if he had any statistics on the map in regard to the number of residences involved in the proposed rezoning as opposed to the number of commercial properties. He advised that there are 312 residences on the map, but was not certain how many commercial businesses were involved.

Mr. Hoover informed he was representing the Briarglen community area and surrounding areas. He presented a petition (Exhibit "B-4") with 650 names, which requested a continuance of the proposed FD zoning. He advised that this is the time to take specific steps for zoning.

Ms. Fennell informed that her property has never flooded, nor has that of anyone else in Shannon Park. She advised that she understood from the Corps of Engineers that the problem in the area was due to rapid water runoff. She cited building permits and no money for upkeep of drainage channels as problems with the current zoning. She requested a letter from the City that her property was not to be zoned FD. She noted that there are several different flood maps at the current time and suggested that aerial photos of the 1984 flood be made available. She further advised that detention ponds devalue adjacent areas.

Mr. Draughon asked if FEMA uses maps of the Corps of Engineers as a basis for its floodway determinations and Mr. Williams informed it does and advised that these are the flood insurance maps.

Ms. Wilson advised that there appeared to be several different maps available, including those of the Master Plan, the Corps of Engineers' map, etc.

Mr. Francis informed he is the legal counsel for the owners of the Rockwood Village Mobile Home Park. He asked if any of the published maps had been amended and wanted to know when he could be assured what map would be utilized for the FD zoning. Mr. Williams informed there are several areas where the City would recommend modifying the maps and advised there would be recommendations in regard to the maps at the proposed meeting of July 17. He also advised that something would be available prior to that meeting.

Mr. Francis informed he needed to be able to give written assurance to his clients if there are changes made to the maps and Mr. Williams advised that he felt the City would be able to provide individual written responses.

Mr. Welch informed he is a resident of the Briarglen Subdivision and expressed concern that although he felt the fee-in-lieu of detention is a good tool, the detention ponds already in existence are not being maintained. He suggested that the fees be increased in order to build more ponds and establish permanent procedures for maintenance. He also suggested that an increase in fees would make it more difficult to develop and advised that he did not feel that detention ponds should be built in park areas. Ms. Kempe informed that some development is required to provide onsite detention, but it depends on the City Hydrologist's review as to what is required. Mr. Draughon advised that the present system didn't appear to be working because the fund for the fee-in-lieu of is not building up fast enough.

Mr. Carmichael informed that he lives in Regency Park and there has been flooding down the street, but not on the bank of the creek near where he lives. He advised that he has lived in his home for 20 years and has never been flooded. He suggested that the main reason the creek overflows is because the creek is not being maintained and there is a bridge on the abutment which causes water to back up. He also advised that the overpass at 46th Street and the Broken Arrow Freeway also causes water to backup.

Mr. Fagan informed he was flooded in 1976 and 1984 so he moved farther south near Norberg Park and was concerned about whether the City would be able to maintain the park or if it would be utilized as a detention pond. Mr. Hays advised that the Corps of Engineers has proposed using it as a retention site, although the City would prefer not to have detention in Norberg Park. The City prefers a detention plan in Brookhollow.

Mr. Brown informed he is experienced in water diversion and advised that the "choke" at Mingo and Bird Creek must be cleared. He advised that he had attended a neighborhood meeting and was informed that it would take 7-10 years to clear this "choke". He asked why it would take so long and advised that he felt the City's priorities are mixed up. He asked if the

City or the Corps has the final say in regard to the floodway designation and was advised that the Corps designates floodplains.

Mr. Carnes asked what the plans are in regard to the channel where Mingo Creek flows into Bird Creek. Mike Buecher, representative of the Corps of Engineers, advised that the plan is to open up 250' at the bottom of the channel to relieve the blockage, but it requires authorization by Congress. Once it is authorized, the Corps can begin work within three months at a cost of about \$3 million.

Mr. Brown suggested that people sentenced to public service work could be utilized to clean out the creeks.

Mr. Robinson informed he moved into the area in 1966 and in 1977 the City requested 50' of his property for the creek, but nothing has been done. He advised that there is a great deal of dirt and trash sitting in the creekbed.

Mr. VanFossen asked what the City's responsibility is in regard to cleaning out the creeks. Mr. Williams informed the City is to provide full maintenance in channels that are dedicated and improved; in areas not dedicated, the City would only maintain the flow line. He advised that the Stormwater Management Dept. has requested funding from the City, but the existing policy is for minimal maintenance.

Mr. Landiss had left the hearing, but had requested that the Commission secretary read his letter. The letter stated that his property has not flooded and he felt the property value would be effected if the zoning is approved. His letter also suggested that changing the zoning designations would not control flooding.

Mr. Rich informed he is a real estate broker in commercial real estate and owns property at 87th and E. 41st. He advised that the Corps maps do not indicate this property to be in the floodplain, but the City's map on FD designation raises a question as to whether it is in the FD designation. He asked why this property was not designated floodplain or floodway in the past. He advised that the property flooded last May due to backup of water from a small stream located nearby and noted that if the property is placed in FD zoning, it would be a non-conforming use and if destroyed, it would not be able to be rebuilt without a considerable amount of difficulty. He asked what happens to homeowners who have a lien on their property if this should happen.

Mr. Runnels informed he is an attorney representing owners of property located on the east side of 91st E. Avenue. He noted that there is a "choke" that goes under the Broken Arrow Freeway and asked what was proposed in the Master Drainage Plan. Mr. Williams informed that the Plan is funded for this area and construction should begin in the near future, but was unsure how long it would take. Mr. Runnels informed he felt it inappropriate that zoning to FD be undertaken prior to development of a plan for solving the problem. He also felt it unfair to designate this property FD because the backup shows that all the area

south of the Broken Arrow Freeway will be relieved of the problem once the "choke" is removed. He suggested that as soon as a study is complete, a drainage improvement district could be imposed for improving the channel near the underpass. He also suggested that the City could condemn the property he was representing. Mr. Williams informed that this area has had a Master Drainage Plan completed and there is corrective action proposed; however, detention upstream has not been funded. Mr. Runnels asked if the plan was only for a detention facility as opposed to opening the "choke" and Mr. Williams informed it was.

Mr. Meek advised that he purchased his house in 1973 and it flooded in 1973, 1974 and 1976, but he couldn't get flood insurance prior to that. He advised that his home also flooded in 1984 and asked if his house would be purchased at its appraised value. Mr. Williams informed that if a person had knowledge of the flood situation, he would probably not purchase the house at a non-affected appraised value. The fact that the house had been flooded would affect the value, but not the fact that it was located in a floodway.

Mr. Frye informed he was representing individuals whose property was apparently located in the floodway (37th and 145th E. Ave. in the Sunhill South Addition). He presented a petition (Exhibit "B-5") requesting that the City reconsider the proposal to rezone 37th Street South as a floodway and also stated that during the flood of May 1984, there had been no flooding in this area. He advised that the problem in this area is that homeowners would have difficulty convincing prospective purchasers that only the street is zoned floodway, but not the homes.

Mr. Anderson advised that he has had problems with water drainage and he feels this is a community problem. He advised that he did not support this proposal and noted that a petition was being circulated requesting denial of the proposed zoning. He suggested that the City was unable to substantiate its request for continuance and requested that the Commission deny the application.

Mr. Lewis informed he is on the Board of Directors of Longview Lake Estates Homeowners' Association, consisting of about 750 homes. He informed that the homeowners were opposed to the rezoning plan. He advised that about 13-15 homes in the area will be designated FD, two of which have not flooded, several others have had little water. This zoning plan would place homes not previously listed in the floodplain, as being in the floodway. He was concerned about the property values and about the impact of FD zoning on the addition. He advised he did not think this procedure is an equitable way to approach the problem. There is a petition that has been circulated which would be presented at the City Commission meeting. He advised that the homeowners feel that construction needs to be restricted in the Mingo Creek watershed until channel improvements have been made and he would like to see a time frame on when improvements would be made.

Z-6052 (cont'd)

Mr. Flowers informed he purchased his property, which adjoins Norberg Park, in 1979. His property was elevated prior to the time he purchased it and only his yard had water on it during the 1984 flood. He advised that the creek is 20' wide and 6' deep and is eroding his property; requested the City move his fence farther onto his land because of the erosion.

Mr. Horner advised that eroding conditions, due to lack of surface management, have resulted in drainage problems and recommended that the proposed rezoning be shelved. He advised his property is not in the area proposed to be rezoned and is not in the 100-year storm plan, but felt this is a community problem since one person's water affects another person. He suggested that the City readjust its priority, return with a comprehensive program and stop development of low land unless development prevents further deterioration of the problem.

Ms. Wilson noted that the Federal Government does the work along the creeks and asked if there is a clear delineation as to who has the responsibility for the problems and how much of the problems can be solved with local or Federal money. Mr. Williams advised that the responsibility in regard to the Mingo Creek watershed is defined and noted that there are no Federal funds authorized for improvements to its tributaries since that's the City's responsibility. He advised that the City is in support of the Corps' drainage plan for Mingo Creek and the City will try to make its plan consistent with that of the Corps. Ms. Wilson asked if the Stormwater Management Dept. would be working in conjunction with the Corps to share information and Mr. Williams advised it would and informed that Mr. Buckert, of the Corps of Engineers, had recently been on loan to the City to assist in providing input.

Mr. Connery asked for clarification on why Mr. Williams was requesting a continuance and Mr. Williams advised the City wanted the continuance in order to allow more time to respond to questions and concerns.

Mr. Draughon requested clarification of the difference between the Corps maps and the City of Tulsa Master Drainage Plan. Mr. Buckert informed that the Corps is only permitted to base its maps on an area greater than one square mile; whereas, the Master Drainage Plan has taken the basic information furnished by the Corps and utilized future urbanization figures and added information not available to the Corps. He also advised that the City's floodplain area is larger than the Corps'.

Mr. Draughon asked what the difference is between present urbanization and full urbanization. Mr. Williams advised that the scope of services of the Master Drainage Plan require the contractor to use the Comprehensive Plan for development. Full urbanization may take 20-40 years. There are approximately 165 acres of undeveloped land within the Mingo Creek basin at the current time.

Ms. Wilson asked what portion of the 312 houses would be included in the proposed FD mapping flooded on Memorial Day. Mr. Williams advised that he could not answer that question at this time. She also asked how many acres were being considered for FD zoning in his application. Mr. Williams advised that 432 acres were being considered for FD and that there are 4,032 acres in the drainage basin.

Mr. Robinson informed he lives in Park Plaza East III and IV Addition and noted that there is a cement drainage easement on South 136th E. Avenue that has been proposed to be rezoned FD. He advised that there are many lots along the easement and none of the homes were flooded in May 1984; water traveled across the street at 136th Street into the drainage easement. He also noted that there is a detention pond on 129th Street which held the water during the flood. He advised that FD zoning of this area would seem to have an adverse effect and requested that the FD designation be removed from the drainage easement.

Mr. Doss informed that the fact that the area did not flood was not due to the area having little rain since 13" was received in May 1984. He advised he didn't know how designating 37th Street FD would solve any drainage problems and asked if zoning of the street would affect the homes. Mr. Hays informed that this zoning was affected sometime ago and it appears there was water draining into the street. Whether or not the area is designated as floodway, there will be water runoff in the street. Mr. Doss questioned how this zoning would affect property values in the area.

Ms. Doss advised that the City had stated that the street, 25' from the centerline would be zoned FD and requested clarification in regard to the A, B and C designation for flood insurance purposes. She also asked if there was thought to be a problem in 1981, why were the homeowners not notified of the potential problem.

Mr. Brucker informed that "A" is designated as being within the 100-year floodplain; "B" is the area between 100-year and 500-year floodplain and "C" is all other areas.

Mr. Hardt informed he was representing First Home Service Corporation and informed that the storm drainage plan which has been approved in one area is bonded and under construction. When completed, this area would be in compliance; therefore, he requested the FD determination be removed. In regard to the Mayo Farm area west of 51st and the Broken Arrow Freeway, he informed that this drainage area was less than 640 acres; thus, under the criteria noted, it would be in conformance with the Plan. Ms. Wilson questioned Mr. Williams about the 640 acre standard and was advised that he is asking the TMAPC to consider changing the policy on drainage from 640 acres to 40 acres.

Ms. Higgins asked how long it would take for the City to remove an area from FD on the maps and Williams informed it would take approximately 60-90 days. Mr. VanFossen expressed concern about the 640 acre standard, but though 40 acres was too small for these purposes.

Mr. Hardt noted that the City of Broken Arrow had taken the position that it would penalize the developer if an area was zoned as fully-urbanized FD. Mr. Williams advised that the reason the City of Tulsa is utilizing the 640 acres is that under the 640-acre guideline, a developer must have a permit for floodplain development or earth change.

Z-6052 (cont'd)

Mr. Cash informed that the bridge under construction on 41st, east of Memorial is being built with a larger number of ducts, thus there would appear to be considerably more water volume would flow through and create more flooding along 39th Street. He advised that this is the area which was previously mentioned where debris collects and felt the bridge should be reconstructed. He asked if provisions had been made regarding the water flow or water retention due to the new post office building on 46th Street and Mr. Hays advised that the Federal Government didn't have to follow the City's regulations, but noted there is onsite detention there.

Mr. Rice informed he was representing a property located at 9200 S. 39th E. Avenue which was undeveloped at this time. He advised that there had been a plan to develop a building of about 10,000 square feet on the property, but a letter had been received by the TMAPC protesting the proposal. He suggested that bridges be removed so that the creeks would be free of obstruction.

Mr. Fincannon informed that he wished to protest the fact that he was required to wait to speak until so late and advised he felt this to be a violation of the open meeting law. He advised that he was opposed to the proposed rezoning and that he felt the problems should have been solved within the past 30 years. He also advised that the people should have been notified of the flooding problem when the developments were approved.

Mr. Krepps informed he was opposed to the FD designation because it would not solve the flooding problem on Mingo Creek. He felt the homeowners were being singled out and the commercial development was getting off free. He questioned the City's policy of fees-in-lieu of detention.

Mr. Pertruit informed that his home is in a floodway and advised he felt the City has its priorities confused. He suggested that the City was doing nothing to correct the cause of the flooding problems. He advised that the major cause of flooding along the creek is due to commercial zoning south of the Broken Arrow Freeway, along 41st Street and advised that flooding had not been a problem until commercial and industrial development was permitted in this area. He also noted that box culverts get smaller farther south and advised that stringent controls should be placed on the area south of the Broken Arrow Freeway. He further recommended that a study of the area be made by the City prior to adoption of the proposed rezoning and requested restriction on development south of the City. He noted that onsite detention is a good idea if the detention facility is required to be maintained.

Other Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Williams advised he hoped the Commission had a better understanding of the reason for the requested continuance and noted that the City recognizes there are several technical issues that need to be resolved prior to mapping; i.e., 640 vs. 40 acre requirement. He suggested some possible input from the community and that study groups representing neighborhood groups might be utilized. He noted that the people needed to be informed of the consequences of the regulation and the issue of non-conforming use and asked that the people present fill out cards

Z-6052 (cont'd)

provided in order to have written comments. Finally, he recommended to the Commission that it not make a recommendation, but continue this case until July 17.

It was noted that although over 60 people had signed up to speak, many were not present when called upon to speak.

Mr. VanFossen expressed his concern that six weeks would not be enough time to accomplish the goals of the City and suggested a continuance until September when the Corps of Engineer maps would be updated.

Ms. Kempe informed that she felt a lot of questions had been answered and advised she would be willing to continue the case, but questioned whether July 17 might not be too soon to have the information ready.

Mr. Williams informed he felt that July 17 would give the City adequate time and felt that the City needed to make some decisions.

Instruments Submitted:

- Letter from John Moody (Exhibit "B-1")
- Letter from Brookhollow Neighborhood Action Committee (Exhibit "B-2")
- Petitions from Shannon Park Addition (Exhibit "B-3")
- Petition from Briarglen Community (Exhibit "B-4")
- Petition from Sunhill South Addition (Exhibit "B-5")

TMAPC Action: 8 members present

On **MOTION** of **VANFOSSEN**, the Planning Commission voted 6-2-0 (Carnes, Connery, Draughon, Higgins, VanFossen, Woodard, "aye"; Kempe, Wilson, "nay"; no "abstentions"; Harris, Paddock, Young, "absent") to **CONTINUE consideration** of Z-6052 until Wednesday, September 18, 1985, at 1:30 p.m., in the City Commission Room, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

There being no further business, Chairman Kempe declared the meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Date Approved June 5, 1985

Cherry Kempe
Chairman

ATTEST:

Marilyn A. Wilson
Secretary
1st Vice-Chrm.

5.22.85:1556(26)