

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of Meeting No. 1849
Wednesday, August 21, 1991, 1:30 p.m.
City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Ballard	Draughon	Gardner	Linker, Legal
Carnes	Horner	Hester	Counsel
Doherty, 1st Vice Chairman	Neeley	Stump	
Harris		Wilmoth	
Midget, Mayor's Designee			
Parmeale, Chairman			
Wilson, Secretary			
Woodard			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Tuesday, August 20, 1991 at 11:44 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Parmele called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of August 7, 1991, Meeting No. 1847:

On **MOTION** of **WOODARD**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of August 7, 1991 Meeting No. 1847.

REPORTS:

Report of Receipts and Deposits:

Mr. Gardner presented the Report of Receipts and Deposits for the month ended July 31, 1991 and advised that all items were in order.

TMAPC ACTION; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to **APPROVE** the Report of Receipts and Deposits for July, 1991.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Doherty reported that the **Rules and Regulations Committee** met at 11:30 on August 14, 1991 and advised that the recommendations made will be covered at public hearing. He added that the

Committee will meet again on August 28, 1991 to discuss antennae and tower regulations. The Rules and Regulations Committee does not anticipate having items prepared for public hearing prior to mid-September concerning this issue.

* * * * *

Subdivisions:

Revised Sketch Plat Approval:

Southern Pointe Third (1583) (PD-18) (CD-8) (RS-3)
East 91st Street & S. Hudson Avenue (AG to RS-3 pending)

The purpose of this additional TAC review is to advise the Committee of various changes and/or recommendations made after the TAC meeting 5/7/91. After meetings attended by the Developers, TMAPC Staff and Department of Public Works Staff and Director, Charles Hardt; the developers of both Bradford Place and Southern Pointe Third have incorporated the following changes.

Southern Pointe Third:

Because of the expression of a desire of the TMAPC to provide a collector street from Southern Pointe Second south to 91st Street (as per TMAPC minutes of 12/5/90), and because the Major Street and Highway Plan calls for a north-south collector in this vicinity, Traffic Engineering's recommendation is to build Hudson and 89th Place* as a collector street between 91st Street and the 89th Place * and Granite Avenue* intersection. When the original recommendation was made by Traffic Engineering they were not aware of the specific desire of the TMAPC, and apparently the City Council also, to provide this collector street from 91st Street to Southern Pointe Second. * Street names as corrected on current plat.

Bradford Place:

Further review of Bradford Place resulted in a change in Traffic Engineering's recommendation concerning the street pattern. The stub street to the north would likely result in an undesirable street pattern which would allow an easy by-pass route around the 91st and Yale intersection via a long, straight Darlington Avenue and a long, straight, "Un-named" street to Yale. It is now the opinion of Traffic Engineering that the public will be better served by eliminating the stub street to the north and connecting Bradford Place and Southern Pointe Third with a street connection at either 90th Street or 89th Court.* (The above information from memo dated 5/13/91, Traffic Engineering to TMAPC/INCOG.)

The connecting street on 90th has been made on both plats, eliminating a long over-length cul-de-sac in Southern Pointe Third. The stub street to the north in Bradford Place has been eliminated with the second point of access being on 90th Street as per recommendation of DPW (Traffic Engineering). The only issue remaining in Southern Pointe Third is the width of right-of-way and width of paving on Hudson and East 89th Place. The Subdivision Regulations require 60' of right-of-way with 36' of paving and sidewalks on both sides of collector streets. (Applicant's proposal is for 54' of right-of-way, 30' of paving, and sidewalks on one side. This still provides for 12' behind the curb for utilities.) The general alignment of Hudson will provide the connection to 91st Street so the only issue is that of widths and sidewalks. There will be a minimum of 60' right-of-way from 91st to 90th Streets.

The conditions listed are taken from the previous TAC minutes of 5/7/91 with some modifications based upon the changes made and shown on the current plats.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Lindsay Perkins, Ed Schemerhorn and Greg Breedlove.

The developer's explained their proposal for S. Hudson Avenue, which would begin at 91st Street with a minimum right-of-way width of 60' (right-of-way is actually more since a median is planned.) and 36' of paving from 91st Street to 90th Street. The width would reduce to 54' of right-of-way with 30' of paving from 90th Street to the intersection of 89th Place and Granite Avenue. This configuration will maintain a minimum of 12' behind the curb for utilities, which is consistent with standard street dedications and construction.

A very lengthy discussion followed, regarding the merits of the proposal and/or the required widths of 60' and 36' of paving under the Subdivision Regulations. It was also noted, that the TAC in general had no objections to the original proposal for 26' paving in a 50' right-of-way. The staff had no objection to the street proposal being made by the applicant, since this represented an effort on the part of the developer to comply with the wishes of the Planning Commission to provide a collector street from Southern Pointe 2nd to 91st Street. This section is unique in that there are no homes or development to feed to a collector from the middle of the north half of the mile, due to Holland Hall School occupying a 160 acre tract.

The Department of Public Works representatives did not endorse a waiver of the Regulations, but did note that the alignment was satisfactory and there was no objection to the applicants proposal. However, regarding sidewalks, DPW (Traffic) did express an objection to the proposal of sidewalks only on one side of the collector street.

The utilities had no objection to the design as long as sufficient easements were provided and the distance behind the curb remains a minimum of 12'.

Further discussion was made regarding the merits of the proposal and is summarized as follows:

- (a) Staff and TAC, including DPW and other utilities unanimously agreed there is no objection to the street layout as proposed.
- (b) DPW did not endorse a waiver of the Regulations, but did not object to applicants' proposal, except regarding sidewalks. (Recommended sidewalks on both sides, per Regulations.)
- (c) This is a unique mile section since full-size collector system cannot be provided all the way through the section due to the large Holland Hall tract.

There was no new information to provide or discussion and a motion was in order for sketch plat approval.

On MOTION of HEMPHILL,, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the SKETCH plat of *Southern Pointe Third*, subject to the following conditions: and further including the comments (a), (b), and (c) in the "summary".

1. Provide a collector street on the alignment of E. 89th Place and S. Hudson Avenue to 91st Street. Sixty-feet of right-of-way, 36' paving and sidewalks on both sides are required by Subdivision Regulations. (Applicant proposes 54' right-of-way, 30' paving on these streets. Waiver of Regulations required if this option is accepted by the Planning Commission.
2. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines.
3. Water plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat. Include language for Water and Sewer facilities in covenants.
4. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owners(s) of the lot(s).
5. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat.

6. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Stormwater Management and/or Engineering), including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by the City of Tulsa.
7. A request for a Privately Financed Public Improvement (PFPI) shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Engineering Division).
8. Street names shall be approved by the Department of Public Works and shown on plat.
9. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
10. Bearings, or true north-south, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by Department of Public Works (Engineering).
11. All adjacent streets, intersections, and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
12. Limits of Access or (LNA) as applicable shall be shown on the plat as approved by Department of Public Works (Traffic). Include applicable language in covenants.
13. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with Department of Public Works (Traffic) during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)
14. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
15. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
16. The restrictive covenants and deed of dedication shall be submitted for review with preliminary plat. Include subsurface provisions, dedications for storm water facilities, as applicable.
17. Provide sight distance data for the intersection of 90th and Hudson as well as the entry median at 91st and Hudson. (Required by DPW, Traffic Engineering).
18. A paving radius of 45' will be required on the cul-de-sac on 89th Court. Provide additional easement as needed for utilities. (Subject to approval of Utilities and Fire Department.)

19. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.
20. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Wilmoth advised the Commission of three basic issues in which requirements differ with the applicant's request; the width of the right-of-way, the width of the paving, and installation of sidewalks. He explained that the staff/TAC recommendation was to require a minimum of a 36' wide street with 60' of right-of-way on Hudson from 91st Street to 90th Street, then a 30' wide street with 54' of right-of-way on Hudson from 90th Street to 89th Place, then a 26' wide street with 50' of right-of-way on Granite. Mr. Wilmoth referred to an enclosed map from the subdivision regulations indicating where utilities lay in the 12' area between the curb and the edge of the right-of way to show why this width right-of-way was needed.

Mr. Wilmoth reported that TAC recommended sidewalks on both sides of the street. Applicant has not indicated any proposal regarding sidewalks in this subdivision.

Mr. Doherty stated that it is his intent to support a motion to approve this plat subject to the following conditions; 36' of paving be required up to the first cul-de-sac at the north end of the addition, to require sidewalks on one side; and to allow the right-of-way to be adjusted as much as is feasible.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Ed Schemerhorn noted that this was not a typical section. It is a low density section that consists of large lots; therefore, it does not carry as much traffic as a commercially developed section. Mr. Schemerhorn presented a geographic and topographic overview of the surrounding area. He gave examples of other areas in which collector streets were transitioned from 60' to 50' of right-of-way and 26 feet of paving. Mr. Schemerhorn pointed out that a collector street would encourage travel at increased speeds and gave examples of what is being proposed in this addition to aid in keeping speed down. He pointed out that three outlets have been provided for this addition.

Commissioner Harris reported that he has received several complaints about Lakewood being used as a major collector street for traffic off 91st Street, north on Lakewood across Fry Ditch Bridge and into the first two phases of the subdivision. He expressed his concerns regarding increased traffic flow and the imposition placed on established developments.

Mr. Schemerhorn noted that he has agreed to construct a temporary construction road to alleviate traffic on Lakewood.

Mr. Doherty also expressed his concerns with traffic flow and imposing on already established developments.

Discussion ensued regarding other collector streets' design and traffic flow.

Interested Parties:

Mr. Jack Cox

7935 E. 57th Place

Mr. Cox stated that staff recommendation of sidewalks on one side of the street would encourage street parking, since sidewalks would displace additional driveway parking.

Mr. Parmele asked Mr. Cox to address parking on a 36' wide paving surface as opposed to a 30' paving surface.

Mr. Cox responded that with 36' paving he has found there is ample parking in the driveway and much less street parking; this is with no sidewalks.

Mr. Pierre Smith

8815 S. Lakewood

Mr. Smith stated that he was representing Woodhill Heights Subdivision and Woodhill Estates Subdivisions. He gave a review of discussion from the December 5, 1990 meeting regarding subdivision regulations in conjunction with the Major Street and Highway Plan (MSHP). He pointed out that based on subdivision regulations, it is the responsibility of the developer to request of the TMAPC variances from the subdivision regulations. Mr. Smith stated that at no time was it requested to not have a collector street north to south or to modify regulations. He stated that the opening of the Fry Creek Bridge has made Lakewood function as a collector, and the traffic safety and security of their subdivision was negatively impacted by the ability of traffic to flow through their neighborhood. The collector street, as proposed, does not meet subdivision regulations. He considers the critical issue to be the 36' width of the paving in terms of traffic flow to these neighborhoods. The main concern should be consistency of implementation of subdivision regulations, MSHP, etc. He encourages the TMAPC to be consistent with these policies. In closing he asked approval of Southern Pointe Third sketch plat be subject to current subdivision regulations from Granite Avenue to 91st Street, and that square corners at the intersections of Granite and 89th Place and 89th Place and South Hudson be flattened to facilitate traffic flow. He reiterated the need to keep traffic off Lakewood.

Dudley Tenney

5903 E 88th Street South

Mr. Tenney stated that he resides in Woodhill Estates and is concerned with the risk of human error factor. He emphasized the need of wider streets to create a safety buffer for emergency braking.

Richard Polishuk, City Councilor

Councilor Polishuk stated that he was present to represent the view point of his district. From the City Council perspective a collector street is defined as a 60' right-of-way and 36' of paving. On a situation where the street is the entrance to the addition it is necessary to consider the 36' width. He stressed the Council's concern with being consistent with the subdivisions rules and regulations and encouraged this standard to be used with any future collector streets.

Applicant's Rebuttal

Mr. Schemerhorn reemphasized the safety issue. He stated that this is not just an economic issue. He pointed out that he is willing to install a temporary construction easement to help alleviate the problem. He reiterated that when streets are widened traffic tends to move with increased speeds.

TMAPC Review Session

Discussion ensued regarding the applicant's proposal and TAC/Staff requirements.

Mr. Doherty moved approval of the sketch plat of Southern Pointe Third with the following variations; that 36' of paving 54' right-of-way plus necessary easement be required for all of Hudson and 89th Place; that 26' of paving and 50' right-of-way be required for Granite, and that sidewalks be required on one side of the street. This includes waiver of subdivision regulations.

Mr. Linker advised the Planning Commission they must first vote to rule on this item on sketch plat stage rather preliminary plat. He suggested voting to waive subdivision regulations first.

Mr. Doherty moved to remove the motion, and moved to waive subdivision regulations to deal with the issue at the sketch plat approval stage.

TMAPC Action, 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **8-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to rescind the motion and waive subdivision regulations in order to deal with the issue at the sketch plat approval stage.

Mr. Doherty suggested the sketch plat of Southern Pointe Third be approved as presented with the following variations: that Hudson Avenue and 89th Place have 36' of pavement width, 54' of right-of-way width, plus easements necessary for utilities; that Granite Avenue have 26' of paving plus 50' of right-of-way, and that sidewalks be required on the east side of Hudson Avenue, 89th Place and Granite Avenue.

Mr. Doherty explained the reason for suggesting 26' paving on Granite is that on the edge of the subdivision the street is currently 26' and sees no reason to widen this until it reaches the first cul-de-sac.

Ms. Wilson stated that definitions define a collector street as a street intended to move traffic from local streets to arterials. Nowhere is it stated that a collector is intended to travel the entire mile section. What is needed, in this instance, is a collector street to go south to 91st Street. She stated she feels duty bound to get a collector street system in this portion of the section.

In response to inquiry from Commissioner Harris Councilor Polishuk replied that the issue is not the 60' right-of-way, but the fact that the street needs to be 36' wide. To move traffic and to allow parking 36' is what is required and what the City Council would approve in light of their subdivision approvals.

TMAPC Action, 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-1-0*** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Parmele "nay"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to **APPROVE** the sketch plat of Southern Pointe Third as presented with the following variations: that Hudson Avenue and 89th Place have 36' of pavement width, 54' of right-of-way, plus easements necessary for utilities; that Granite Avenue have 26' of pavement width with a 50' wide right-of-way, and that sidewalks be required on the east side of Hudson Avenue, 89th Place and Granite Avenue.

*On August 21, 1991 Mr Parmele originally voted in favor of motion, but on September 4, 1991 changed his vote from aye to nay making the vote 7-1-0.

* * * * *

Prairie Home Estates (213) (PD-15)

(AG)

E. 119th Street North & North Memorial Drive

Staff Recommendation:

This plat was reviewed by TAC on 5/7/91 and by the Planning Commission on 5/15/91 as a sketch plat. The major issue was a street system that would either be public dedication improved to County specifications or a private street system to be maintained by the homeowners in the subdivision. TAC recommended as a preference, a public street system. Criteria was also provided for streets, easements, etc., regardless of whether they would be public or private to ensure adequate access and utility services, etc. In discussion at the Planning Commission meeting, there were concerns about maintenance and who would eventually pay for the streets. The sketch plat was approved subject to all the

conditions as listed and a requirement that all the streets be public and not private.

Applicant is resubmitting the sketch plat for a rehearing to permit the private street system instead of a public system.

In reviewing the previous minutes, (TMAPC 5/15/91) a number of the conditions have already been met. Should the request for a private street system be approved, it should be clearly stated on the plat and in the covenants that these are private streets and maintained by the homeowners in the addition. In addition, if private streets are allowed, signage should be provided at the entrances to the subdivision clearly stating that the streets are private, and maintained by the homeowners and not the County.

A copy of the Planning Commission minutes of 5/15/91 was provided for information.

Staff noted that a stub street has been provided to the north and west as requested in the previous review. These include temporary turn-a-rounds as recommended. Access will also be available to the south.

Staff and TAC still prefer a public street system, but further note that applicant has provided restrictions and provisions for maintenance of the private roads, including language absolving Tulsa County from any liability or responsibility for maintenance. (This is the same type of plat as approved by both TMAPC and the Board of Adjustment on "Country Acres" near 171st and S. Peoria.)

Traffic Engineering suggested that if streets are to be private, the applicant should provide the County Engineer and Planning Commission with some basic criteria as to paving width, cross section, and provisions for drainage.

There was some discussion regarding water line easements parallel to 119th Street North. Staff suggested that the easements be shown as general utility easements so all utilities can use them. The 60' private roadway would also need to be a utility easement.

On MOTION of KOCH, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the revised SKETCH plat of *Prairie Home Estates* noting that a preference is for a dedicated street system, but having no objection to a private street system if the provisions are made for maintenance and signage as outlined in the conditions as follows:

1. If private street system is approved, then actual roadway easement should be centered within a 60' corridor, with an additional 25' setback and utility easement provided. The private street should also be designated as a utility easement.
2. If private street system is approved, signs shall be posted at all entrances to the subdivision clearly stating that the

roads are private and maintained by the property owners and not Tulsa County. Sign(s) shall be in place prior to issuance of any building permits in the subdivision.

3. If a private street system is approved, Board of Adjustment approval is required for "Zero frontage" lots on a private street.
- *4. If public street system is required, provide 60' of right-of-way with 25' building lines and utility easements parallel thereto.
5. Preliminary and final plats shall be drawn and submitted in accordance with Chapter 3 of the Subdivision Regulations (Specifications for Documents.)
6. Show limited access on those lots fronting North Memorial. Access should be limited to one per lot, with location and driveway tile sizes subject to the approval of the County engineer.
7. Utility easements shall meet the approval of utilities. Show additional easements as required. Where lots are "back to back" or "side to back", show 11' easements on each side to total 22'.
8. Water plans shall be approved by Washington County Rural Water District #3 prior to release of final plat.
9. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owners(s) of the lot(s). (Include all utilities in this paragraph.)
10. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the County Engineer, including storm drainage and detention design (and other permits where applicable), subject to criteria approved by the County Commission.
11. A topo map shall be submitted for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (Subdivision Regulations). Submit with drainage plans as directed.
12. All curve data, including corner radii, shall be shown on final plat as applicable.
13. Bearings, or true north-south, etc., shall be shown on perimeter of land being platted or other bearings as directed by Department of Public Works (Engineering).
14. All adjacent streets, intersections, and/or widths thereof shall be shown on plat.
15. It is recommended that the developer coordinate with County Engineer during the early stages of street construction concerning the ordering, purchase, and installation of street marker signs. (Advisory, not a condition for release of plat.)

*waived. See motion.

16. Street names shall be approved by County Engineer and shown on plat. (Change E. 120th St. N. to E. 119th St. N.).
17. Street lighting in this Subdivision shall be subject to the approval of the County Engineer and adopted policies as specified in Appendix C of the Subdivision Regulations.
18. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
19. The method of sewage disposal and plans therefore, shall be approved by the City-County Health Department. Percolation tests required prior to preliminary approval.
20. The owner(s) shall provide the following information on sewage disposal system if it is to be privately operated on each lot: type, size, and general location. This information is to be included in the restrictive covenants on plat.
21. The method of water supply and plans therefore, shall be approved by City-County Health Department.
22. All lots, streets, building lines, easements, etc., shall be completely dimensioned.
23. A Corporation Commission letter (or Certificate of Nondevelopment) shall be submitted concerning any oil and/or gas wells before plat is released. A building line shall be shown on plat on any wells not officially plugged.
24. The restrictive covenants and deed of dedication shall be submitted for review with preliminary plat. Include subsurface provisions, dedications for storm water facilities and utility easements, as applicable.
25. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations. (Required even if streets are private.)
26. All Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

Staff Comments & Discussion

Mr. Wilmoth reminded the Planning Commission that this issue had been before them on May 15, 1991. It was taken back to the Technical Advisory Committee, and some changes were made. A street was stubbed out to the north, as requested, and temporary turn-arounds provided on the ends provided. The issue remaining is public versus private streets. The TAC still prefers a public street system, but has no objection to a private street system with the following safeguards: signage of the property at the entrance to the subdivision stating the streets are private and not maintained by the county, but by the homeowners in the subdivision; requirements in the covenants to include the same kind of restrictions. This is to be provided if it is approved with a private

street system it would require Board of Adjustment approval for the zero frontage on a dedicated street. Mr. Wilmoth stated the applicant has complied with all requirements except for the public street system, and this is the request for a waiver.

Ms. Wilson stated the problem with the previous request was should private streets be allowed this would require homeowners to maintain the streets. Once the stub street to the west is opened, others who do not live in this addition may drive on the private streets cause wear and tear of the street, and the homeowners would then be responsible for repair. She questioned how this problem was addressed in the sketch plat and the proposed covenants.

Mr. Wilmoth stated that the covenants would provide for this, and signage added should cover this potential problem.

Mr. Gardner stated that this discussion has been held before. This is a self imposed hardship and Ms. Huckaby must obtain a variance from the County Board of Adjustment, waiving the zoning code. He pointed out that this subdivision does not meet the subdivision regulations because it does not meet the zoning code. If a variance is denied, Planning Commission action on this case is irrelevant. The BOA must make a decision, and if they fail to find a hardship then they must meet the ordinance. Ms. Huckaby can file a PUD and have private streets, otherwise a variance must be obtained through the County Board of Adjustment.

Commissioner Harris commented on the memo from Mrs. Huckaby noting reference to several covenants she agrees to incorporate into the requirements. He noted that should the private road one day become a publicly maintained road the covenants must be worded in such a way that the cost of bringing the road up to county standards would be borne by the adjacent property owners.

Commissioner Harris made the motion to approve incorporating the wording in Mrs. Huckaby's August 21, 1991 memorandum, subject to Board of Adjustment approval of a variance to the County Zoning Code.

Mr. Linker reminded the Planning Commission that this subdivision is at sketch plat stage and the regulations that require these items be addressed at the preliminary plat stage, not sketch plat.

TMAPC Action, 8 members present:

On MOTION of HARRIS, the TMAPC voted 7-1-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; Wilson "nay"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to withdraw the motion and waive the subdivision regulations to allow consideration of these matters at the sketch plan stage.

TMAPC Action, 8 members present:

On MOTION of HARRIS, the TMAPC voted 7-1-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Woodard, "aye"; Wilson "nay"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to APPROVE the sketch plat of Prairie Home Estates incorporating the wording in Mrs. Huckaby's August 21, 1991 memorandum in the covenants, subject to Board of Adjustment approval and conditions as recommended by staff and TAC of needed variances of the zoning code.

* * * * *

Preliminary Plat Approval:

West Highlands IV Amended (PUD-159-1)(382) (PD-8)(CD-2)
West 62nd Street and S. Waco Avenue (RM-1, RS-3)

Staff Recommendation

This plat is to amend the existing plat of *West Highland IV* by taking a number of platted lots with approximately 35' widths and combining those lots into larger ones with approximately 50' to 56' widths. The lots as platted provide for zero lot line construction, but the new lots in this amendment will provide 5' side yards on each side of the dwellings. The amended plat will comply with the provisions of PUD-159-1, and in fact will be more restrictive since the lots will be larger. (See staff summary of comparison of existing and proposed plats for detailed PUD information.) Staff is not recommending an amendment to the PUD since this plat will comply with all the recorded provisions of the PUD.

Although not a condition of approval, Staff advises applicant to be certain that no title problems are created by the replatting of only a portion of this addition. Some title work may be needed, but that is not to be a part of this plat review nor is it a condition of approval.

The Staff presented the plat with the applicant represented by Ed Nickle.

On MOTION of MILLER, the Technical Advisory Committee voted unanimously to recommend **approval** of the PRELIMINARY plat of *West Highlands IV Amended*, subject to the following conditions:

1. On face of plat show number of lots and approximate acres. Also show the following: After each notation of the front 15' building line and easement show an * and a note on face of the plat: *Garages/carports must be set back a minimum of 18 feet. (Although this is in covenants, Building Inspection has asked that this also appear on face of plat.)

2. Covenants:

- Page 1; References should be Section 910 thru 970, date is 6/5/74 and add ...*"and subsequent minor amendment 159-1 approved by the TMAPC on 7/7/82."*
- Page 1; Include *"water lines"* in dedication.
- Page 3; Add Landscaping & Paving Repair language, per sample.
- Page 4; line 2, add after the word "structure" ... *"Rear Yard Setback shall be a minimum of 11 feet except where easements are greater."*
- Page 4; Item 7: Add: *"(Maximum of 26' to top of top plate.)"*
- Page 4; Item 8: This is a private restriction, but applicant may want to make sure of the meaning of the total square footage required in the house. Usually this does NOT include the garage or porches. (Advisory, not a condition of approval of plat.)
3. Verify with utilities that all pedestals, water meter, fire hydrants, gas meters, etc. are within the lots to be created by this resubdivision. If any facilities need to be moved so as to not conflict with driveways, property lines, etc. applicant should coordinate this with utilities. Relocations will be at developers' expense.
4. All conditions of PUD 159-1 shall be met prior to release of final plat, including any applicable provisions in the covenants or on the face of the plat. Include PUD approval date and references to Section 910-970 of the Zoning Code, in the covenants.
5. Utility easements shall meet the approval of the utilities. Coordinate with Subsurface Committee if underground plant is planned. Show additional easements as required. Existing easements should be tied to or related to property lines and/or lot lines.
6. Water plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat. (If required)
7. Pavement or landscape repair within restricted water line, sewer line, or utility easements as a result of water or sewer line or other utility repairs due to breaks and failures, shall be borne by the owners(s) of the lot(s).
8. A request for creation of a Sewer Improvement District shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works (Water and Sewer) prior to release of final plat. (If required)
9. Paving and/or drainage plans shall be approved by the Department of Public Works (Stormwater Management and/or Engineering), including storm drainage, detention design and Watershed Development Permit application subject to criteria approved by the City of Tulsa.

10. It is recommended that the applicant and/or his engineer or developer coordinate with the Tulsa City-County Health Department for solid waste disposal, particularly during the construction phase and/or clearing of the project. Burning of solid waste is prohibited.
11. A "Letter of Assurance" regarding installation of improvements shall be submitted prior to release of final plat, including documents required under Section 3.6-5 of Subdivision Regulations.
12. All (other) Subdivision Regulations shall be met prior to release of final plat.

PUD 159-1 WEST HIGHLANDS - COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED PLATS

<u>PUD ITEM:</u> <u>IV AMENDED</u>	<u>WEST HIGHLANDS IV</u>	<u>WEST HIGHLANDS</u>
Plat/text conditions of approval	Yes	Yes
Development Standards:		
Permitted uses:	0-lot line detached	Detached
single-family	single-family D/U	D/U with 5'
side yards		
Maximum number of Dwelling Units (D/U)	128	---
Actual platted	128	29
Remaining in West Highlands IV		
after amended plat is filed	83	29
Total lots (D/U) platted after amendment = 112 or a net decrease of 16 D/U.		
Maximum building height	26' (top plate)	Same
Minimum Livability Space	1,200 SF	Same
Building Setbacks:		
From centerline of S. Union and W. 61st	85'	Same
*Front Yard	15'	Same
*Garages/carpports	18'	Same
**Between units	5'	5' min side
yard <u>each</u> side		
**No eave overhang over Property line		of lots in
amended plat		
***Rear Yard	10'	11'
***Except where easement are greater		
Parking	2 per D/U	Same
Final plat to be Detail Site Plan	Yes	Yes

Conclusion: The amended plat will comply with the provisions of PUD 159-1 in meeting the minimum standards. There will be fewer dwelling units and the side yard restrictions are greater than required by the PUD. All conditions/standards in the amended plat are at least as restrictive as the PUD and in most cases more restrictive. No amendment to the PUD 159-1 would be required to permit the processing of the amended plat.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Wilmoth stated that this involves taking small lots and combing them to make larger lots. This is a reduction of approximately sixteen dwelling units. This was compared with PUD requirements and meets or exceeds the conditions with the PUD. There are no waivers required and is simply an expansion of the existing lots.

TMAPC Action, 6 members present:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, Midget, Parmele and Neeley "absent") to APPROVE the Preliminary Plat of West Highlands IV Amended subject to conditions as recommended by staff.

* * * * *

Adwon Center (1301) (PD-25) (CD-1)
3820 North Peoria

(CS)

Comments & Discussion:

Mr. Wilmoth stated that this was a reduction of access points, rather than the two existing currently there will be one 50' access point in the center due to improvements to the driveway. Traffic has approved and staff recommends approval.

TMAPC ACTION; 8 members present:

On MOTION of DOHERTY, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to APPROVE change of access for Adwon Center, as recommended by staff.

Request For Modification of Setback From Oil Well (S.R. 410.1.c)

Gilcrease Hills, Village II, Block 26 (2702) (PD-11) (CD-1) (RM-1)
West Queen Street & North Tacoma Avenue

Staff Recommendation

Mr. Wilmoth stated that staff would like to hear from the applicant. He believed the applicant was proposing a 50' building line and fencing. Staff would tend to agree with this, but would like to hear Roy Johnsen's comments. Supporting data was provided in a letter from Handy Waychoff and Associates dated May 8, 1991.

Comments and Discussion:

Mr. Johnson stated he would view this as staff recommendation and was in agreement.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Johnsen if state law required a 300' setback.

Mr. Johnsen replied that, that pertained only to drilling and not to an existing well.

TMAPC ACTION; 8 members present:

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to APPROVE request for modification of setback from oil well subject to the conditions as recommended by staff.

Waiver Request: Section 213:

BOA 15806 and 11658 (Unplatted) (2283) (PD-26) (CD-8) (AG)
5416 East 101st Street South

This is a request to waive plat on a 5 acre tract containing an existing church, approved by the Board of Adjustment in case #11658, October 1981. The BOA approval included requirements for dedication of R/W on 101st, utility easements on the north, east & west perimeters, access points, and drainage. Those conditions were met. The church expanded and has provided an up-dated Master Plan for expansion which was approved by the BOA in case #15806 on 8/13/91.

Since the plat requirement was not formally waived by the TMAPC on the original application (11658) this waiver request covers both the previous application and the current one. Although the tract is over 2 1/2 acres and unplatted, the dedications, easements and conditions previously provided will satisfy any requirements that would be made on a subdivision plat.

Therefore, it is recommended this request be APPROVED, noting the requirements of Section 213 of the zoning Code have been met.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Wilmoth stated that staff recommended approval and were in receipt of items that would meet a platting requirement on this.

TMAPC ACTION; 6 members present:

On MOTION of WOODARD, the TMAPC voted 6-0-0 (Ballard, Doherty, Harris, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Draughon, Horner, Midget and Neeley "absent") to APPROVE waiver request as recommended by staff.

Waiver Request: Section 213 and Access Change on Recorded Plat:

Z-6062 Royal Manor South (2692) (PD-9) (CD-2) (IL, PK, RM-1, RS-3)
W 51st Street and South Indian Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

This is a request to waive plat on the remainder of Z-6062 that was included within the above captioned zoning application. As a summary of platting activity in this area, the following should be noted:

Royal Manor South was platted in compliance with PUD 106. It included the Bellaire Drive-In Theater property abutting 51st Street as well as the apartment area to the north.

Z-6062 was processed and approved, which was done concurrently with an abandonment of a portion of PUD 106. (This is designated on some maps as PUD 106A) Enough RM-1 was granted to cover the existing apartment development and mapped in the southeast corner of the complex. PK and some additional IL zoning was approved.

Subsequently, Riverside Chevrolet plat was processed and filed of record to satisfy Z-6062. A portion was unplatted property and a portion was the southeast quadrant of Lot 2, Block 1, Royal Manor South.

Therefore, all of the area within the land covered by Z-6062 has been platted or replatted in compliance with the zoning and/or PUD, as applicable.

Riverside Chevrolet will be utilizing a tract comprised of Lot 2 and part of Lot 1, Block 2, Royal Manor South for an expansion of the agency, under the existing zoning and platting. The existing apartments are all within the remaining portion of PUD 106.

Since all of the land in Z-6062 has now been platted and/or replatted and nothing would be gained by further platting, Staff recommends APPROVAL of a waiver of plat on all the remaining land within Z-6062, noting that the provisions of Section 213 have been met by existing plats.

Staff advised that this application covers a zoning application that was done in 1985, but all the "paper work" on the waiver had never been done since all the land was platted already. TAC had no comments and or requirements. An access change for 51st Street would also be submitted. There were no other comments from the TAC and approval was recommended.

Comments and Discussion:

In response to Mr. Doherty's question Mr. Wilmoth advised that this was going to be an expansion of the existing dealership.

TMAPC ACTION; 6 members present:

On MOTION of WILSON, the TMAPC voted 5-1-0 (Ballard, Harris, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; Doherty "nay"; no "abstentions"; Carnes, Draughon, Horner, Midget and Neeley "absent") to APPROVE requested waiver of plat on Z-6062.

Lot Split for Discussion:

L-17442 Jenkins (2093) (PD-6) (CD-9) (RS-1)
SE/c or E. 33rd Street and South Delaware Avenue

In the opinion of the Staff, the lot split meets the subdivision and zoning regulations, but all residential lot split applications

which contain a lot having more than three side lot lines cannot be processed as a prior approval lot split. Such lot splits shall require a five day written notice to the abutting owners. Deeds for such lot splits shall not be stamped or released until the TMAPC has approved said lot split in a public hearing. (Authority: TMAPC meeting #1628, General Policies; 11/26/86). Approval is recommended.

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Wilmoth stated that the lot split meets the subdivision and zoning regulations; one lot will be 22,000 sq. ft, the other will be just over 16,000 sq. ft. This is an irregular shape and when set backs are applied, it will be difficult, but a house can be built on this lot. However, there are private deed restrictions that prevent any lot splits and minimum house sizes. As far as zoning, the lot does meet zoning requirements with frontage and area.

Interested Parties:

Jane Juergens

3303 South Delaware

Ms. Juergens advised she lived to the southwest of the property being discussed. She is asking for a continuance since notice was just received of the lot split, and she would like more information of what the plans are and what is going on the lot. This is not in sync with the rest of the neighborhood and would like more time to do research and get counsel on this matter.

Thomas Marsh

2850 East 33rd

Mr. Marsh voiced his agreement with the continuance to allow time to research the restrictions in the covenant. He voiced his concern of the proposed split because immediately to the south of the property is a small lake and a utility easement. The lake is owned by the City of Tulsa and requires continuous maintenance. If a house is permitted, where it is proposed to be built, this will deny City of Tulsa access to the lake from that end. At this time it is wide open at the west end. If the lake requires maintenance and drainage or dredging there is no access to the lake other than at the west end of the property. If a house is to be built it appears it will have to be put over the easement. This lot is not, in his opinion, conducive to a lot split. He urged the Planning Commission not to approve it, adding he believes the addition is due more notice than was received. He stated that if the Planning Commission wished to continue and give the applicant an opportunity to state why he wishes to split, he would have no objection.

TMAPC ACTION; 8 members present:

On MOTION of WILSON, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to CONTINUE request for lot split L-17442 until September 4, 1991 at 1:30 p.m., Francis F. Campbell City Council Room, Plaza Level, Civic Center.

* * * * *

Lot Splits for Ratification of Prior Approval:

- L-17390 (2383) McCorkle/Sublett (PD-18) (CD-8) SE/c 93rd & S. 65th E. Ave.
 - *L-17430 (1724) Timms (PD-14) S/side E. 166th St. N, west of N. 129th E. Ave.
 - L-17440 (183) Chili's/Sisemore (PD-18) (CD-8) SE/c E. 66th St. & S. Memorial Drive
 - L-17441 (2502) TDA (PD-2) (CD-1) SE/c of Apache and Garrison Pl.
 - L-17443 Prokop/Duvall (PD-4) (CD-4) 2651 S Yorktown
- *Subject to County BOA approval of necessary variances (8-20-91)

Staff Recommendation:

Mr. Wilmoth stated that the L-17430 was approved by the County BOA August 20, 1991, so all the above listed lot splits do meet regulations. Staff recommends approval.

TMAPC ACTION; 8 members present:

On MOTION of CARNES, the TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Harris, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to RATIFY the above listed lot splits having received prior approval.

Chairman Parmele declared a recess at 3:20 p.m., resumed for Public Hearing at 3:35 p.m.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF TULSA ZONING CODE REGARDING THE PARKING OF RECREATIONAL VEHICLES, BOATS, ETC.

Chairman Parmele stated the purpose of today's meeting was to hear input from the public. He informed those present that there is a proposal from the Rules and Regulations Committee, as to a possible revision to the zoning code, that Bob Gardner would read.

Chairman Parmele asked those interested in addressing the Commission to limit comments to four minutes so that all wishing to speak may do so. He stressed that no action will be taken today, this is for informational purposes only for the TMAPC. He expects to refer this back to the Rules and Regulations Committee to consider the proposed regulations, in light of the comments made today, and come back to the full TMAPC for continuation of the Public Hearing in approximately 30 - 45 days.

Mr. Gardner read the following:

TMAPC RULES AND REGULATIONS COMMITTEE

PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR RECREATIONAL VEHICLES

- I. Existing Vehicle Regulations (**Modifications in bold print**)
 1. No vehicle shall be parked or stored except on a hard surface area constructed of an all-weather material. **The width and depth of the surfaced area shall be equal to or greater than the width and length of the vehicle being parked or stored.** (Section 210.C).
 2. No inoperative or unlicensed motor vehicle shall be parked or stored within the front or exterior side yard in an R District. (Section 210.C).
 3. Off-street parking and off-street loading facilities shall not occupy required livability space.(Section 1301.A).
 4. Required off-street parking spaces and required off-street loading berths shall not be used for the storage, sale, dismantling, or service of any vehicle, equipment, materials, or supplies.(Section 1301.C).
 5. Required off-street parking spaces and required off-street loading berths shall be located on the lot containing the use for which the required spaces or berths are to be provided. (Section 1301. D).

II PROPOSED REGULATIONS

A. PARKING\STORAGE

Other than for purposes of loading and unloading, which shall take place within a 24 hour period, recreational vehicles located in an R District shall be parked or stored:

1. Inside a garage, or
2. Within the side yard or the rear yard, provided:
 - (a) the vehicle does not exceed 42 feet in body length, 8 1/2 feet in width, or 11 feet in overall height, and
 - (b) the vehicle does not encroach into the required side yard and shall be located at least 3 feet from any lot line in the rear yard.

B. USE:

The parking and storage of recreational vehicles is permitted as set out above provided:

1. The vehicle is not used for dwelling purposes;
2. The vehicle is not permanently connected to sewer lines, water lines, or electricity;
3. The vehicle is not used for storage of goods, materials, or equipment other than those items considered to be a part of the unit or essential for its use as a recreational vehicle.

III. Subject to the requirements of Section 1608.C, the Board of Adjustment may, as a special exception, permit recreational vehicles to be parked or stored in the front yard provided:

1. parking inside the garage is not possible;
2. parking in the non-required side yard or rear yard cannot reasonably be accomplished;
3. the unit is parked perpendicular to the front lot line;
4. the body of the recreational vehicle is at least 12 feet from the face of the curb or travel portion of the street, and
5. the recreational vehicle does not exceed 24 feet in length.

IV. DEFINITIONS

Existing: Recreational Vehicle (RV): A vehicular unit required to be licensed by the State which is designed as a self-contained (includes all utility facilities) dwelling unit for recreational, camping, or travel use, which is towed by another vehicle, mounted on another vehicle, or has its own motive power, regardless of size.

Proposed: Recreational vehicle: A trailer, boat trailer, travel trailer, camping trailer, truck camper, camper shell, motor home, tent trailer, boat, houseboat, or similar vehicle. Camper shells which are attached to a pickup truck are not considered a recreational vehicle.

Existing: All-Weather Material: A hard surface, dust-free material capable, during ordinary use, of withstanding without substantial deterioration, normal weather conditions.

Proposed: All-weather material: An asphaltic or portland cement binder pavement or chip and seal pavement which provides a durable and dust-free surface. Gravel, rock or screenings is not considered an all-weather, dust free material.

or

Proposed: All-weather material: A hard surface, dust-free material capable, during ordinary use, of withstanding without substantial deterioration, normal weather conditions. Gravel, rock, or screenings is not considered an all-weather, dust free material.

Comments and Discussion:

In response to Mr. Midget's inquiry as to who would be responsible for enforcement, Mr. Doherty replied that Code Enforcement would be responsible for enforcement since this would be part of the zoning code. Representatives from that department were present at the Committee discussions and are an integral part of the process. The final recommendation from the Committee would include a statement on code enforcement and uniform and equitable application thereof. He again reiterated that this proposal is to solicit public input and to gauge needs and standards of the community so when the final proposal is written, in response to the City Council's request, that it will incorporate that attitude.

Mr. Gardner added that staff does not envision any different enforcement of this item than any other item in the zoning code.

Interested Parties:

Charles McCaughin

1627 S. Baltimore Ave.

Mr. McCaughin expressed his concerns of who would enforce the amendment and how it would be done. He stated that there were already laws in effect covering these regulations. He warned that the city may be infringing on constitutional rights by instating such an ordinance.

Leonard Goddard

10931 E. 28th St.

Mr. Goddard stated that prior to purchasing his recreational vehicle he checked on requirements of installing a driveway on the side of his lot for parking. He was informed that as long as it was on an all weather pad it was legal. He has parked one there for some time. He pointed out that much money is spent on taxes and tags related to recreational vehicles. He feels the privilege to park recreational vehicles on one's own property should be the same as any other vehicle. Parking in the backyard is generally not possible because of the limited width between houses. Much money is invested in his recreational vehicle and believes it looks as good or better than any other vehicles in his neighborhood. If rv owners are required to put vehicles in storage, the limited amount of storage space would cause rental rates to sky rocket, and insurance premiums would rise. Recreational vehicles left in

storage also deteriorate more rapidly. Being in storage would make the recreational vehicle more accessible for robbery. A new ordinance is not needed, just enforcement of the one in effect. He pointed out the lack of enforcement of unattended vehicles presently. To pass this ordinance leaves no choice but to sell his home and move to another state that appreciates recreational vehicles and are more tolerate of those fortune enough to own one. He encourages recreational vehicle owners to canvas their neighborhood and report every violation of other vehicles.

In response to Mr. Doherty's inquiry of 30' providing ample setback from the street Mr. Goddard replied that it was.

In addition the following list of people spoke opposing the proposed parking requirements for recreational vehicles:

James Godwin	1605 E. 54th PL
Evelyn Brentlinger	5933 S. 100th East Ave.
Joe Creekmore	3172 E. 26th St
Bob Masters	224 S 118th East Ave.
Clay Herring	2317 W 44th St.
Virginia Lewis	3729 E. King Pl
Arthur Petros	218 S Sandusky
Lynal Hoffman	3724 E. 46th St.
Colan Winkler	3345 S Louisville
Maurise Kissler	4218 S. Darlington Pl.
Charles Ketterer	9225 E. 58th St.
Ellis Berry	
Deborah Redding	1627 S Baltimore
Deanna Hudson	1239 S. 76th E. Ave.
Art Mullen	10002 E. 29th St.

Their concerns were enforcement of city codes already in effect, infringement of constitutional rights, inability to access backyard to park vehicle, storage as being inconvenient and expensive, vehicles in storage being easy targets for robberies, and economic hardship for recreational dealers. The majority expressed displeasure with vehicles that are detrimental to their neighborhoods being parked in violation of city code.

Terry Wilson, Planning District 5 Chairman

Mr. Wilson took a neutral position. He pointed out that recreational vehicle owners are the minority in their neighborhoods just as trashed out cars are. This ordinance proposes a code of conduct as to the way neighborhoods are kept. Mr. Wilson stated that esthetic appearance has much to do with the value of neighborhoods and supports the process in consideration of the code.

Manual Jackson, President Oklahoma Campground User Assn.

Mr. Jackson stated that Oklahoma Campground User Association represents approximately 300,000. This organization was formed from the Department of Tourism to give campers a voice. He pointed out that tourism is the second largest industry in Oklahoma. A big

part of this tourism is associated with recreational vehicles. An ordinance, such as is being considered, reflects a negative image.

Comments and Discussion:

Ms. Wilson stated that this is a draft to solicit public comment and stated the ordinance includes boats, trailers, etc. and not just recreational vehicles.

Mr. Linker commented that Oklahoma can regulate for esthetic purposes, but this ordinance involves more than just esthetic purposes.

Mr. Doherty stated that in proposing to prohibit recreational vehicles from being parked in the front yard the thinking was not that the vehicle is unsightly, but that the vehicle is so large as to obstruct open space, as required in subdivision regulations, and visibility up and down the street. Not that the recreational vehicle is a detriment to neighborhood.

Mr. Doherty made a motion for continuance of the public hearing to October, 2, 1991.

TMAPC ACTION; 7 members present:

On **MOTION** of **DOHERTY**, the TMAPC voted **7-0-0** (Ballard, Carnes, Doherty, Midget, Parmele, Wilson, Woodard, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Draughon, Harris, Horner, and Neeley "absent") to **CONTINUE** the public hearing to October 2, 1991, at 1:30 p.m., Francis F. Campbell City Council Room, Plaza Level, Civic Center.

Mr. Parmele announced that the **RULES AND REGULATIONS COMMITTEE** will meet September 4, 1991, and asked those wishing to attend to call INCOG offices for the place and time.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Date Approved: 9-11-91



Chairman

ATTEST:


Secretary

