

TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of Meeting No. 2327

Wednesday, November 13, 2002, 1:30 p.m.

Francis Campbell City Council Room

Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Bayles	Dick	Dunlap	Romig, Legal
Carnes	Horner	Fernandez	
Coutant		Huntsinger	
Harmon		Matthews	
Hill		Stump	
Jackson			
Ledford			
Midget			
Westervelt			

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices on Tuesday, November 12, 2002 at 11:22 a.m., posted in the Office of the City Clerk, as well as in the Office of the County Clerk.

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

Minutes:

Approval of the minutes of October 23, 2002, Meeting No. 2325

On **MOTION** of **HILL** the TMAPC voted 7-0-1 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Midget "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the minutes of the meeting of October 23, 2002, Meeting No. 2325.

REPORTS:

Director's Report:

Mr. Stump reported that there is one item on the City Council agenda for November 21, 2002.

Mr. Stump reported that the County Commission adopted the amendments recommended by the Planning Commission concerning sexually-oriented businesses and their spacing. The City Council should be considering the same issues in December.

SUBDIVISIONS:

FINAL PLAT:

Metro Park East – IL (3394) (PD-18) (CD-6)
Northeast Corner of East 61st Street and South 129th East Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

This plat consists of four lots in one block on 28.07 acres. The property will be used for industrial uses.

All release letters have been received for this final plat. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the final plat.

Applicant was not present.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **LEDFOORD**, TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat for Metro Park East as recommended by staff.

College Center at Meadowbrook – PUD-625, CO-Z-6735-SP-1 (1884) (PD-18) (CD-8)

Location: East of the Southeast Corner of 81st Street and South Mingo Road

Staff Recommendation:

This plat consists of four lots in one block on nine acres. The property will be used for hotel and commercial uses.

All release letters have been received for this final plat. Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of the final plat.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **HORNER**, TMAPC voted 8-0-0 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the final plat for College Center at Meadowbrook as recommended by staff.

PRELIMINARY PLAT:

Mr. Ledford stated that he would be abstaining from the preliminary plat for Northwest Passage.

Northwest Passage – PUD 624 (2202) (PD 11) (CD 1)
North of Apache, between Gilcrease Drive and Osage Drive

Staff Recommendation:

Mrs. Fernandez stated that staff recommends a continuance to November 20, 2002. She explained that she has met with the engineer for this project yesterday and there would be a new collector street system design at the next Planning Commission meeting.

Applicant was not present.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 8 members present:

On **MOTION** of **MIDGET**, TMAPC voted 7-0-1 (Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; Ledford "abstaining"; Bayles, Dick, Horner "absent") to **CONTINUE** the preliminary plat for Northwest Passage to November 20, 2002 at 1:30 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF THE MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN AS AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA

Staff Recommendation:

Consider adoption of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan and approve Resolution No. 2327:846.

RESOLUTION NO.: 2327:846

**A RESOLUTION AMENDING
THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA, BY
ADOPTING THE MULTI-HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF
TULSA**

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Title 19, OSA, Section 863.7, the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC) did, by Resolution on the 29th day of June 1960, adopt a Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, which Plan was subsequently approved by the Mayor and Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma, and by the Board of County Commissioners of Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and was filed of record in the Office of the County Clerk, Tulsa, Oklahoma, all according to law; and

WHEREAS, the TMAPC is required to prepare, adopt and amend, as needed, in whole or in part, an official Master Plan to guide the physical development of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on the 13th day of November, 2002 and after due study and deliberation, this Commission deems it advisable and in keeping with the purpose of this Commission, as set forth in Title 19, OSA, Section 863.7, to adopt the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan for the City of Tulsa as a part of the Comprehensive Plan of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the TMAPC, that the adoption of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, as set out above, be and is hereby adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area.

Applicant's Comments:

Mr. Ken Hill, Planning Manager, Public Works Engineering Services, City of Tulsa, stated that over the past year the Hazard Mitigation Plan has been developed for multi-hazards. This particular plan would address natural hazards and hazard mitigation. Mr. Hill submitted the Mitigation Plan (Exhibit A-1). Mr.

Hill presented a PowerPoint slide show that pointed out the highlights and requirements of the Plan.

Mr. Hill introduced the consultant for the Mitigation Plan, Ron Flanagan, R. D. Flanagan & Associates. He indicated that Mr. Flanagan has spent the last year developing the subject plan.

Ms. Bayles in at 1:47 p.m.

TMAPC Comments:

Planning Commissioner Mary Hill asked Mr. Ken Hill about the Keystone Dam and the prevention of another flooding scenario as occurred in 1986. She asked if there is communication provided in the plan to help prevent this from happening again. In response, Mr. Hill stated that it is his intent that the Plan would be looked at on a regular basis and have communication with the Corps of Engineers and the surrounding communities.

Ron Flanagan, R.D. Flanagan & Associates, 2745 East Skelly Drive, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74105, stated that he is currently working with the Cities of Jenks and Bixby who are also developing plans that parallel this proposal. One of the recommendations in the plan is to work with the Corps of Engineers to develop plans and look at the levee system on both sides of the river. There needs to be a contingency plan because the levees failed in 1986 and then the homes were rebuilt back behind the levee, setting up for the next disaster.

Commissioner Hill stated that she would like to communication among the cities and the Corps of Engineers to prevent another flood like was experienced in 1986.

Mr. Flanagan stated that every piece of property that is located within the dam failure area of the Arkansas River has been identified. If the Corps of Engineers were to do a 250,000 CFS release again, then the City would know which properties would need to be warned.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WETERVELT**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Dick, Horner "absent") to recommends **ADOPTION** of Resolution No. 2327:846 for the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area as submitted.

CONTINUED ZONING PUBLIC HEARING:

Application No.: Z-6873

RS-3 to OL

Applicant: John W. Moody

(PD-18) (CD-7)

Location: South of southeast corner of East 51st Street and South Oswego

Staff Recommendation:

RELEVANT ZONING HISTORY:

Z-6564/Z-6564-SP-1 November 1996: A request to rezone a lot located east of the northeast corner of East 51st Street South and South Harvard Avenue from OM to CO. The site plan proposed utilizing the existing office building for an office and retail development. All concurred in approval of the request.

Z-6429 January 1994: A request to rezone a .69-acre tract located east of the northeast corner of East 51st Street South and South Harvard Avenue and directly north across East 51st Street from the subject tract from OM to CS or CO. Staff and TMAPC recommended denial of CS zoning; all concurred in approval of CO zoning.

Z-6317 June 1991: All concurred in approval of OL zoning on a lot located west of the southwest corner of East 51st Street and South Oswego Avenue from RS-3 to OL.

Z-6310/PUD-467 April 1991: All concurred in approval of a request to rezone a tract of land located on the northwest corner of East 51st Street and South Pittsburg Avenue and across East 51st Street from the subject tract, from OM and OMH to CO/PUD for commercial development.

Z-6255/PUD-451 November 1989: A request to rezone a tract of land located east of the northeast corner of East 51st Street and South Harvard Avenue from OM and OMH to CO and PUD for commercial development was approved per conditions. The application was withdrawn by the applicant prior to final hearing by the City Commission.

Z-6191 April 1988: All concurred in approval of a request to rezone a tract located on the northwest corner of East 51st Street and South Yale from OMH to CS.

PUD-372 October 1984: All concurred in approval of a request for the development of a 4.14-acre tract located south and east of the southeast corner of East 51st Street and South Harvard for a single-family dwelling and two additional buildings for a proposed shopping center.

AREA DESCRIPTION:

SITE ANALYSIS: The subject property is gently sloping, non-wooded, is the back yard of an existing single-family dwelling and zoned RS-3.

STREETS:

Exist. Access	MSHP Design.	MSHP R/W	Exist. # Lanes
South Oswego Avenue	Residential street	50'	2 lanes

UTILITIES: The subject tract has municipal water and sewer.

SURROUNDING AREA: The property is abutted on the north by a nail salon, zoned OL; to the east by a medical office complex, zoned OM; to the west by parking and the Springer Clinic, zoned OL; and to the south by single-family homes, zoned RS-2.

The District 18 Plan, a part of the Comprehensive Plan for the Tulsa Metropolitan Area, designates the subject tract as Low Intensity – Residential.

According to the Zoning Matrix the requested OL is **not in accord** with the Zoning Matrix.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on existing development, the fact that the requested rezoning is the rear yard of a single-family dwelling and the Comprehensive Plan, staff cannot support the requested rezoning and therefore recommends **DENIAL** of OL zoning for Z-6873. If the TMAPC deems it appropriate to recommend approval of this rezoning, they should also direct staff to prepare amendments to the District 18 Plan map.

Mr. Stump stated that this is a rear portion of an existing residential lot and it would need Board of Adjustment approval if they plan to subdivide that portion off of the existing lot because the existing house would be at the zoning line at the rear of the house and it may or may not have enough livability space, as well as problems with setbacks or lot area. This is a real rarity to see a piece of a residential lot being rezoned so that the non-residential zoning comes right up to the back of the residence itself.

Applicant's Comments:

John Moody, 1924 South Utica, Suite 700, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104, representing Mr. & Mrs. Sam Young, stated that his clients own the entire frontage along South Oswego and the office building located on the corner. The parcel under application is part of and attached to the tract that has frontage on Oswego. The residence is located on the south and faces Oswego and would side up to the subject tract. He stated that it is important for the Planning

Commission to see the various OL and OM zoning depths that have been approved on East 51st Street. His client's lot has not been zoned to a depth equal to the zoning that has been approved along 51st Street. Mr. Moody submitted maps (Exhibit B-2) to highlight the areas which are zoned or being used for offices. Mr. Moody described the surrounding properties and their depth from the centerline. He indicated that the existing OL zoning on his client's lot is 165 feet from the centerline of East 51st Street. He stated that Springer Clinic, across the street and facing Oswego, is zoned to a depth of 190 feet from the centerline, which is 35 feet farther than the area that is under application. The lot immediately adjacent to the subject tract is zoned 195 feet from the centerline.

Mr. Moody stated that he filed an application that would go a depth of 225 feet. There are properties to the west that have a depth of 320 feet from the centerline. He explained that his figure of 225 feet from the centerline is because that is the usable area. He is willing to amend his application to 195 feet from the centerline and it would line up the subject property with the OM adjacent on the east side. The balance of the request be zoned PK.

Mr. Stump stated that the depth would be 190 feet and not 195 feet on the east side. In response, Mr. Moody agreed to 190 feet.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Midget stated that by asking for the PK zoning, it would still be going deeper into the residential areas. In response, Mr. Moody stated that 35 feet of the subject tract would be OL and it would line it up with the OM on the eastern boundary and the OL across the street and the balance (25 feet) would be parking.

Mr. Moody submitted photographs of the surrounding properties with OM or OL uses (Exhibit B-1). He commented that the requested parking would make a good buffer for the residential area to the south. He stated that his client owns the existing house on the southern boundary.

Mr. Carnes stated that he could see the OL zoning at the 190 feet, but the line should stop there and not allow parking. In response, Mr. Moody stated that he would agree with the 190 feet of OL zoning.

Mr. Stump cited the requirements for a PK district regarding landscaping, screening and setbacks. Staff could support OL zoning to the depth of 190 feet to line up with the existing line, but that is all staff could support.

Mr. Romig stated that the applicant did not advertise for parking zoning. In response, Mr. Moody stated that he thought it was included with the OL zoning.

Interested Parties:

Cora Louise Banfield, 4003 East 52nd Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135, stated that Oswego doesn't go through to 52nd Street, but she would be one block away from the subject property and she is concerned about her property being devalued. She indicated that she is protesting the rezoning of the subject property because it faces and adjoins residential homes. In one square mile, all of the commercial property faces either 51st Street, 61st Street, Harvard or Yale Avenue. This type of commercial encroachment would result in the devaluation of surrounding residential properties. Ms. Banfield expressed concerns about increased drainage problems if a parking lot is allowed.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Midget asked Ms. Banfield if she would be opposed to the OL zoning being lined up evenly with the existing OL zoning. In response, Ms. Banfield stated that she would be opposed to the rezoning.

Interested Parties:

Ward Elliott, 3829 East 53rd Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135, stated that he is concerned about the traffic and safety hazards. He further stated that there is no need for more traffic in the subject area. Mr. Elliott cited traffic violations and accidents from a traffic report he obtained from Traffic Engineering. He indicated that Oswego is the most dangerous intersection along 51st Street and that is where the rezoning is requested. He requested the Planning Commission to deny the rezoning.

Mr. Romig stated that there is a section in the Zoning Code that allows the Planning Commission to consider parking since the request was for OL.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Moody read the requirements for PK zoning. He commented that if the Planning Commission doesn't see parking as appropriate he would still need the OL extended so that it is equal to the office zoning on the west and east side.

Mr. Moody stated that the subject property's current access point is at the intersection and it is not an appropriate place. The existing residential structure is an older structure and the depth of the lot is only 115 feet. There is not enough land to tear down the house and rebuild and relocate a new access point. In order to tear this residence down and build a better building with a better access off of Oswego, his client would need the additional 35 feet of OL zoning. This proposal would not be adding any substantial traffic to 51st Street and it would be only fair to allow his client to be treated equally as far as the 35 feet zoning for OL.

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Moody if he is stating that the existing residence would go away and a new building would be located farther back on the subject lot. In response, Mr. Moody stated that it would. He explained that the purpose of the

subject application is to allow his client to remove the single-family structure and build a new building.

Mr. Stump stated that the additional land that is needed to be rezoned to line up with the existing office zoning to the west and east would be 25 additional feet, which would make it 190 feet south of the section line. In response, Mr. Moody stated that he believes Mr. Stump is correct and it would be 25 feet rather than 35 feet.

Ms. Bayles asked if the new entrance would be directly across from the drive of the home to the west. In response, Mr. Moody stated that he didn't think it would be directly across. In response, Mr. Stump stated that the new access would be north toward 51st Street.

Mr. Moody introduced his client, Mr. Sam Young. He indicated that Mr. Young offices in the subject building and has seen the traffic.

Sam Young, 4004 East 51st Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74135, stated that he does respect his neighbor's comments because traffic has always been a consideration along 51st Street. The contributing factors along 51st Street are the eating establishments on the north side of 51st Street and not the businesses on the south side. Most of the accidents that occur in front of his location are due to people turning into the Piccadilly parking lot.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Young if he was the occupant of the residence where the business is located. In response, Mr. Young answered affirmatively.

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Young if he would continue to be the occupant of the new building. In response, Mr. Young stated that he plans to occupy the subject building until he either changes it or sells it.

Mr. Harmon asked Mr. Young if he tore down the old building and built a new one would it increase the traffic on Oswego. In response, Mr. Young stated that it would not increase the traffic, but it would give him a better building to work out of and a better configuration for egress/ingress. Mr. Young requested that the Planning Commission extend him the same boundaries as Springer Clinic to the west and the other building to the east.

Ms. Coutant asked Mr. Young if he would be renting out space to anyone in the new proposed building. In response, Mr. Young stated that he has no idea if he would rent out space. He explained that his plans are to get rid of the old building and have a better approach.

Ms. Coutant asked Mr. Young if he would be the sole occupant of the subject building. In response, Mr. Young stated that currently he is the sole occupant.

Ms. Coutant asked Mr. Young how long he planned to stay in the new building. In response, Mr. Young stated that he has been occupying the existing building for four years and he may there another twenty years. He commented that his wife runs the business located in the existing building and he works for her as an accountant.

Mr. Westervelt stated that the rezoning of the 25 feet to OL would improve the access and the small amount of extra land being rezoned would not have a critical impact on the neighborhood. This would also improve the access to the subject property.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Dick, Horner "absent") to recommend **APPROVAL** of the OL zoning for the additional 25 feet and recommend **DENIAL** of the PK zoning for Z-6873.

Legal Description for Z-6873:

The South 25 feet of the North 190 feet of the Easterly 100 feet of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (NE/4 NW/4) of Section 33, Township 19 North, Range 13 East of the I. B. M., Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U. S. Government survey thereof, **from RS-3 (Residential Single-family High Density District) To OL (Office Low Intensity District).**

OTHER BUSINESS:

Application No.: PUD-579-A

DETAIL SITE PLAN

Applicant: F. Scott Ferguson

(PD-18) (CD-8)

Location: Northwest corner of East 81st Street and Highway 169 South

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for a new medical office building. The proposed use is in conformance with PUD-579-A Development Standards.

The proposed one-story office building meets all setback requirements and height restrictions. All mechanical areas are to be screened and a screened bulk trash enclosure is planned on the northeast corner of the building. The site meets all street yard and landscaped area minimum requirements. Proposed parking and building lighting meet the height and light element visibility restrictions.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-579-A Detail Site Plan as submitted.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute sign or landscape plan approval.)

Applicant was not present.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of HILL, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the detail site plan for PUD-579-A as recommended by staff.

Application No.: PUD-649

DETAIL SITE PLAN

Applicant: John (Jack) Arnold

(PD-6) (CD-9)

Location: 33rd Street South and South Birmingham Avenue

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting approval of a detail site plan for a gated entry to the Birmingham Square residential subdivision. Development Standards require that the entry gates receive Detail Site Plan approval from TMAPC, Traffic Engineering and Tulsa Fire Department prior to issuance of a building permit. The plans submitted have been reviewed and approved by both Traffic Engineering and the Fire Marshall.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-649 Detail Site Plan as submitted.

(Note: Detail site plan approval does not constitute sign or landscape plan approval.)

Applicant was not present.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **CARNES**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the detail site plan for PUD-649 as recommended by staff.

Application No.: PUD-417

REVISED DETAIL SIGN PLAN

Applicant: Charles Norman

(PD-6) (CD-4)

Location: 21st and Utica, St. John's Hospital

Staff Recommendation:

The applicant is requesting approval of revisions to an approved detail sign plan. Although the signs are directional in function, they are larger than the maximum three square feet permitted by the Zoning Code. In January of 2002, the Board of Adjustment and Planning Commission provided relief from restrictions regarding size, height and location of these signs. Therefore, in the absence of such standards, staff has deemed Planning Commission review of subsequent plans appropriate.

Six types of directional signs are proposed in the revised sign plan. All are consistent in color and cohesive in design. Sizes and types proposed are appropriate for the locations indicated. Of note, however, are the signs "D-1" and "A-1" located in Development Area B on the west side of Wheeling Avenue, but adjacent to residential. At 9'10" (height) 51 sq. ft. (display surface area) and 21' (height) 92 sq. ft. (display surface area), respectively, these signs would typically not be appropriate adjacent to residential uses. However, the residential uses on the east side of Wheeling are owned by St. John and are part of their Health System. If the proposed revisions to the detail sign plan are approved, the signs "D-1" and "A-1" noted above should not be considered a precedent for approval of similar signs located adjacent to residential uses.

Staff recommends **APPROVAL** of PUD-417 Revised Detail Sign Plan as submitted.

Applicant's Comments:

Charles Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, stated that he is in agreement with the staff's recommendation; however, in January 2002, the Planning Commission approved a request to delegate authority to the staff to approve these kinds of building identification and directional signs within the 25-acre campus of St. Johns. There are a total of approximately 75 signs, and in this instance because of some fairly significant changes in the original

plan, staff has chosen to bring this application back to the Planning Commission for detail sign plan approval, but he hopes that staff would still be able to interpret the January 23, 2002 approval. If signage changes are submitted to the staff in the future, then the authority to the staff would still be in existence to approve the detail sign plans, unless, as in this case, staff determines it should come back before the Planning Commission for approval because it deviates from one of the standards.

TMAPC Comments:

Mr. Harmon stated that he believes it is safe to say that staff can act with the approved authority that they have, but they can certainly feel free to bring anything back for review. In response, Mr. Norman stated that he agrees with Mr. Harmon's statement and he doesn't object to the staff bringing this application before the Planning Commission, but he hopes to preserve the original concept that he wouldn't have to return to the Planning Commission each time of the 3' x 3' signs within the campus are changed or relocated.

Ms. Bayles stated that she is a nearby resident of St. Johns Medical Center and the changes in the signage have been a vast improvement.

Mr. Norman stated that it has been an enormous chore for architect Pam Deathrage, and the staff to establish procedures to do this, but he believes everyone is on track now to administer the standards appropriately in the future.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford, Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the revised detail sign plan as recommended by staff.

Review/Accept TMAPC Meeting Dates for 2003.

2 0 0 3 SCHEDULE

Tulsa Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (TMAPC)

Regular meetings of the TMAPC are held on Wednesdays at 1:30 p.m. in the Francis F. Campbell City Council Room, Plaza Level, Tulsa Civic Center.

Regular work sessions of the TMAPC Comprehensive Plan Committee, Rules and Regulations Committee, Community Participation Committee and/or Budget and Work Program Committee are held on the third meeting of each month following regular TMAPC business in Room 1102 of City Hall.

JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH
8th	5 th	5th
22nd	19 th	19th
29th (Work session)	26th (Work session)	26th (Work session)
APRIL	MAY	JUNE
2nd	7 th	4th
16th	21 st	18th
23rd (Work session)	28th (Work session)	25th (Work session)

JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER
2nd	6 th	3rd
16th	20 th	17th
23rd (Work session)	27th (Work session)	24th (Work session)
OCTOBER	NOVEMBER	DECEMBER
1st	5 th	3rd
15th	19th (Work session)	17 th (Work session)
22nd (Work session)		

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:

On **MOTION** of **WESTERVELT**, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Bayles, Carnes, Coutant, Harmon, Hill, Jackson, Ledford; Midget, Westervelt "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Dick, Horner "absent") to **APPROVE** the 2003 TMAPC meeting dates as recommended by staff.

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

Date Approved:

12/18/02



Chairman

ATTEST Mary E. Hill
Secretary