

PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan *Comments and Responses - Summary on the Final Draft*

The following comments were made on the Final Draft of the PLANiTULSA Comprehensive Plan (posted on www.PLANiTULSA.com). These comments were made after January 14, 2009. The first column shows the section or page number of the comment, if applicable. The second column shows the comment as made (these are not edited); and the third column notes the consultants response to these issues. When the comments are general opinions that do not need a response, the third column is left blank.

The comments are organized into three categories:

- a. General comments or comments of support or opposition that do require a specific response.
- b. Clean up and corrections that are not substantive (i.e. typos, clarifications, verbiage)
- c. Framing of issues that need to be discussed and resolved by TMAPC (i.e. specific goal and policy language)

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Excellent plan. Couple of things need to start right away...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete the Gilcrease Expressway as soon as possible. 2. Start converting all municipal and county-owned vehicles to CNG. Do 20% a year. Finish by 2015. 3. Start the detailed transportation planning this spring. Start building a light rail system by 2015. Finish it in 2020. <p>Obviously, these are no more than "details" in a very big picture that has to come together consistently but they are "markers" we should start putting down now.</p> <p>This is a very ambitious plan. It is both creative and thoughtful. If Tulsa actually looked and worked like this, people would fight for the chance to live here. Do NOT let this die because finances look gloomy this year. There are enough of us here to pay for this and make it happen. We're not afraid to do this or spend money for it. We don't want our leaders to be afraid, either. We want to see them out front, making a difference.</p> <p>"Make no little plans..."</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>One thing I haven't seen mentioned in the plan is the need to address signage in Tulsa. Our overabundance of pole signs, billboards and Vegas-like digital signs are a big impediment to creating an attractive, livable city. Indeed, changing the sign ordinances to restrict the height, size and number of signs allowed per lot (as well as the brightness of digital signs), would have a profound impact upon the desirability of our public right of way.</p> <p>We can't create inviting, walkable streets without addressing the issue of ugly, ubiquitous visual clutter.</p> <p>I also wonder if there should be some statement offering guidance about PUDs. Obviously, the new plan (and suggested changes to the zoning code) should lessen the need for PUDs. At least theoretically. In practice, we seem to have an addiction to PUDs, which are not necessarily used to create unique, higher quality developments. Instead, they are generally used to mass together lots for inappropriate, large-scale, suburban-style developments. How do we break this habit? Can we offer guidelines that would enable the TMAPC to "just say no?"</p>	<p><i>Signage – this issue can be addresses during ordinance amendments, if desired.</i></p> <p><i>PLANiTULSA provides guidelines for desired future development. Policies in the plan as well as the strategic plan recommend that zoning ordinances be amended to accommodate the development desired by citizens and stakeholders. These policies also recommend the use of PUDs to accommodate proposals where innovative development is not allowed by the development codes.</i></p>
	<p>Not at all happy that revisions are being posted without anything showing what changes have been made. Am I expected to re-read everything all over again hoping I catch all changes? Very disappointed.</p>	<p><i>Tracking logs were posted on the website indicating changes that were made to the initial posted draft.</i></p>
	<p>I have always enjoyed walking to town. When I lived in Brookside, I daily walked downtown using Cincinnati and the Midland Valley Trail and alleyways and side streets. I walked a total of 8 miles per day. Now I live closer to downtown and still do this. I enjoy seeing more pedestrians uptown these days. In the past years I shared the sidewalk with only the homeless. I no longer have a grocery store within walking distance (except the Quik Trip) so would welcome that option. What is the old Homeland at Denver and 12th being used for? Is it for sale?</p>	

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>The plan should include planning on how Tulsa deals with municipal waste stream management. With the construction, demolition, renovation and infill development proposed in the plan, we should seek greener solutions to how to address the waste generated in these processes.</p> <p>8,000 lbs of waste are typically thrown into the landfill during the construction of a 2,000 square foot home. Annually, builders in the United States generate approximately 31.5 million tons of construction waste, almost 24 percent of the total municipal solid waste in this country. When over 50% of that waste can be recycled there is no reason for it to go into the landfill. A construction recycling program for commercial, industrial, residential and transportation construction should be discussed, considered and included in the plan as a possible greener solution to this issue.</p> <p>Deconstruction, as opposed to traditional demolition, is also a greener solution that would provide new green collar jobs, promote construction and demolition waste recycling while creating green jobs in a new recycling market in Tulsa, thereby reducing the impact of construction and demolition debris waste streams on municipal landfills.</p>	<p><i>Agreed, this is an important component of encouraging more sustainable development. The PLANiTULSA prototype demonstration projects detailed in the Strategic Plan could include a waste-stream management and best practices component. Furthermore, information about such measures should be included in the one-stop-shop for permitting and zoning.</i></p> <p><i>The city may elect to adopt incentives (e.g. discounted permit fees) that encourage waste reduction, waste-stream diversion, and other measures.</i></p>
	<p>I searched the transportation section for the word age, aging, elderly, old, older, etc and found one statement that the old and young may be killed on page 32. I emailed long ago about the horrible sidewalks, telephone poles in the middle of the walk, along S. Lewis across from Southern Hills and south you see people walking on hillocks or below street grade being spewed with drainage from rain or snow. AARP recently emailed "Planning Complete Streets for an Aging America" a research report developed by a consortium traffic experts. Hope Planitulsa will somehow consider the content. Thanks.</p>	<p><i>PLANiTULSA promotes safer streets and broadens transportation options primarily through the recommendation to use context sensitive solutions processes. These processes include a detailed review of existing conditions, the needs of the community, and draw upon citywide implementation tools to make improvements. In addition, PLANiTULSA emphasizes providing transportation options such as walking and biking in future transportation projects.</i></p>

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>I would like to see the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan in it's entirety, as adopted by the Tulsa City Council to fulfill requirements a Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Oklahoma Department of Civil Emergency Management (ODCEM), be implemented and incorporated into the plan. It might not be a bad idea to even add an entire section to the plan covering hazard mitigation planning to address the goals of the Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan by making Tulsa a more disaster resistant community in our planning, with special emphasis on, including but not limited to, building codes for commercial and residential properties, municipal facilities, infrastructure, and transportation systems. Proactive planning to mitigate natural or manmade disasters, as opposed to a reactive plans, are a much more cost effective approach to manage times of emergency and to reduce the potential costs associated with the damage, destruction, or disruptions caused by disaster events including loss of life and losses to the local economy. Making Tulsa more disaster resistant will make it a more desirable place to live, work and play. I hope this will be considered and included, or at least discussed for inclusion in the final draft of the plan.</p>	<p><i>Plans that have been adopted prior to the PLANiTULSA plan remain in effect. PLANiTULSA recommends that some plans (e.g. neighborhood plans, etc.) be reviewed and amended so they are aligned with Our Vision for Tulsa and the general goals of PLANiTULSA.</i></p>
	<p>I am very concerned about ratifying this Plan for the entire city. I have heard that our present system is 30 years old. I say if it aint broke don't fix it.</p> <p>I think it will put undue stress on many levels of development. Please pass this around to the TMAPC board members as my veto.</p>	
	<p>P.21: "Implications for the land use planning program include the need for an expanded and improved one-stop-shop permitting process so developers can easily build new space for small businesses and housing for their workers." (This statement is echoed on P.61). AMEN!</p>	<p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 23, paragraph 3]</p>

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>P. 49: “The challenge in these places is to preserve character without preventing residents from reinvesting in their homes to meet contemporary standards.”</p> <p>Agreed that this is a challenge. There are means available to “preserve” the character of a neighborhood. To build something specific into the plan is fraught with peril. An effort was made to introduce Neighborhood Conservation Districts a couple of years ago. It met very strong resistance and resulted in at least one city councilor losing her seat. Be very careful here.</p>	<p><i>No change needed.</i></p> <p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 54, 2nd column, paragraph 2, last sentence]</p>
	<p>P. 58: “If each neighborhood plan includes its own zoning designations, its own design standards, or its own street types, over time Tulsa’s planning and zoning would become hopelessly complex and fragmented.”</p> <p>Agreed! However, other parts of this plan seem to promote just that.</p>	<p><i>Small area plans are not intended to have their own zoning districts, but to draw upon a city-wide set of zoning districts and investment tools.</i></p> <p><i>Note appendix items regarding tools for small area plans.</i></p> <p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 63, paragraph 2, third sentence]</p>
	<p>Goal 15: A couple of items in here talk about “development incentives”. This is a great approach. If you mandate something, people are always looking for a “work-around”. If you provide incentives, people are always looking for ways to comply to get those incentives.</p>	<p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Land Use Chapter, Page 83, Goal 15]</p>
	<p>Part III, Goal 5.2: "Maintain and expand incentives of rehabilitation of existing housing in targeted areas."</p> <p>We like this. The use of incentives instead of mandates is a positive approach.</p>	<p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Housing Chapter, Page 12, Policy 5.2]</p>

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Part III, Goal 5.3 references a "streamlined permitting process".</p> <p>Very important goal. This cannot be overemphasized.</p>	<p>[Reference is to Working Draft; Location of comment in Final Draft: Housing Chapter, Page 12, Policy 5.3]</p>
	<p>I think the parks section is good, but there is no mention of "dog parks". I am relatively new to Tulsa and I am amazed at the low number of dog parks and the locations of the existing ones. They are not very accessible. As I compare the existing dog parks to other parks in Tulsa, the ratio of dog park users seem to outnumber usage of other parks by at least 3 to 1. The dog parks are used every day as opposed to the other parks being used mainly on weekends. You speak of a sense of community, dog owners have something in common, and that makes way for meeting new friends. I urge you to take a look at new dog park locations, accessible by paths to down town and mid town residents. Charging a quarter for each use could be instituted to maintain the purchase of waste bags, water, maintenance etc. The dog parks in Houston have swimming ponds for the dogs with fenced sections for large and small dogs. If the park was near the river, it seems a water circulation system could be powered by a solar source and the water could be shut off in the colder months.</p>	<p><i>The parks chapter does not focus on specific types of facilities, such as dog parks. Implementation of the recently prepared Parks Plan will address specific programming needs. In addition, the small area planning process should be used to identify where and how to incorporate specific programming needs in the park system.</i></p>
	<p>Many in our neighborhood have spoken and requested that 76th Street between Sheridan and Memorial be opened on the east end of the street with a left turn opening from 76th Street to go north on Memorial. A man was killed around Christmas trying to make a left turn (north) onto Memorial off of 76th Street. He turned into the oncoming traffic. There are numerous other turn lanes into the are - this is a much more logical location and one needed.</p>	

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the "Our Vision for Tulsa" document. I am a retired City Planner with 38 years of experience in the public and private sectors in Colorado and California including almost 25 years as a planning director and community development director.</p> <p>My opinion of the document is that the graphics are nice, but the vision is mostly fluff - mom and apple pie. I am reminded of an old Richard Hedman cartoon that shows two planners talking. One planner says to the other, "Ideally, all your policies cancel each other out. That's the only way you can do whatever you want and still get federal funds."</p> <p>Many of the vision concepts conflict with one another. Further, it appears to me there is nothing in the vision that indicates we are going to do anything to curb urban sprawl, revitalize or redevelop existing dead or near dead shopping centers (or improve the appearance - landscaping - of new ones), or really revitalize the downtown.</p> <p>I realized long ago that no city council member and no city manager can ever say no to proposed new retail or office development and that developers, as a group, are incapable of preventing themselves from overbuilding. The result in Tulsa and almost every other city has been a huge over-supply of retail shopping centers and office development. The unfortunate result in many cities, and Tulsa, is deteriorating downtowns and deteriorating older shopping centers and office buildings. Cities, beginning primarily in the 1950's, started approving shopping centers, office buildings, and residential development all over the place; and urban sprawl became rampant. Those factors, along with the oil and automobile companies buying the streetcar operations and shutting them down, caused downtowns to decline. Unless there is strong political commitment and leadership to revitalize downtown Tulsa, and I suspect there isn't, it isn't going to happen.</p> <p>(continued below)</p>	

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>(continued)</p> <p>If downtown is going to be revitalized, then the Comprehensive Plan is going to have to say something like no more new office buildings of more than 40,000 square feet in area will be allowed outside the downtown. It is my impression from a recent tour that most of the beautiful and historic buildings in the downtown are vacant or underutilized. They are going to stay that way unless there is a major political commitment to filling them up.</p> <p>There needs to be similar policies for multi-family residential, movie theatres, restaurants, etc. The survey results showed that half of survey respondents would choose to live in an existing neighborhood rather than downtown. That's not surprising considering the current state of downtown Tulsa. There are, however, downtowns in other cities, in which I, and many others, would like to live: San Francisco, Portland, Boston, even Fort Worth. Unfortunately, it's a vicious circle. If people don't want to live downtown, there isn't going to be a strong downtown. To have a strong downtown, people have to live there. Downtown retail is probably a lost cause until there is a significant downtown residential population.</p> <p>I think the transportation issue is very difficult. The population densities in Tulsa are not sufficient to support any form of mass transit other than bus (and probably not even bus); and the "quick reliable bus" noted in the document is an oxymoron. I have become convinced over the years that no one is going to ride a bus if there is any other way to get where they need to go. They will ride streetcars however, the older and quaint the better.</p> <p>A streetcar line from the north into downtown, then out along Fourth Street, and up Peoria by Cherry Street and through Brookside would be very nice and, I think, utilized.</p> <p>I think that the challenge to the consultants for Portland is: What policies, strategies, codes, and ordinances are necessary to get the "Pearl District," in downtown Tulsa and limit urban sprawl. The vision as drafted isn't going to cut it.</p>	

Page #	General Comments/Questions	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Please make the proposed rail connection to the Tulsa Airport more explicit. There needs to be an intermodal connection there.</p>	
	<p>I strongly support the Planit Tulsa recommendations, but am extremely disappointed that the Tulsa Metropolitan Transit Authority budget has been cut by 31%, resulting in driver layoffs, route cancellation (Cherokee Industrial Park), and reduced runs on other routes. Instead, our city leaders have spend the federal stimulus transportation funds on building more highways and bridges, which will cause more traffic congestion and force Tulsa onto the EPA dirty air list.</p>	

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
<p>Our Vision For Tulsa, Page 6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision, page 6, the last bullet point is missing a word or phrase. • Land use, page 14, chart 7, three shadings on graph per se, whereas there are four categories shown. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The <u>city</u> has the ability to monitor trends, spot key opportunities and meet challenges strategically.</i> • <i>Will correct chart on page 14 for consistent chart/legend</i>
	<p>I would like to make you aware of an incorrect statement that is appearing in the plan document and on your website. The TMAPC adopts the plan and the city council approves the plan the reverse is the way it is being presented. I have tried to emphasize this distinction every time I see it but to no avail. This is not my interpretation but State Statutes (Title 19, Section 863.7) language where the authority is derived. The very first sentence in 19-863.7 states, "The commission shall make, adopt, and may publish a master plan of the municipality, and of the unincorporated area of the county...". Further it states, "The council and/or board may approve the plan in whole or in part, or return the plan or any portion thereof to the commission for further consideration." For some unknown reason from the beginning there has been an effort to minimize the role the</p>	<p><i>Language has been clarified on website.</i></p> <p><i>Clarify with underlined language</i></p> <p><i>2.5 The Land Use Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is adopted by <u>TMAPC and approved by City Council.</u></i> • <i>Is amended by <u>TMAPC and approved by City Council.</u></i> <p><i>The PLANiTULSA team has consistently respected the role of both the TMAPC and the City Council in the preparation and review of</i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
	<p>TMAPC has in the comp plan to emphasize the city's role. I plan to make sure this correction is made in the TMAPC public hearing.</p>	<p><i>the Comprehensive Plan. Both the TMAPC and the City Council are tremendously important to the success and implementation of PLANiTULSA. The team has tried to use common language - rather than technical jargon - where possible to make the plan as easy to read and access as possible.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to the legal authority for review, TMAPC has the background and depth of understanding of land use issues necessary to review and adopt the plan. The City has additional tools to implement the plan.</i></p> <p>The team's approach has always been that TMAPC and City Council both play critical roles in plan development.</p>
<p>Land Use Chapter, Page 17, paragraph 2, last sentence</p>	<p>P.19: "Revisions to the zoning code based on market-test prototypical developments (described below) will greatly enhance Tulsa's redevelopment climate." This statement is not strong enough. We believe that revising the zoning code is essential. How can this new plan work with the old code? We question how this can even go forward under the existing zoning code.</p>	<p><i>Amend sentence to emphasize: "Revisions to the zoning code based on prototypical developments (described below) are crucial for enhancing Tulsa's redevelopment environment."</i></p>
<p>Comment reference: Land Use Chapter, Page 18-19, last paragraph.</p> <p>Suggested amendment: Transportation Appendix II: Sustainable Network Initiative,</p>	<p>P.20: The second paragraph promotes the benefits of connectivity.</p> <p>While we agree in general with this statement, it must be balanced by the strong market preference for cul-de-sacs. Cul-de-sacs are the antithesis of connectivity, but they are something which sought after by the buying public of Tulsa. This could be a difficult balance.</p>	<p><i>Cul de sacs are popular and provide an amenity. However, too many can cause a lack of connectivity which has been proven to increase congestion on the order of 20 to 30 percent. We believe that Tulsa can continue to allow cul de sacs but also require through-connections on the order of six to eight per mile. This allows cul de sacs on the range of 200 to 250 feet in length.</i></p> <p><i>Consultant has revised Transportation Appendix II: Sustainable Network Initiative to clarify street connectivity recommendations.</i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
<p>pg 29-30</p> <p>Land Use Chapter, Page 33, paragraph 2, sentence #3</p>	<p>1. Page 33 - Existing Residential Neighborhood section - Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation or improvement of existing homes, or small-scale infill that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm, and proportion as seen from the street.</p> <p>What complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion is to broad and open to interpretation and likely will result in frequent conflicts. This same statement is made in other parts of the Land Use Chapter and needs to be eliminated there as well. Also, this will slow down the permitting process if the Permitting Department has to approve consistent in form, scale, rhythm, and proportion and what complements the character of the neighborhood. They don't have the personnel to do this. This will not accomplish Tulsa being a friendly place to do business. It would be a good idea to let the neighborhood planning groups take care of this. Small-scale infill redevelopment allows the owner the option to demolish and rebuild, if desired.</p> <p>Suggested Change - eliminate "small-scale infill that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion as seen from the street" and add "small-scale infill redevelopment."</p>	<p><i>Replace text with: "Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code."</i></p>
<p>Land Use Chapter, Page 33, paragraph 2, sentence #3</p>	<p>P.30: <i>[Final Draft version referenced here]</i> On existing residential neighborhoods: 'Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation or improvement of existing homes, or the construction of appropriately scaled new housing on vacant parcels.'</p> <p>Phil Marshall came up with preferred language: "Development activities in these areas should be limited to the revitalization, rehabilitation or improvement of existing homes, or the construction of new housing on small parcels."</p> <p>Phil's language does not prohibit the right to tear down the existing structure and put up a new one. There seems to be a strong bias towards this type of activity throughout the document. All too often homes are neglected beyond the point of rehabilitation. Property owners MUST be given the right to replace undesirable structures.</p>	<p><i>Replace text with: "Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code."</i></p>
<p>Land Use</p>	<p>P. 47: <i>[Final Draft version referenced here]</i> "The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while</p>	<p><i>Replace text with: "The ideal for the Areas of</i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
Chapter, Page 47, paragraph 3, last sentence	accommodating appropriate development and reinvestment." Phil Marshall expressed concern about the use of the word "appropriate". We note that this was changed in the "Final Draft". While the word "appropriate" was removed, it was replaced with requirements of "form, scale, rhythm and proportion." Some clarity is sought on these terms. Overseeing the form and rhythm of a project sound very arbitrary.	<i>Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating redevelopment, reinvestment and infill."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 52, paragraph 3, last sentence	Page 52 - Areas of Stability - insert period after reinvestment and eliminate the sentence "that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportions." See #1 above for explanation.	<i>Replace text with: "The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating redevelopment, reinvestment and infill."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 56, paragraph 3, first sentence	P. 51: [Final Draft version referenced here] Plan categories: "These plan categories are to be implemented by zoning regulations that ensure the appropriate shape, scale, and make-up of development with the district." Again, this repeats a continuing theme of governmental control over the appearance of homes. We echo our concerns about opening the door to Neighborhood Conservation Districts.	<i>Replace first sentence with: "These plan categories are implemented by zoning regulations, which apply setback, height, and other development standards."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 64, paragraph 3	We believe there should be a separate master plan for downtown.	<i>Add language to end of paragraph 3: "The Downtown Area Master Plan should be reviewed by TMAPC and considered as a potential Small Area Plan. Many of the ideas and concepts suggested in the current version of the downtown plan also are recommended in PLANiTULSA. Any possible inconsistencies between the two plans should be resolved if and when the downtown plan is adopted."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 75, Policy 2.9, bullet #4	3. Page 75 - Paragraph 2.9 - eliminate the paragraph " Small-scale infill that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion, as seen from the street." See #1 above for explanation.	<i>Replace bullet #4 with: "Small-scale infill, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 75, Policy 2.9,	The same language referencing "rhythm and proportion" are mentioned again in Goal 2.9 and Goal 13 of the Final Draft.	<i>Replace bullet #4 with: "Small-scale infill, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the</i>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
bullet #4		<i>zoning code."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 77, Policy 5.1, bullet #9	<p>Goal 5.1: "Address potential conflicts with historic development patterns and mass and scale of buildings in the underlying zoning of historic zone patterns."</p> <p>We're not certain what this means and would appear to open a door to excessive regulation.</p>	<i>Remove bullet #9: it is a confusing statement.</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 81, Goal 13	<p>4. Page 81 - Goal 13 - eliminate "existing neighborhoods are stable and infill development is complementary in form, scale, rhythm and proportion."</p> <p>Suggested Change - Existing neighborhoods are stable and infill development should revitalize, preserve and enhance these urban areas. See #1 above for explanation</p>	<i>Replace text with: "Existing neighborhoods are stable and infill development revitalizes, preserves and enhances these urban areas."</i>
Land Use Chapter, Page 82, Policy 14.2	<p>5. Page 82 - Goal 14, Paragraph 14.2 - Assume that Neighborhood Plans & Small Area Plans support preservation objectives.</p> <p>Suggested Addition - after preservation, add "and revitalization."</p>	<i>Replace Policy 14.2 text with: "Assure that Neighborhood Plans & Small Area Plans support preservation and revitalization objectives."</i>
Housing Chapter, Page 7, Paragraph two, final sentence	<p>P.9 of Working Draft [<i>Final Draft version referenced here</i>]: "Tulsa's future multi-family housing should be designed to fit into the scale of the existing neighborhoods, with high-rise unites (likely to feature spectacular views) reserved for high-density urban areas, such as the downtown core."</p> <p>How is high-rise defined? Is it wise to limit a type of housing in such a broad manner?</p>	<i>Replace sentence with the following: "Tulsa's future multi-family housing will vary in size and style and be designed to fit into the scale of the existing neighborhoods. For example, high-rise units will be reserved for higher density urban areas."</i>
Housing Chapter, Page 11, Policy 1.6	<p>Part III, Goal 1.6: "Require that infill in historic neighborhoods is compatible in style and scale."</p> <p>Very strong language. How is a "historic neighborhood" defined? Who determines what is a compatible style? Isn't this potentially subjective?</p>	<p><i>Per other comments, Final Draft includes Policy 5.6 to create an infill and revitalization toolkit.</i></p> <p><i>Remove Housing Policy 1.6 from Final Draft, in light of this language.</i></p>
Housing Chapter, Page 13, Policy 9.2	<p>Part III, Goal 9.2: "Work with developers to promote more development of LEED and other accredited "green" residential projects."</p> <p>Recommend striking "LEED and other". There are many other programs out there; most notably the National Green Buliding Standard, which is the only standard certified by ANSI. This standard is not only ANSI</p>	<i>Replace policy 9.2 language with "Work with developers and stakeholders to promote the development of more "green" projects, based on a performance standard or building efficiency and sustainability rating program.</i>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
	<p>certified but allows for "green" to be achieved on a much more cost effective basis. Why name LEED as if it is the only way to go?</p>	<p><i>The performance standard should be based on a widely accepted and measurable methodology."</i></p>
<p>Small Area Planning Land Use Chapter and Appendix</p>	<p>Some question arose about the concept of Small Area Plans. How is this different than PUDs?</p> <p>Define citizen advisory committees</p> <p>Define where small area plans should be used</p>	<p><i>Add to Land Use Chapter, page 62, intro to Small Area Planning process and Intro to Small Area Plan Appendix (existing language is quoted for context):</i></p> <p><i>"The small area planning process should be used in areas where significant change is expected and the development in question would be at the scale of a new neighborhood and include many landowners. For example, when there is a proposal to extend utilities and infrastructure to an undeveloped area that will support a large number of new households or jobs, a small area plan should be used to guide that development. Small area plans do not need to be used for more routine planning actions, such as developments or subdivisions of land under single ownership. In these instances, a subdivision, zone change, PUD or other process under the zoning code is sufficient. However, individual landowners may elect to do a small area plan if they choose. Another instance where this process should be used is in already-developed areas where new growth or redevelopment is expected, such as neighborhoods along a corridor that will receive significant transit investments."</i></p> <p><i>Amend language describing Citizens Advisory Committee with underlined text: <u>A citizen advisory committee is a group of informed</u></i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
		<p><u><i>citizen stakeholders - architects, businesses, developers, builders and landowners - representing a full range of interests who meet on a regular basis to critically review analysis and products at each step of plan formation.</i></u></p> <p>Add underlined text:</p> <p>Small Area Planning <i>The primary means of implementing the PLANiTULSA comprehensive plan should be through the small area and neighborhood planning process. This process can apply to existing neighborhoods in need of revitalization, main streets or other corridors, and vacant areas where new communities are envisioned.</i></p> <p>What Is a Small Area Plan? <i>Prior to the PLANiTULSA comprehensive plan update, INCOG and Tulsa’s Planning Department began working with selected communities to create neighborhood plans. The small area and neighborhood planning process will be an important implementation element of the comprehensive plan. To ensure consistency between these plans and overarching city goals, this section lays out a process for how to conduct small area plans and use their results to direct zoning, infrastructure, and other implementation elements. A small area plan is any plan that addresses the issues of a portion of the city. Small area plans can cover as little as 10 acres or even thousands. <u>Small areas usually have a cohesive set of characteristics, such as an existing or future corridor, center, or</u></i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
		<p><i>other element. While small area plans can include both areas of change and areas of stability as well as transition areas, the city should focus the small area planning resources where change is anticipated and desired, predominantly in areas of change. The advantage of a small area plan is its ability to engage issues and people at an intimate scale. The result can be a richly detailed plan that addresses the area's unique issues with tailored solutions.</i></p> <p>Where Should Small Area Planning Take Place?</p> <p><i>The small area planning process should be used in areas where significant change is expected and the development in question would be at the scale of a new neighborhood and include many landowners. For example, when there is a proposal to extend utilities and infrastructure to an undeveloped area that will support a large number of new households or jobs, a small area plan should be used to guide that development. Small area plans may be conducted in Areas of Stability, but the time and resources are better put to use in Areas of Change.</i></p> <p><i>Small area plans do not need to be used for more routine planning actions, such as developments or subdivisions of land under single ownership. In these instances, a subdivision, zone change, PUD or other process under the zoning code is sufficient. However, individual landowners of large tracts</i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
		<p><u>may elect to do a small area plan if they choose. Another instance where this process should be used is in already-developed areas where new growth or redevelopment is expected, such as neighborhoods along a corridor that will receive significant transit investment.</u></p>
<p>Comments Appendix Transportation</p>	<p>Page 14 shows the Primary Arterial cross-section under the Current Urban Arterial heading. That is incorrect. Please replace with the Current Urban Arterial cross-section.</p> <p>[pg 14] The Main Street with Angled Parking option was removed entirely. It did not need to be removed. Use the ITE standards for angle parking and adjacent lane dimensions.</p> <p>On Page 18, the Secondary Arterial, Multi-Modal Street cross-section shows 10' inside lane width, with 10' sidewalks. Change the inside lane width to 11', and reduce the sidewalk width to 9'.</p> <p>On Page 25, for the current 26' Residential Collector, show 26' as minimum for the cross-section.</p> <p>Leave the 36' Residential Collector as is, based on previous comments: In the 36' Residential Collector typical section, the travel lanes should be changed to 22 feet minimum. The typical right-of-way existing for these streets is 50 feet. Therefore, the sidewalk should be shown as 6' and the strip between remain as 8', or vice-versa.</p>	<p><i>Agree, make all corrections to cross-sections in Final Draft of Appendix Transportation I: Context Sensitive Solutions Process</i></p>
<p>Comments Appendix Transportation</p>	<p>Page 42 – In the second sentence of the fourth paragraph in Appendix 1, the sentence should read, "...to create, but the result is...". Under Project Development Process- Network Alternative Analysis, the abbreviation "r-o-w's" should be spelled out as "Rights-of-Way".</p> <p>Page 43 – Under Project Development Process – Multi-Modal Alternative Analysis, in the last paragraph, the first sentence, the word "where" should be replaced with "were".</p>	<p><i>Agree, make all corrections in Final Draft of Appendix Transportation I: Context Sensitive Solutions Process</i></p>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
	<p>Page 44 – Under Project Development Process – Subdivision Connectivity Analysis, in the last sentence of the first paragraph, the word “comprehensible” should be changed to “sensible”. Under this section, an example would be very useful, perhaps with a sample map used to show calculation of the connectivity ratio.</p> <p>In the Institute Context-Sensitive Solutions and Design section, in the third paragraph, the second sentence, the word “placemaking” is misspelled. The third sentence needs semi-colons after “New York City;” and after “urban vitality;”</p>	<p><i>Consultant has revised Transportation Appendix II: Sustainable Network Initiative to clarify street connectivity recommendations.</i></p>
<p>Comments Appendix Transportation</p>	<p>Examples of the process to use Context Sensitive Design and more explanation would be beneficial.</p>	<p><i>The strategic plan will include an attachment with four suggested catalyst corridors where the CSS process could be applied.</i></p>
<p>Maps</p>	<p>City of Tulsa Staff referred comments from recent City Council meetings:</p> <p>The proposed South Tulsa Bridge at Yale and 131st was removed from the Fall 2009 draft of Our Vision For Tulsa.</p> <p>For the final draft of the Vision and Plan, it has been proposed that the consultant remove the bridge alignment from the GIS coverage and Illustrator files used to produce the maps, because a faint line still appears on a number of maps.</p>	<p><i>Consultant will remove the bridge segment from the GIS layers and Illustrator files used to produce the PLANiTULSA maps.</i></p> <p><i>All maps will be updated throughout Our Vision for Tulsa and the Policy Plan with the segments removed.</i></p>
<p>Land Use, page 74</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plan should be constantly updated and changed - look at language to recommend that plan is updated every 5 years ▪ Correct language to comply with state law 	<p><i>Clarify with underlined language</i></p> <p><i>2.5 The Land Use Plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is adopted by <u>TMAPC and approved by City Council.</u></i> • <i>Is amended by <u>TMAPC and approved by City Council.</u></i> • <i>Amendments can be initiated by landowners, the Planning Commission, or the City Council</i> • <i>Should be amended to conform to zoning changes</i>

Page #	Clean up and Corrections	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Should be amended no more than twice in a calendar year.</i> • <i><u>Should be reviewed by the Planning Commission every five years and updated, as necessary</u></i>
<p>Land Use Chapter, Page 1 and to Land Use Policy 2.6 on page 74</p>	<p>Include that this is not a regulatory document</p>	<p><i>Add underlined language: Page 1: This chapter of Tulsa’s Comprehensive Plan addresses how Our Vision for Tulsa will be realized through the use of land. <u>The Comprehensive Plan is not a regulatory document.</u> The goals and policies at the end of this chapter will guide the design of the city’s regulatory system, including the zoning code, rules governing the subdivision of land, the interaction of land use and transportation and economic development.</i></p> <p><i>Add to Land Use Policy 2.6 (pg. 74): The Comprehensive Plan is a policy guide, <u>not a regulatory document.</u> The Land Use Plan is not intended, nor should it be used, to affect decisions that are permitted by the zoning code by right.</i></p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
	<p>The bridge over 41st St makes no sense. It would compromise the value of Riverparks and bring heavy traffic from the west side of the river in to a primarily residential area on the east side. There is a bridge only 1 mile away at 51st so this also seems redundant.</p>	<p><i>This bridge is consistent with the Arkansas River Corridor Vision Plan. The possible bridge at 41st is intended to show how a better connection for pedestrians, bikes, and transit could be made to SW Tulsa. Bridge is conceptual, and would require detailed study.</i></p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retain bridge</i> • <i>Remove bridge</i>
	<p>Thanks for your presentation this evening on PlaniTulsa.</p> <p>We discussed the Xmas tree lot at 31st and I-44. That address would be approx 7600 and 7700 East 31st St. The property meanders south along the B/A I-44 on ramp westbound.</p> <p>The City did considerable Audubon Creek improvements across that property from West to East from the 1990 sales tax extension. Yet, there is still some privately owned property on the 31st street frontage and more across the creek to the south.</p> <p>It currently has a for sale sign on the property with something to the effect of "Commercial Potential." I believe it is RS-2 zoning as it has never had but one house on it which is long gone. Our HOAR fought many zoning cases on that property in the 80's and early 90's. I heard it was owned by a person who owns the large billboard lighted sign on the property.</p> <p>With lack of ingress and egress, FD zone area and the state will not allow any access from the on ramp, it would be costly to bridge the creek to access the back of the property which abuts the Magnolia Terrace Addn. And, the District 5 Comp plan currently does not recommend commercial in that area. I hope that does not change with PlaniTulsa.</p> <p>I would like to see your PlaniTulsa maps revised and remove this area from change and perhaps, classify as stable. Most residents here believe it should be open land with a mini-forest to reduce I-44 traffic noise. Please Advise.</p>	<p><i>Given limited access and constraints on the subject property, designation as Area of Change with plan category of Neighborhood Center is likely an oversight.</i></p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>include the area as an Area of Stability and/or change the plan category to Existing Neighborhood, or</i> • <i>leave the designation as it appears on the map.</i>
	<p>Remove statement permitting land owners to prepare a small area plan.</p>	<p><i>Individual land owners of large tracts may wish to prepare small area plans for their property</i></p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p><i>and submit to the city for review and approval. This is especially important for landowners holding large tracts of land and wishing to obtain buyoff on master planning their site prior to obtaining development approvals. Language is clarified that small area plans are not appropriate for individual lots.</i></p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Leave option for land owners to conduct small area plans of large tracts</i> • <i>Remove option</i>
	<p>Small area plan should be used only in areas of change</p>	<p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Leave language as amended (see above clarifications to small area planning language)</i> • <i>Stipulate that small area plans may only be prepared in areas of change</i>
	<p>Keep areas of change and remove areas of stability.</p>	<p><i>Areas of Stability are primarily the fairly stable residential neighborhoods where no significant changes in land use are expected over the next ten to twenty years. The goal is to maintain the character of these areas and accommodate some new development and redevelopment that maintains the vitality of the area. The majority of new development will be directed to Areas of Change; areas that will benefit from, and thrive on, an infusion of population, economic activity and investment.</i></p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retain areas of stability and change</i> • <i>Retain only areas of change</i> • <i>Delete areas of stability and change</i>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land use chapter recommends being amended no more than twice a calendar year so there is some stability and to monitor performance ▪ Don't want to lock them in to wait until the plan is updated twice a year. 	<p><i>Twice-annual plan amendments mean that the plan should be amended to conform to zoning changes made in the last 6-month period. This allows TMAPC to change a zone and then amend the plan to match. This allows TMAPC to make zoning changes as they are requested and does not require plan changes at every meeting, which are difficult to keep up with administratively.</i></p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retain option to update plan twice a year to be consistent with zoning changes</i> • <i>Change option to requirement that plan be updated with every zoning change approve</i> • <i>Insert another time frame for updating of plan</i>
	<p>Wayne, As I understand it the TMAPC is going to be discussing the upcoming public meetings on the PlaniTulsa process at their meeting today. As I also understand it, the “ground rules” for the meetings on Feb. 23 and March 10 will be discussed. I intended to attend today’s meeting, but will be unable due to an unexpected illness. Nevertheless, I wanted to ensure that the HBA’s concerns about the process is heard today.</p> <p>First, I would like to say that this email will not address the substantive concerns we have with PlaniTulsa at all. This is simply to communicate the problems we have observed with the procedures and a request for additional time to evaluate the substance.</p> <p>Approximately one month ago, the “Final Draft” of the plan was released. In fact, members of the HBA were meeting to evaluate the</p>	<p><i>Respondent requests that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1) public comments not be limited to 3 minutes per speaker; and</i> <i>2) that an additional 30 to 60 days be allowed for evaluation of the Final Draft.</i> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Establish speaking rules</i> • <i>Establish procedures for review</i> • <i>Continue hearings as needed</i>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
	<p>plan at the very moment the final version of the Land Use Chapter went on line. Within 2 days after that meeting, I met with Susan Neal, Theron Warlick and Martha Schulz to discuss the concerns of the HBA. A couple of weeks after that, we met with John Fregonese to continue our discussions. Following that, we met again with Ms. Neal, Mr. Warlick and Ms. Schulz. I mention the number of meetings we have had to highlight the fact that we have been <u>very</u> actively involved in the process ever since the Final Draft came out. It is against this backdrop that some are saying “What has taken you so long to bring us your concerns?”</p> <p>This is at the heart of the problems with this process. For many months, we have asked the citizens of Tulsa to share their vision and dream of a better Tulsa with Fregonese and Associates. Many of HBA’s members, including myself, participated in that process. However now that the 200+ document is available, there seems to be a mad dash across the finish line. I am told that despite our various concerns (and that we needed to express those concerns to the planning commission) we may have only 3 minutes to do so. This is shocking.</p> <p>The size of this document is huge. The ramifications this document will have on Tulsa’s future are vast. And we are limited to 3 minutes? We have taken every opportunity we could to express our concerns since the Final Draft became available. We have not been lying behind the log. However, the reality is that more time is needed: not only during the TMAPC meeting, but for additional meetings. Currently it feels as if we don’t express our concerns (within 3 minutes) by March 10, then our concerns are not valid. How can we possibly hope to have a meaningful evaluation of a 200+ page document which we control Tulsa’s future in such a short time frame? This feels frighteningly similar to the full court press which was happening in D.C. to pass a health care bill.</p>	

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
	<p>We respectfully request that: 1) public comments not be limited to 3 minutes per speaker; and 2) that an additional 30 to 60 days be allowed for evaluation of the Final Draft. In my discussions with other business groups in town, <u>not a single one</u> had actually read through the plan. Many read the Vision Statement and believed that was the plan itself. This was no fault of the readers, but due to a confusing website. Again, while months of input have been sought only a few short weeks seem to be allowed to evaluate this enormous document with lots of complex issues. Why the rush? We submit that all Tulsans will benefit from additional time to read and evaluate this document which is of utmost importance. Because, like they say, “The devil’s in the details.”</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
	<p>Wayne, as a long time builder and remodeler in Tulsa’s urban areas, I am very concerned about the rapidity of the approval process for this plan, as well as the basic make-up of the document. It is very clear to me, that the emphasis of the plan is on the “areas of change” and not on existing neighborhoods. This is, supposedly, where the growth in tax base occurs, as well as the areas where traditional <i>urban development</i> and <i>new urbanism</i> concepts most readily apply. The development community has been told repeatedly, that certainty of process is one of the primary underpinnings of this plan. Yet, very little, if anything can be done without changes to the zoning code. And no provisions for certainty are mentioned, outside these areas of change. It appears to me, in fact, that very little creativity has gone into the areas of stability, which is where Tulsa is most at risk for a declining tax base.</p> <p>Bottom line, this is moving too quickly. Some would say we’ve been working on this for over 2 years. My response is why has it taken so long to get a final draft document together, and at this point, what’s another 30-60 days to provide everyone concerned adequate time to discuss and comment?</p>	<p><i>See above</i></p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
	<p>Unfortunately, out of town business will take me away from the city for both of the scheduled TMAPC hearings.</p> <p>I urge support for Paul Kane’s recommendations. They will insure a fair and equitable process.</p>	
	<p>Define the use of the word “Protect” in the plan and replace with another word.</p>	<p><i>The word “protect: is currently used in Tulsa’s existing zoning code – in reference to residential and commercial areas:</i></p> <p>SECTION 400. PURPOSES OF RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS A. General Purposes. The Residential Districts are designed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieve the residential objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. 2. Protect the character of residential areas by excluding inharmonious commercial and industrial activities. 3. Achieve a suitable environment for family life by permitting in residential areas appropriate neighborhood facilities, such as places of worship, schools, and certain cultural and recreational facilities. 4. Preserve openness of the living areas and avoid overcrowding by requiring minimum yards, open spaces, lot areas, and by limiting the bulk of structures. 5. Permit a variety of dwelling types and densities to meet the varying needs of families. 6. Control the density of residential development to facilitate the planning for an economical provision of streets, utilities, and

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p>other public facilities.</p> <p>SECTION 700. PURPOSES OF COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS A General Purposes The Commercial Districts are designed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieve the commercial objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. 2. Meet the needs for commercial services and goods of the metropolitan area and trade area. 3. Preserve and promote the development of efficient, commercial facilities and encourage a compatible relationship between commercial facilities and other land uses and thoroughfares, by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Differentiating the types and purposes of commercial activities. b. Establishing bulk and area controls. c. Requiring off -street loading and parking facilities. d. Controlling the number, area, location, and types of signs. e. Protecting the character of commercial districts and their peculiar suitability for commercial uses <p><i>In addition, the word “protect” is used throughout the existing comprehensive plan. For example:</i></p> <p>District Plan 2 Goal 2. Modify current land use practices to more</p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p>closely reflect the existing uses and conditions within the neighborhood. Encourage infill on small lots and ensure compatible infill development in the future. Modify design and land use standards to support improved design as a means of protecting residential areas from incompatible commercial/industrial uses.</p> <p>District 5 Plan</p> <p>2. GENERAL POLICIES</p> <p>2.1 District-Wide Policies</p> <p>2.1.1 Provide a better living environment through the limitation of certain physical hazards in the area; including flooding and traffic.</p> <p>2.1.2 Protect and preserve District 5 as primarily a place to live, maintaining the quality of life in residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>4.5 Industrial Areas</p> <p>4.5.1 GOAL</p> <p>Protect the employment base by encouraging compatible industrial uses beneficial to the quality of District 5.</p> <p>4.5.2 OBJECTIVES</p> <p>4.5.2.1 Preserve and protect from encroachment those sites exhibiting desirable characteristics for industrial</p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p>development.</p> <p>District 9 Plan</p> <p>4.7.1 GOAL Identification of the areas in District 9 which either should not be developed, or should be given extreme care in development.</p> <p>4.7.2 OBJECTIVES</p> <p>4.7.2.1 The avoidance of community problems and the protection of community values through the prevention of misdevelopment in areas that is sensitive.</p> <p>4.7.2.2 The protection of the property and streams of District 9 from the erosion and siltation which potentially accompany the development of areas designated as sensitive.</p> <p>4.4 Commercial Areas</p> <p>4.4.1 GOAL To provide convenient, concentrated and efficient commercial activities which will add to the quality of the District as a self-sufficient unit of the total urban pattern.</p> <p>4.4.3.8 The former Whittier Elementary School site may be appropriate for commercial development/redevelopment. This is recommended to be through the PUD process, and extend to the alleyway between Zunis and Gillette. The development should include adequate screening and buffering to protect the</p>

Page # if Changes made	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p>residential areas on the north. Closing of one or more of the area streets should be considered to avoid commercial through-traffic in the neighborhoods.</p> <p>4.4.3.10 At such time as further commercial development occurs at the Pine/Lewis intersection, consideration should be given to protection of surrounding residential areas by cul-de-sacing and closing streets to reduce commercial through-traffic in the neighborhoods.</p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Retain the word “protect” in plan</i> • <i>Replace the word “protect” throughout the plan</i>