

## PLANITULSA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TMAPC DISCUSSION ISSUES

***The following issues need to be discussed and resolved by the TMAPC. These issues have been submitted by the TMAPC, INCOG, and the public.***

### ***5 Big Issues (see transmittal memo for details)***

Item #	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issues
1	Strategic Plan language in Final Draft of <i>Our Vision for Tulsa</i>	<p>Proposed Action: To address this issue, the Team asks the Planning Commission to consider amending <i>Our Vision for Tulsa</i> to remove the Proposed Strategies section in its entirety from the Vision (pages 4 and 40-45).</p> <p>Potential actions by the TMAPC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend <i>Our Vision for Tulsa</i> to remove pages 4 and 40 – 45</li> <li>• Retain Proposed Strategies in <i>Our Vision for Tulsa</i></li> <li>• Propose alternative amendments</li> </ul>
2	Areas of Stability and Change	<p>The Team asks that the Commission consider retaining the Areas of Stability and Change Map, as presented in the plan. Removing the Area of Stability component of the map will render the map useless for the purposes of guiding growth and development under the plan. TMAPC may elect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain areas of stability and change</li> <li>• Retain only areas of change</li> <li>• Delete areas of stability and change</li> </ul>
3	Small Area Plans in Areas of Stability	<p>Add to Land Use Chapter, page 62, intro to Small Area Planning process and Intro to Small Area Plan Appendix:</p> <p><u><i>A citizen advisory committee is an appointed group of informed citizen stakeholders including, but not limited to – landowners, residents, business owners, architects, developers, and builders who have an interest in the area. - - This advisory committee should represent 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>

Discussion Log

Item #	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issues
		<p><u>Small planning areas usually have a cohesive set of characteristics, such as an existing or future corridor, center, or other element. Accordingly, small area plans should be used in areas of change and transition areas, focusing resources where change is anticipated and desired.</u></p> <p>Potential actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept the amendment to emphasize use of small area planning resources in Areas of Change</li> <li>• Retain the existing text</li> <li>• Propose alternative amendments for Small Area Planning process</li> </ul>
4	The Scale of Small Area Plans	<p>Add to Land Use Chapter, page 62, intro to Small Area Planning process and Introduction to Small Area Plan Appendix:</p> <p><b>Where Should Small Area Planning Take Place?</b></p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>Small area plans need not 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 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>Furthermore the Team proposes to remove Land Use Policy 3.8 (Land Use Chapter, page 78), which currently reads:</p> <p>3.8 In order to ensure that new development is compatible with <i>Our Vision for Tulsa</i>, zoning change decisions for developments over 5 acres on land currently zoned agriculture and shown as “New Neighborhood” should be based on small area plans to determine appropriate zoning and densities. Other building blocks may be appropriate, as well, given service levels and development patterns.</p>

Discussion Log

Item #	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issues
		<p>This policy may be seen as overly prescriptive in terms specifying how much land would be affected, and is not needed, given the more explicit description of when and how small area plans should be used.</p> <p>Potential actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept amendments to clarify scope and scale of small area planning</li> <li>• Accept deletion of Land Use Policy 3.8</li> <li>• Retain the existing text</li> <li>• Propose alternative amendments for Small Area Planning process</li> </ul>
5	Zoning and the Plan	<p>The Team proposes several language amendments based on these concerns. The intent of these amendments is to clarify that development and redevelopment in Areas of Stability and Existing Neighborhoods (as throughout the city) is regulated by the zoning code, <u>not</u> by the Comprehensive Plan, which is not a regulatory document. The proposed language removes potentially subjective terms such as “character” and “rhythm and proportion”, and replaces them with the following objective language:</p> <p><u><i>"Development activities in these areas should be limited to the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and small-scale infill projects, as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code."</i></u></p> <p>Instances where text changes are proposed, Land Use Chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 33, paragraph 2, sentence #3</li> <li>Page 56, paragraph 3, first sentence</li> <li>Page 75, Policy 2.9, bullet #4</li> <li>Page 81, Goal 13</li> </ul> <p>Potential actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accept the amendments</li> <li>• Retain the existing text</li> <li>• Propose alternative amendments for Small Area Planning process</li> </ul>

**OTHER ISSUES FOR TMAPC DISCUSSION**

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
1 Public	Vision Map	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><i>This bridge is consistent with the Arkansas River Corridor Vision Plan. The possible bridge at 41<sup>st</sup> 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> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain bridge</li> <li>• Remove bridge</li> </ul>
2 Home Builder s	Land Use	Remove statement permitting land owners to prepare a small area plan.	<p><i>Individual land owners of large tracts may wish to prepare small area plans for their property 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"> <li>• Leave option for land owners to conduct small area plans of large tracts</li> <li>• Remove option</li> </ul>
3 Home Builder s	Land Use Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land use chapter recommends being amended no more than twice a calendar year so there is some stability and to monitor performance</li> <li>▪ Don't want to lock them in to wait until the plan is</li> </ul>	<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</i>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		updated twice a year.	<p><i>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"> <li>• <i>Retain option to update plan twice a year to be consistent with zoning changes and clarify the language as needed</i></li> <li>• <i>Change option to requirement that plan be updated with every zoning change approve</i></li> <li>• <i>Insert another time frame for updating of plan</i></li> </ul>
4 Michelle Cantrell	Land Use Chapter, Page 74, Policy 2.7	<p>Should the stability/change map have a designated time period for updating?</p> <p>2.7 Use the Stability and Change Map as a guide to where future growth and development will occur. The Stability and Change map helps establish the implementation priorities for PLANiTULSA in specific geographic areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Edges between the areas of stability and areas of change are variable and in most cases are transition zones between intensities of uses.</li> </ul>	<p>The Team recommends that the Stability and Change Map be amendable twice annually.</p> <p>Proposed text:</p> <p>The Stability and Change Map may be amended twice annually by the TMAPC when the Land Use Map is amended.</p> <p>TMAPC may elect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend Policy 2.7 to include the biannual amendment clause</li> <li>• Retain the text as written</li> <li>• Propose an alternative amendment</li> </ul>
5 Michelle	Land Use Chapter, Page 77,	<p>Why say “at a minimum”?</p> <p><i>5.1 Review and revise the zoning code to ensure that</i></p>	<p>Statement is intended to stress the importance of adding mixed use zoning districts to the code in order to facilitate development envisioned in the</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
Cantrell	Policy 5.1	<p><i>a diverse range of uses and building types can be produced by the market place.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>At a minimum, create mixed use districts that allow the PLANiTULSA building prototypes to be developed, by right, and bring parking standards up to current best practices.</i></li> </ul>	<p>plan.</p> <p>The TMAPC may amend the language to remove “at a minimum”.</p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Amend Policy 5.1 to remove “At a minimum” and begin the statement with “Create”</i></li> <li><i>Retain the text as it is</i></li> <li><i>Propose alternative amendments.</i></li> </ul>
6 Home Builders		<p>Define the use of the word “Protect” in the plan and replace with another word.</p>	<p><b><i>The word “protect: is currently used in Tulsa’s existing zoning code – in reference to residential and commercial areas:</i></b></p> <p><b>SECTION 400. PURPOSES OF RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS</b></p> <p><b>A. General Purposes.</b> The Residential Districts are designed to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Achieve the residential objectives of the Comprehensive Plan.</li> <li>2. <b>Protect</b> the character of residential areas by excluding inharmonious commercial and industrial activities.</li> </ol> <p>e. <b>Protecting</b> the character of commercial districts and their peculiar suitability for commercial uses</p> <p><b><i>In addition, the word “protect” is used throughout the existing comprehensive plan. For example:</i></b></p> <p><b>District Plan 2</b></p> <p><b>Goal 2.</b></p> <p>Modify current land use practices to more</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	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 <b>protecting</b> residential areas from incompatible commercial/industrial uses.</p> <p><b>District 5 Plan</b></p> <p><b>2. GENERAL POLICIES</b></p> <p><b>2.1 District-Wide Policies</b></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>21.2 <b>Protect</b> and preserve District 5 as primarily a place to live, maintaining the quality of life in residential neighborhoods.</p> <p><b>4.5 Industrial Areas</b></p> <p>4.5.1 GOAL</p> <p><b>Protect</b> 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 <b>protect</b> from encroachment those sites exhibiting desirable characteristics for industrial development.</p> <p><b>District 9 Plan</b></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 <b>protect</b> the residential</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
			<p>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 <b>protection</b> 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"> <li>• <i>Retain the word “protect” in plan</i></li> <li>• <i>Replace the word “protect” throughout the plan</i></li> </ul>



Discussion Log

7 INCOG	Transportation 9 Figure 3	This map does not show any roadway widenings on 81st or 101st Streets. These roads are currently over capacity and are projected to be extremely over-burdened by 2030. Currently segments of 81st Street (From Yale to Mingo) and 101st Street (Sheridan to Memorial) are already operating at LOS E, meaning that the facility is "in the vicinity of capacity," or LOS F operation. (INCOG 2009 Congestion Management Process, p. 17, Map 4) <b>Recommended Action: Include roadway widenings on 81st and 101st Streets from Riverside Drive to Garnett Road.</b>	<p>Team recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reevaluation of roadway widening based on demographic changes and recommendations to use a multi-modal approach to meet the travel demands of Tulsans.</li> <li>• Emphasizing the need for Transit improvements to the 91<sup>st</sup> and Mingo-Garnett Corridor prior to investments in roadway capacity.</li> <li>• Conducting an analysis of the subject area using the urban corridor planning process to uncover intersection and ITS improvements that could be made in conjunction with transit alternatives.</li> </ul> <p>The Team has prepared a document that proposes a corridor planning process on several key facilities in the city.</p> <p>Recommend that the Urban Corridor document be added to the Plan document as a transportation appendix.</p>
8 Michelle Cantrell	Housing Chapter, Page 8	Townhomes and compact single family homes would be located in existing sf neighborhoods. Does that include areas of stability? How would you envision townhomes to be in larger lot SF neighborhoods?	<p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Leave wording as is</i></li> <li>• Clarify the sentence to: <i>Townhomes and compact single family homes would be located on small parcels in new neighborhoods.</i></li> </ul>
9 Michelle Cantrell	Housing Chapter, Page 11, Policy 1.1	<p>Also see goal 1.1 (p. 11). Concern over higher end neighborhoods having single houses torn down for 4 or 5 townhouses. How will we balance this?</p> <p>1.1 Establish land use and zoning designations that permit the creation of single family homes on small and medium sized lots, attached townhomes, and cottage or courtyard style housing. These housing types should be permitted in new and existing residential neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Intent was to encourage a mix of housing in new neighborhoods.</p> <p>Amend to delete "and existing" to read:</p> <p>1.1 Establish land use and zoning designations that permit the creation of single family homes on small and medium sized lots, attached townhomes, and cottage or courtyard style housing. These housing types should be permitted in new residential neighborhoods.</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
10 Michael Reed		<p>Need to add to our PLANiTULSA project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exit ramp off I75 NB onto the overpass of Independence near Archer Street</li> <li>2. Acquire federal funding or Stimulus dollars for a rail system on the Evans Fintube sites and connect to rail corridor over to 23<sup>rd</sup> and Jackson.</li> </ol>	<p><b><i>These items are site specific and should be evaluated as part of an implementation program.</i></b></p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Leave these items to be considered as a small area plan or in an implementation program</i></li> <li>• <i>Include these items in the plan</i></li> </ul>
11 Joe Wester- velt		<p>To: Ms. Michelle Cantrell, TMAPC c/o INCOG (via email) PIANiTULSA Team (via email)</p> <p>I have completed my review of the January 2010 draft of the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. The draft plan with the changes noted below can potentially assist the community in <b>re-building our tax base, ensuring our quality of life, hopefully reversing the trend of population loss and declining services.</b></p> <p>These changes are made necessary by the fact that Tulsa is a Midwestern working town of considerable less size than many cities that have comprehensive plan/zoning codes that resemble the draft plan. Tulsa has no regional airport, no oceans, no mountains, no remarkably temperate weather, no large employment centers, no density, and no significant public transportation system in place. In fact our basic street system is in need of complete rehabilitation. There is a limit to the regulation and politicization of our zoning code that our city and the local economy can bear.</p>	

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		<p>My comments are as follows:</p> <p>1. Remove all language regarding the TMAPC being moved from INCOG and consolidated in a City of Tulsa Department. Such a move is fiscally irresponsible and will further politicize the zoning process. The consolidation referenced in the plan has become a divisive issue for all involved and has no place in the Comprehensive Plan analysis and debate. It would take a herculean effort to create a more dysfunctional arrangement than having the TMAPC approving their own demise, while The City Planning Department pushes for immediate adoption of the Plan unchanged, with expectations of continued employment and job growth.</p>	See Major Discussion Item # 1
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		<p><b>2. Small Area Plans should occur only in "Areas of Change", not "Areas of Stability."</b> There should be a clear mechanism that allows an area to "opt out" of a nonfunctional or dysfunctional "Small Area Plan." If they can be created, they also need to be able to be dissolved.</p> <p>"Small Area Plans" in the "Areas of Stability, will morph into some form of conservation district that will have a chilling effect in healthy and necessary residential infill. A clear example of this is the fact that homes in Maple Ridge, north of 21st street have square foot prices lower than homes in Sunset Terrace, South of 21st Street, as a result of the challenges of our existing Historic Preservation process. We should not allow the</p>	See Major Discussion Item # 4

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		ad valorem tax base to be depressed by this unintended consequence of the Plan.	
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		3. <b>"Areas of Stability" need to be better defined, as current description is too broad.</b> Maps that designate these areas need to recognize existing growth corridors (Brookside, Cherry Street, the Lewis and Utica Medical corridor, River Corridor, etc) so that the most economically likely growth can be nurtured and tax base improved.	Existing growth corridors in areas that are not exclusively single family are shown as areas of change.  <i>TMAPC may elect to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Leave these areas as designated</i></li> <li>• <i>Change all corridors regardless of existing use to Areas of Change</i></li> </ul>
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		4. <b>Text should be modified to make clear that development and new home construction can occur in "Areas of Stability."</b> These small projects would be regulated by our existing/revised zoning code.	See Major Discussion Item #5
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		5. <b>Remove the implication that "Stakeholder Meetings" be held in order to assist in the design of an owner's project or required zoning change.</b> The impact of such a process should be clear to all. If one cannot get a PUD through a zoning process currently, how can we expect a project to be approved or the process be more efficient with this suggested change to the public process?	See Major Discussion Item # 3
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		6. <b>Remove the requirement that all parcels 5 acres and larger, that are re-zoned from AG zoning, be subject to a "Small Area Plan."</b> This is unnecessary and unrealistic due to large amount of relatively inexpensive suburban land available within City of	See Major Discussion Item # 4

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		Tulsa fence lines. This provision of the draft plan will insure that the beneficiaries of our comprehensive plan will be our neighboring suburbs.	
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		<b>7. Language should be added to the plan to reflect that fact that this is an organic plan and that modifications to plan have a clear process, and not limited to every 6 months, particularly in the initial years.</b> It is inevitable initially that there will be adjustments to maps and other items as the plan begins to be tested by use.	<p>The Plan is intended to be an evolving document.</p> <p>The twice-annual amendment policy is intended to streamline the process of amending the plan. Zoning changes will continue as usual and the plan will be amended twice a year to update it with any changes made by the TMAPC.</p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Retain the existing language to amend the plan twice a year.</i></li> <li>• <i>Consider policy language that allows plan amendments more frequently.</i></li> </ul>
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		<p><b>8. Add two new zoning designations to our existing code (to be drafted by the TMAPC, its staff and City Planning Department).</b> MUD (Mixed Use Development) and TZD (Transition Zone Development). The MUD zoning designation should be tailored to accomplished mixed use developments contemplated by planners for downtown and other appropriate areas in "Areas of Change." It should have flexible uses by right.</p> <p>The TZD zoning designation should be reflected on maps as areas of transition between "Areas of Change" and "Areas of Stability", it should allow for mixed uses, non residential uses, multifamily uses and parking. There should be uses by right, with clearly</p>	<p>The Plan recommends the creation of new zoning districts. The specifics of these district will be determined through that process.</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		described and significant buffers (masonry walls, trees, prescribed buffers, etc) from adjacent "Areas of Stability."	
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		9. Recognize that the concept of merging housing and growth trends provided by INCOG with desired results of the survey group in (Land Use Section starting on page 45) to produce a new trend of growth per the 2030 goal, is pure conjecture.	
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		10. <b>There needs to be some sort of notice given to out of state/city land owners.</b> Out of state property owners will be affected by this process just as will local owners. If our own business leaders do not know much of the plan; how can they?	
11 Cont. Joe Wester- velt		11. <b>Tulsa County should also approve the Comprehensive Plan.</b> The County spent in excess of \$200,000 to support the new comprehensive plan. Regardless of a legal opinion provided by the City of Tulsa legal department, that the County is not required to sign off on the new comprehensive plan, constituents whose tax money was used for this process deserve the County Commission's involvement in the approval of the document. The assumption that "legal or not legal" should be the measure of validity for public policy is misguided. The County Commission's involvement in the plan is clearly proper public policy.  Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts	

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p>regarding the draft of the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan. I hope you consider and make the necessary changes to the document as suggested above along with other modifications suggested by other citizens and professionals that understand the assets and vulnerabilities of our community</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Joe Westervelt</p>	
<p>12</p> <p>John Bumgarner</p>		<p><b>General Observation</b></p> <p>The City of Tulsa does not recognize its image among developers, builders, and investors is in such contrast to surrounding cities (Owasso, Claremore, Bixby, Sand Springs, Broken Arrow), that an attitude change by the City of Tulsa is mandatory. If a survey was taken, I would suggest over 90% of those responsible for new capital investment in the City would characterize the City as unfriendly to new development; particularly “in-fill” development.</p> <p><b>City of Tulsa</b></p> <p>How can we charge you fees, impose rules, enforce restrictions, allow often highly-charged political outcomes to zoning decisions via “neighborhood” groups led by an outspoken minority?</p> <p><b>All Other Communities</b></p>	

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		<p>How can we help you?</p> <p>The City of Tulsa says it wants “infill development” but does nothing to overcome the biggest impediment to such development — ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY. Moreover, during the two years of hard work and thousands of hours of citizen input at public workshops, where were the guidelines regarding economics? Much of what citizens want cannot happen without (i) more infrastructure money, and (ii) more residentially zoned land available for development and re-development.</p> <p>What has happened over many years are incremental “takings” of land by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Original zoning in 1923;</li> <li>• Expanded roadways, sidewalks and ROW;</li> <li>• Imposition of required parking ratios that reduce the development footprint;</li> <li>• Mandatory landscape set-asides; and</li> <li>• The inability to acquire residential land to add parking to support commercial development (office or retail), even if properly buffered, except by a change in zoning (always opposed by so-called “neighborhood” associations).</li> </ul> <p>As useable land has “shrunk” and the economic utility of the remaining useable area has become more restricted, there has been no good way for an infill project to expand its useable area. Hence, the ability to be commercially viable becomes much, much more difficult. There is, indeed, a reason why the City of</p>	



Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		Tulsa has lagged behind other communities.	
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		<b>Specific Questions about PLANiTULSA:</b>  1. If an area is “mapped” (based on an algorithm?) as “yellow” or “blue”, how specifically can it be changed? Now? In the future?	<p>The Areas of Change and Stability map was initially built using the City of Tulsa’s existing building and land use designations. The map was then reviewed and edited by City of Tulsa and INCOG staff.</p> <p>The map can be amended by the TMAPC and approved by City Council.</p>
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		2. The corridor between the north of Hillcrest and the South of St. John is or will become a key future growth area for the medical and health care sector. The current maps do not recognize the need for more robust development on Utica Avenue along this critical corridor. How can this be fixed? The area for future growth needs to be defined as 300 feet from the property line along Utica Avenue, between 13th St. and 19th St. And, yes, this will intrude into a segment of certain neighborhoods while protecting the ability of the health care sector to efficiently expand and grow for the benefit of the entire City. Quality development along this corridor will stabilize the perimeter of the neighborhoods.	

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		3. What is the standard for determining something is “historical?” What if a property owner wants to opt out? Is that possible? What if the property is absolutely not of historical quality and on the fringe of a so-called historic district? Is that property forever deemed to rot away because of a superficial designation? There needs to be a much stiffer standard applied to the HP designation. It is being misused to provide “protection” to neighborhoods.	
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		4. How is the term “neighborhood” defined? Who determines? If a “neighborhood” migrates from 10% rental properties to 55% over time, do property owners vote? Should votes be cast by land area? Do renters count? Far too often, a <i>vocal</i> minority of property owners present themselves as a “neighborhood association” and, as such, win political votes they would have lost in a fair debate. An example is the project at the southeast corner of 15th & Utica that went through seventeen public hearings . . . BOA, TMPAC, HD, and City Council . . . to get a curb cut on Victor Avenue. By written petition, the project had overwhelming support of “neighborhood” residents and property owners. However, because of 15-20 dedicated “naysayers,” it took seventeen hearings. The vocal minority showed up, while the supporters were more passive (even though they signed a petition with over 150 names in support). Vocal beats written every time -- even if wrong for the best long-term interest of <b>ALL</b> the citizens of Tulsa.	<p>“Neighborhood” is not rigidly defined in the plan, but renters and owners should be considered members of a neighborhood.</p> <p>The intent of using the Small Area Planning Process, as outlined in the plan is to minimize the need for excessive hearings and review of projects. Small Area Plans are intended to be guided by property owners and areas stakeholders and implemented by applying zoning districts that allow the kinds of development described in PLANiTULSA.</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		<p>5. On page 45 of “Achieving the Vision” :</p> <p>“The city will adopt the comprehensive plan but most of the key projects will be built by the private sector.”</p> <p>Why not have a few workshops for investors and developers BEFORE a final plan is developed?</p>	<p>The PLANiTULSA team has met with Home Builders Association, local foundations, and numerous land owners and developers during and following the plan draft process. A Return On Investment model training was conducted in December of 2009 for the Home Builders and other developers. The PLANiTULSA team is happy to meet and discuss the plan with the development community at any time.</p>
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		<p>6. On page 45 of “Achieving the Vision”:</p> <p>“The City should establish measurable goals based on the PLANiTULSA strategic plan (<i>examples?</i>), make sure the departments and agencies have adequate resources to accomplish them (<b>\$\$ how many \$\$</b>) and hold them accountable for performance.”</p> <p>What is being measured? How is the City going to hold departments and agencies accountable?</p>	<p>Specific goals and tasks for the first one- to two-years of implementing the PLANiTULSA plan are described in the Strategic Plan document, which will be considered by the Mayor and City Council as part of their budgetary discussion.</p>
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		<p><b>Additional Concerns:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan should add a category called “fringe” to identify areas where the conflict between development and so-called stable neighborhoods will almost certainly occur, in order for the entire City of Tulsa to grow and expand jobs. Most of these areas are already known. Future ones will also need a category in which to fit.</li> </ul>	<p>Small Area Planning Process and recommended zoning code revision is intended to focus on the interface between areas of change and stability.</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of “small area planning” is a potentially dangerous impediment to building anything “new” in the City of Tulsa. “Small area planning” will likely be dominated by a small group of residents (not necessarily property owners) who care only about a small, local area, instead of the City of Tulsa as a whole. The political analogy that comes to mind is “ward politics.” We see it in City Council activities all too frequently. Once you politicize zoning, forget about growth. It will prove very elusive.</li> </ul>	<p>The Small Area Planning Process has been used in other cities to create visionary but workable plans that have served as the basis for growth and redevelopment.</p> <p>The 6<sup>th</sup> Street District Plan (Pearl District) represents a local example of a small area plan that advocates for zoning changes that would enable good infill development. At present, the zoning districts requested in the plan (mixed-use) have not been created or applied.</p> <p><i>TMAPC may elect to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Retain the small area planning process</i></li> <li><i>Remove small area plans as an implementation measure of PLANiTULSA</i></li> </ul>
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On Land Use (“LU”) page 77 - Land Use Priority 2: “Put procedures, processes and tools in place to effectively and equitably implement PLANiTULSA.”</li> </ul> <p>Why have the specifics not been expressed? Where are the details? Can they be provided?</p>	<p>The Goals and Policies section includes the specific language that will guide decision makers in implementing the plan.</p>
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		<p><b>More Specific Suggestions</b></p> <p>1. If the Plan is going to mix in throughout its verbiage, specific action recommendations, then it should also require the author to list them as a separate appendix so the reader can focus on action specifics vs. “fluff.”</p>	<p>The Goals and Policies section contains specific policies to guide the TMAPC and the City.</p> <p>The Strategic Plan, as maintained by the Mayor’s Office, will detail specific actions to implement the plan.</p>

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		2. The author should quantify the cost of “planning” needed to implement this Plan.	A comprehensive plan establishes goals and policies that will help guide the City in allocating resources.
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		3. Have the author list and quantify the first 5 (or 10) things necessary to implement the transportation chapter. It is well conceived, but is it doable? How do we make it doable?	The Strategic Plan includes the initial recommended actions for concepts in the Transportation chapter.  In addition, an Urban Corridor appendix details recommendations for four specific facilities.
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		4. On Land Use (“LU”) page 5, the last sentence reads:  “This map should evolve as the Comprehensive Plan is implemented, keeping true to the overall vision, but adjusting to new neighborhood plans, unforeseen opportunities, and <i>minor</i> adjustments that will arise.”  The word “minor” should be deleted.	The TMAPC retains the authority to amend the plan.
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		5. On pages 38-39 of “Achieving the Vision,” the verbiage here is fuzzy, obtuse, and fails to be specific as to HOW the “Plan for Action” will do something other than speed approvals more swiftly than competing communities.  When will the City of Tulsa:  remove barriers to desired actions	The Vision broadly outlines these ideas, while the Policy Plan and Strategic Plan specify how they will be carried out.

Discussion Log

Item # Source	Section/ Page Column Paragraph or Table	Issues for TMAPC Discussion	Framing of Issue
		coordinate public interest create strategic partnerships ? ? ?	
12 Cont.  John Bum- garner		6. On "Achieving the Vision," page 44: "Step 4: Conduct Neighborhood and Small Area Planning in Key Areas" should be deleted. It will discourage a broader view of what the City of Tulsa needs and will lead to a "protection mentality." In other words, small area planning becomes a large PUD designed by planners and citizen "stakeholders." It is not a good idea except in a large area (not small), reconstruction context.	See above