

**PLANITULSA COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
COMMENTS RECEIVED BETWEEN MARCH 5 AND MARCH 9, 2010**

Attached are the comments received on the plan between March 5 and March 9. The comments fall into three categories:

- ***Discussion issues***
- ***Consent issues***
- ***General comments/questions***

The following comments should be added to the Discussion Log

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
1 Vision Statement Home- builders	<p>P. 45 – 3rd Paragraph; 2nd & 3rd sentences should be deleted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not believe that bringing the planning commission “in house” in the City of Tulsa is wise. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Currently, the City pays 41% of the TMAPC budget; yet 92% of all land development cases are in the City of Tulsa. This would make it financially unwise to remove the TMAPC from INCOG. 	<i>See major discussion items</i>
2 Vision Langenkamp	<p>Name: Langenkamp</p> <p>Taking planning out of ingco to city is not the answer reestablishment the tmapc as the independent unit it once was with the commission hiring and firing it's director as planned by title 19 of Oklahoma statues. Planning is to be metro wide and tmapc is to plan, manage subdivisions regulations, board of adjustment (that has been allowed to slip into secondary zoning board),small area planning city and county, zoning and overall manager of the comprehensive plan. Just pulling out planning misses the point of the title 29 legislation. Stormwater, parks, urban development, codes, all need to be coordinated re planning strategies outlines in comp plan. Transportation fits nicely with cog mission. Reestablishment tmapc as independent unit funded by city county and federal dollars</p>	<i>See major discussion items</i>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
3 Land Use Policy 3.6 Phil Marshall	<p>Eliminate all of Land Use Policy 3.6, page 76 on final draft, so it will be consistent with TMAPC Discussion Issues, item #5 on page 3, Zoning and the Plan.</p> <p>3.6 Encourage complementary building height, scale, design and character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a sense of place by encouraging development of buildings, structures and landscapes that complement the character and scale of their setting. • Encourage new development to be appropriate to the context of its location in density, massing, intensity and size, particularly when adjacent to existing residential areas and historic districts. • Design buildings to be compatible in height, scale, bulk and massing to the urban context and established character of the surrounding area. • Design parking lot location, configuration, access points and screening to minimize spillover and mitigate any negative effects. 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain policy 3.6</i> ▪ <i>Remove policy 3.6</i> ▪ <i>Amend language in policy 3.6</i>
4 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 51 – Last sentence under the section “Population and Job Growth” should be deleted. (“To prevent job growth from outstripping housing production here, the city should be prepared to engage in necessary small area planning so new communities can be built quickly.”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There seems to be heavy reliance on small area plans in this plan. We believe that small area plans can be an important tool when used judiciously. The use of small area plans for new development seems excessive. ○ The NAHB reviewed the Final Draft of this plan at our request, they stated the following about the Small Area Plans in the PlaniTulsa Final Draft: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “One should be aware that small area plans, regardless of their specificity, can end up being used to delay or protest against development in a designated small area plan area rather than encourage it. In this respect, the small area plan almost always provides for an additional layer of uncertainty in the zoning approval process. This point should be made very clear to the City.” ▪ “The language in this section reads: ‘The primary means of implementing the PLANiTulsa comprehensive plan should be through small area and neighborhood planning process. This process can apply to existing 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain sentence</i> ▪ <i>Delete sentence</i> <p><i>See major discussion items</i></p>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
	<p>neighborhoods in need of revitalization, main streets or other corridors, and vacant areas where new communities are envisioned.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “What is so troubling about this language is the scope in which small area planning can take place within the city. Essentially, all development, redevelopment, greenfield development could be subject to a small area plan. This is not typical of how small area plans are conducted.” ▪ “An example definition given to a small area plan by the American Planning Association is as follows: ‘A plan.... That covers specific subareas of a (jurisdiction). These plans provide basic information on the natural features, resources, and physical constraints that affect development of the planning area. They also specify detailed land-use designation used to review specific development proposals and to plan services and facilities...’” ▪ “Limits on regulatory powers should be placed on them and their geographical locations should be limited to specific areas identified by the community as having special needs and goals.” ▪ “Small Area Plans have a role in Tulsa’s overall planning process, but they should be limited to areas where redevelopment is most targeted. Also, Small Area Plans should encourage private investment and development, not established to give neighbors unreasonable control over the development review process.” 	
5 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 53 (52?) – Last sentence of 1st paragraph should be deleted. (“This includes working with areas that are already developed and are in need of infill strategies, and new communities on vacant land, both inside the city and in areas to be annexed.”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We recommend that small area planning be limited to Areas of Change. Such a revision would make this final sentence irrelevant. 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Delete sentence</i> ▪ <i>Retain sentence</i>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Since revitalization in Areas of Stability is not anticipated by the plan, Small Area Plans, which by definition are designed to facilitate revitalization would have no place in such areas.</p>	
<p>6 Land Use Pianalto</p>	<p>Name: Peggy Pianalto Neighborhood (optional): Midtown One version of this plan contained under Existing Residential Neighborhoods and Areas of Stability the phrase "consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion." Then I read in the comments where this phrase was removed and changed to "as permitted through clear and objective setback, height, and other development standards of the zoning code." Why? The problems in our neighborhoods now are with the zoning codes which allow the ugly, ill-proportioned and ill-fitting infills. I think the language should be corrected to include the words "form, scale, rhythm and proportion."</p>	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Insert terminology "consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion" when discussing infill</i> ▪ <i>Retain language as currently written</i> ▪ <i>Amend language</i>
<p>7 Land Use Home-builders</p>	<p>P. 53 (52?) – The final sentence of the page ("The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating redevelopment and reinvestment that that complements the character of the neighborhood and is consistent in form, scale, rhythm and proportion.") should be replaced with: "The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating redevelopment, rebuilding and reinvestment as permitted through setback, height, and other objective development standards of the zoning code. While new and development will be encouraged and promoted in Areas of Change, it is not the intention of the Comprehensive Plan to prohibit redevelopment, rebuilding and reinvestment in Areas of Stability."</p>	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain language as is</i> ▪ <i>Replace language using suggestion to the left</i> ▪ <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>
<p>8 Land Use Home-builders</p>	<p>P. 53 – The map should be updated to show the two distinct categories of Areas of Stability (Established Areas vs. Reinvestment Areas) discussed on Page 54.</p>	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Amend map as recommended</i> ▪ <i>Retain map</i>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
9 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 54 – First paragraph should be deleted. (“Historic designations are often considered the only way to protect classic neighborhoods; this is a valuable policy tool to preserve a neighborhood’s special qualities. However, most neighborhoods do not meet the requirements necessary to qualify for historic designation. The concept of stability and change is specifically designed to enhance the unique qualities of older neighborhoods that are looking for new ways to preserve their character and quality of life.”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This paragraph intimates that Areas of Stability are “watered down” versions of the protections which historic preservation district offer. This is not true and is a misleading implication. 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain paragraph as is</i> ▪ <i>Delete paragraph</i>
10 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 54 – 2nd Column, 2nd paragraph, final sentence (“The challenge in these places is to preserve character without preventing residents from reinvesting in their homes to meet contemporary standards.”) should be replaced with: “The challenge in these places is to preserve character without preventing property owners from reinvesting in, rehabilitating or rebuilding their homes.”</p>	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain sentence as written</i> ▪ <i>Amend sentence as suggested</i>
11 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 55 – Delete first paragraph on the page. (“This plan does not identify which areas are Established and which are Reinvestment Areas. . . .”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Since we are suggesting that the map DOES highlight the differences in these areas, this sentence would no longer make sense. 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain paragraph as written</i> ▪ <i>Delete paragraph as suggested</i>
12 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 57 – Final paragraph, second sentence (“When possible, rezoning should be conducted under the auspices of a small area or neighborhood planning process.”) should be deleted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As noted above, small area plans are over-used in this proposed plan. 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain sentence as written</i> ▪ <i>Delete sentence as suggested</i>
13 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 57 – Final sentence under Parking Management Districts (“It is most likely that parking management and mixed-used zoning districts should be applied concurrently under the guidance of a small area or neighborhood planning process.”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comments above on the overusage of small area plans. 	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain sentence as written</i> ▪ <i>Delete sentence as suggested</i>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
14 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 77 – Goal 4.3 should be amended to read: “Ensure that adequate land to accommodate desired development is zoned and ready for development through implementation of city initiated zoning cases.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing references to small area plans. <p>4.3 Ensure that adequate land to accommodate desired development is zoned and ready for development through implementation of city initiated zoning cases following the adoption of small area plans. City initiated zoning recommendations should be consistent with small area plans.</p>	<p><i>Intent of this policy is that the city initiates zoning only after the completion of a small area plan or study, or at the request of the owner.</i></p> <p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Retain sentence as written</i> ▪ <i>Delete reference to small area plans as suggested</i>
15 Land Use Home-builders	<p>P. 78 – Goal 5.3 – Does this mean that all new subdivisions in Tulsa must be done under a small area plan with “robust” involvement by the public? If so, developers will reject this and the suburbs will thrive. If our reading of this is accurate, this goal should be deleted.</p> <p>5.3 Create a robust and meaningful public involvement process that emphasizes long-term consensus rather than project-by-project evaluation and approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Develop and use a standard small area or neighborhood planning process to develop a long-range vision for new centers, neighborhoods, and areas in need of revitalization and reinvestment. ▪ Design the small area and neighborhood planning process to maximize local public input and identify key implementation steps. The resulting plans should reflect neighborhood needs and desires and support citywide Vision and goals. ▪ Small area or neighborhood planning process shall result in an implementable plan and a clear land use program that enables build-by-right zoning standards for desired buildings and uses. 	<p><i>See major discussion items regarding small area planning</i></p>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
16 Land Use Policies Fregonese	<p>Policy 6.3 in the Land Use Section,</p> <p>6.3 Consolidate some or all of the following development-related functions into a Community or City Development Department within the City of Tulsa: small area planning, long range planning, capital planning, economic development, community development, zoning administration and development permitting to improve service delivery and to maximize the city's resources allocated to development support.</p>	<p><i>To be consistent with previous discussion regarding removing the topic of reorganization from the Policy Plan and Vision documents, Policy 6.3 should be removed from the Land Use Policies as well.</i></p>
17 Housing Chapter Fregonese	<p>Page 6 – Housing Section</p> <p>Single-Family Homes on Smaller Lots Large-lot subdivisions consume large amounts of land and infrastructure. By broadening the range of lot sizes in new neighborhoods, Tulsa can diversify the housing supply and still retain its tradition of single-family neighborhoods. In particular, Tulsa has an opportunity to develop new single family homes on lots ranging in size from 3,500 to 5,000 square feet. Some small lot single family designs include homes oriented around a communal courtyard or cottage-style homes. Others are designed in more traditional patterns. These smaller lot single family homes would be primarily owner-occupied.</p> <p>Townhomes Townhomes are generally two to three stories tall and designed in a compact arrangement. Townhomes are attached to other townhomes, and generally include shared maintenance and other services. These homes fit well in many types of residential neighborhoods and can be used as infill development, <u>where appropriate</u>, in sizes as small as two or four units per building and on lots as small as 10,000 square feet. Townhomes can also be clustered around environmental constraints on parcels which could not effectively support single family development. Townhomes can vary considerably in design and architectural style, and may be either owner- or renter-occupied.</p> <p>Page 8 – Housing Section</p>	<p><i>Team recommends adding in underlined language and deleting wording as shown to clarify Housing section.</i></p>

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
	<p>The Tulsa 2030 Goal was designed to meet Tulsa’s demand for a variety of housing types and address the gaps in housing by income range. A housing need analysis was conducted to ensure that Tulsa can fill in gaps in the city’s existing housing supply and meet the needs of its future demographics, such as those of an aging population.</p> <p>Based on this analysis, the Tulsa 2030 Goal included about 64% single family homes, 8% townhomes and 28% multi-family units, both ownership and rental. While this new housing mix reflects a shift from current trends, it would also serve to meet the affordability needs of Tulsa’s future citizens.</p> <p>The diversity and location of housing was designed to fit best with Tulsa’s existing character. This means that the most compact condos and apartments would be located in the downtown and along major corridors. Townhomes and compact single family homes would be located on small parcels in existing single family neighborhoods <u>which have struggled with challenges such as vacant lots and abandonment</u>. This would help ensure that there is housing to meet every Tulsan’s need, while preserving the city’s single family neighborhoods.</p> <p>Page 11 – Housing Section</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 <u>and existing residential neighborhoods and in existing neighborhoods needing revitalization and infill development on vacant lots.</u></p> <p>1.2 Page 11 – Housing Section</p> <p>5.6 Create and encourage the use <u>of</u> an infill and revitalization toolkit to help facilitate housing development in existing residential neighborhoods <u>where appropriate and desired.</u></p>	

Item number# Chapter Source	Discussion Issues	Comment/Discussion
	<p>Goal 7— Low-income and workforce affordable housing is available in neighborhoods across the city.</p> <p>7.1 Work with for-profit and non-profit developers to encourage new mixed-income developments in every neighborhood <u>across</u> the city.</p> <p>7.2 Ensure that land use and zoning regulations allow a mix of housing types, including single family homes, cottage homes, townhomes, condominiums and apartments that serve people at a variety of income levels.</p>	
<p>18 Parks, Open Space and Environment Langenkamp</p>	<p>Name: Langenkamp Email Address: Chiefsandra@aol.com</p> <p>Flood plain management needs to be as conservative as original intent of no building in potential wet areas or the creation of new wet areas as created by inappropriate building. Any softening of this approach will see return to invasive and potentially damaging land uses. 2). Define carefully stable and unstable land uses re comp plan. Much too subjective and now invites development in unwarranted area. 3). Begin design phase for metro government design as financial condition of city at risk and new approach warranted. 4) escape temptation to to select easy step of a city planning unit missing point of tmapc created by title 19 as a metro wide planning unit.</p> <p>Reestablishment as statute intended an independent tmapc funded by city and county with already designed authority to hire and fire director. This is the missing link to have person capable and trained as planner to negotiate the comp plan coordination so missing in city and county government!!!</p>	<p><i>The TMAPC may:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Amend language in Parks, Open Space, and Environment Chapter to include these specific issues more directly</i> ▪ <i>Retain existing language</i>

The following comments should be added to the Consent Log

Item number#	Consent Issues	Comment/Discussion
1 Land Use Chapter Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 33 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
2 Land Use Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 52 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See Consent log
3 Land Use Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 56 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
4 Land Use Home-builders	P. 62 – First paragraph should be revised as follows: “ The primary <u>One of the means</u> 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.”	Add to consent log
5 Land Use Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 74 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
6 Land Use Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 75 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
7 Land Use	P. 76 – Delete Goal 3.8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See comments above on overusage of small area plans. 	See consent log

Item number#	Consent Issues	Comment/Discussion
8 Home-builders	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.	
9 Land Use Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 77 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
10 Land Use Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 81 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
11 Housing Chapter Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 11 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log
12 Housing Chapter Home-builders	We endorse the change suggested by Fregonese to p. 13 as shown on the Consolidated Log.	See consent log

The following general comments have been received through INCOG staff and the website.

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
1	<p>Name: Pam Iacoe Email Address: piacoe@swbell.net Neighborhood (optional): Timberland</p> <p>Please think carefully about any changes to the requirements for infill in existing neighborhoods. Part III - items 1.6 and 5.4 represent the consensus view that established neighborhood design should be preserved. Building large houses with vast areas of concrete on lots not designed for it dramatically affect the water flow and can cause irreparable damage to neighbors. The tree kill is vast and lasts for years. The standing water deteriorates the streets. Today, neighbors have no notice of a tear-down and can not protest the building of a home not remotely compatible in style or size. Our established neighborhoods are a backbone to what makes Tulsa great - don't allow that support to erode.</p>
2	<p>From: EasleyJBPC1@aol.com [mailto:EasleyJBPC1@aol.com] Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2010 8:26 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Proposed Citizens Committee and Historic Designations</p> <p>Mr. Alberty, Please accept this correspondence in regards to both the establishment of a proposed Citizens Committee and the establishment of Historic Designations. I would like to go on record as being adamantly AGAINST both of these proposals. Neither is necessary while both are invasive. Bill Easley</p>
3	<p>From: Duenner, Robert [mailto:Robert.Duenner@morganstanleysmithbarney.com] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 9:44 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject:</p> <p>Dear Tulsa Resident,</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my concern regarding the way The Housing and Land Use Sections of the Plan It Tulsa proposed Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tulsa is being drafted and the direct effect it will have on all of us</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
	<p>in our existing neighborhoods.</p> <p>In short, the two sections of concern are written as an overlay for the entire city to current rules, regulations and property rights.</p> <p>The common thread that concerns me throughout these sections is that in addition to the current laws and rules that are already in place regarding your property, the revised plan adds yet another layer of bureaucracy that is both unnecessary and invasive. Among the most troubling proposals is the creation of an undefined Citizens Committee to be appointed that will have the power to direct both “style and size” in regard to renovations and infill of our property and neighborhoods. How many people will sit on this commission? Who would be eligible for consideration? What are their qualifications to make these judgments or to over-ride our judgments as to how we spend our money for property improvement?</p> <p>Very simply, this Citizens Committee will hold subjective power to which you and I have no recourse. Just imagine hiring an architect and spending your time and money developing what is right for you only to have the Citizens Committee rule “that is too big for our taste” or “please change your design, we don’t approve of your style”? Are you kidding me? The plan also strongly suggests that we “pursue historic designations” which will give neighborhood associations a legitimate leg to stand on in the case of a decision or dispute. On the surface this might sound good except for the fact that it moves us ever closer to losing current property rights you now have as homeowners to spend your money on home improvement/building projects as our budgets and taste dictate. And, what if you are in a neighborhood where you disagree with the the association or the people who run it? All neighborhoods, midtown or otherwise with few exceptions were formed without these associations. The forming of them for anything more than a social board takes away our property rights, not to mention can become a source of conflict. And, it’s usually the vocal minority who rule. We all want peace in our home life. With associations and historic designations come more meetings with strife and division to our already complicated schedules. These should not be forced upon anyone in Tulsa.</p> <p>The Land Use Section of the Plan basically reads the same way for all development. A Citizens Committee which dictates both “size and style” for development of any size, plus now, they suggest where a development be located (area of change or stability). Tulsa has a wonderful history of entrepreneurship. Location is key to commercial and residential real estate. Real estate is market driven, not Plan driven. Should The Land Use section of this plan pass, it will produce a result that is contrary to the Vision Section of Plan It Tulsa, which is development friendly for a stronger growth, work force and tax base. It will be perceived as “unfriendly” to those we are hoping to attract from within our city and those we hope to attract nationally and internationally.</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
	<p>I understand wanting to develop and infill struggling parts of town, and I even love mixed use developments which are proposed. I am not opposed to all change, just change which encroaches on so many individual property rights. I urge anyone in an area of change to read carefully....do you want your area of town to be an area of change? Research how this will affect you if the plan is passed. Do the areas of stability promote growth in the same way that has continued to keep them stable?</p> <p>I am trying to keep this as short as possible. To read for yourselves, you can go to www.PlanitTulsa.org then click on both the housing and land use sections. If you agree with me please send an email as soon as possible to www.walberty@incog.org to register your disagreement. It can be short and simple. Just say I disagree with the proposed citizens committee and the pursuance of historic designations. This is the email address of a man named Wayne Alberty at Incog. He will broadcast your letter to each member of the planning commission and to the PlanitTulsa office. Please also let your City Council representative know. There is the final meeting on March 10th so if you plan on registering your complaint please do it by March 9. You are welcome to come and voice your concerns at the meeting March 9, 1:00 to 4:00 on the bottom floor of City Hall.</p> <p>On a personal level, I know a lot of people have spent a great deal of time on this plan and many ideas they came up with are wonderful (Walking paths, bike paths, train system from outer areas to downtown, mixed use). However, it is in the "fine points" of the plan that have the opportunity to ruin an otherwise good idea and change something that is currently working. As the saying goes, "the devil is in the details". At a time when the city is laying off police and firemen, and closing community centers, we really need to take a step back and consider not only what I have laid out before you but the cost to the taxpayers to implement such a plan. The cost section of the Plan had not been reduced to writing at the last planning commission meeting (but the tone was move forward without regard to cost). Even with partnerships of public and private funding on these developments proposed, there will be substantial costs incurred for Tulsa's share (extra engineering, water studies, streets etc.) The economy is drastically different than it was when the city hired this firm to come up with a plan. Plan it Tulsa however, seems to be going full speed ahead whether we have the money to implement it or not.</p> <p>Robert Duenner</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
4	<p>From: Donald Detrich [mailto:ddetrich@ellerdetrich.com] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 9:20 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Tulsa Plan</p> <p>I disagree with the proposed citizens committee and the pursuance of historic designations. We don't need busy bodies telling us how to develop our property. Please register my concerns with the committee. Thank you in advance.</p> <p>Don Detrich</p>
5	<p>From: Pauline Moore [mailto:eggsandhoney@me.com] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 11:21 AM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Plan It Tulsa comprehensive plan</p> <p>Dear Wayne; We are very opposed to the Citizens Committee as written in the plan. We have enough over sight without adding, what amounts to , a homeowners assoc for the city. Sincerely Paul and Paula Moore</p>
6	<p>From: Lise Inman [mailto:blevinslm@berrywood.com] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 12:17 PM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: proposed citizens committee and the pursuance of historic designations</p> <p>Good Afternoon Wayne, I am writing to voice my opinion in opposition to the proposed citizens committee and the pursuance of historic designations. There are existing oversight via neighborhood associations that create a better community based approach to these issues. I disagree strongly with the proposed citizen's committee and the pursuance of historic designations... This issue has been strongly contested in the past and I urge you to have a public debate on these details rather than quietly push them through in these plans. Warmest regards, Lise Inman</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
7	<p>From: Robert Mackey [mailto:mackeyr@sbcglobal.net] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 4:33 PM To: incog@incog.org Subject: Object to neighborhood policy</p> <p>I heard recently that there is going to be appointed a "committee" for our neighborhoods that will tell us how we can renovate our homes and even build our homes. I recently sold three lots in the Philbrook area and did run into problems getting neighbors to okay a change in the set back for one of my lots. I got over 50% of the people to okay the set back but the blue bloods in the neighborhood kept me from obtaining the necessary 60% vote to okay it. It's okay as I eventually prevailed by legal methods to obtain what I need without the set back. I suddenly realized at the time that several people I hardly knew had the power to keep me from selling some property that my father had invested in over 50 years ago. I had asked for nothing more than what all the other home owners in the neighborhood enjoyed with their set back. Nevertheless I asked myself at the time what would happen if, some day, they had the right to tell me what color I could paint my house or if I could renovate it my way. Scary! I saw this while living in the French Quarter in New Orleans but felt it was okay for historical reasons. There was nothing historical really about this area at the time so I dismissed the thought. Now I see that there may be little committees appointed (credentials?) that would control my investment for me. Not what my father had in mind! The area is not a tourist area necessarily other than the museum so why should a committee tell me what I can do with my investment especially after my father had bought it. I don't want to look like the museum anyway! All in all this idea of forming little "Big Brother" committees is mindless and needless. The councilors would be better off leaving things alone. signed, Dr. Robert W. Mackey</p>
8	<p>From: Dunn [mailto:dunn100@att.net] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 6:37 PM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Plan It Tulsa</p> <p>Dear Mr. Alberty:</p> <p>It is my understanding that you are going to discuss Plan It Tulsa recommendations with the Planning Commissioners this week. I want to voice my strong disagreement with the idea of creating a new citizens committee to put their nose into homeowners rights to manage their property. We already have laws and rules and regulations that provide oversight of these issues. Further I disagree with their plans for new historic designation procedures. We also already have this. This sounds like some busy bodies who should go get a life. And stay out</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
	<p>of mine and my neighbors. I am requesting that you distribute this to each of the commissioners. Thank you,</p> <p>William Dunn 3510 S. Birmingham Ave Tulsa OK 74105</p>
9	<p>From: Jennifer_O'leary@bcbsok.com [mailto:Jennifer_O'leary@bcbsok.com] Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 1:28 PM To: Matthews, Dane Subject: RE: FW: Tulsa Parks Master Plan - Open Public Forum Meeting</p> <p>Definitely-and all the budget cuts. It's just sad. Oh here are my PlaniTulsa comments:</p> <p>As a former city employee, I am concerned about the approximately 1.3 million spent on the PlaniTulsa consultants. It might have saved the city from having to take some of the furlough days. I believe we should concentrate on fixing the current issues such as rehiring police officers, fixing city streets, keeping street lights lit at night, funding our city parks, etc. Having a plan for the city is great, but the money for the changes will not just appear. Plus, I am not willing to pay extra taxes to fund the plan. I would rather pay taxes to rehire police officers and focus on the safety of our city. Let's work on one thing at a time--not "if we build it, they will come" mentality.</p> <p>I also believe that the information regarding PlaniTulsa has not been communicated effectively. The entire process is a mystery to most people. The majority of Tulsans are concerned with keeping their jobs, finding a job, providing for their families, and basically staying afloat. PlaniTulsa is just not a legitimate concern or viable plan. Honestly, it was a large wastet of city funds.</p>
10	<p>From: Gail Barbre [mailto:gbarbre@cox.net] Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 9:45 PM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Plan It Tulsa</p> <p>We are NOT in agreement with the plans that the committee has in mind.</p> <p>Charles & Gail Barbre 4249 South Victor Avenue 742-7110</p>

Item number#	General Comments/Questions
11	<p>Name: Graham Brannin Email Address: gbrannin@cox.net Comments: 3 Points: - Follow through and accountability is the most important element, this could require some sort of public oversight. - Density and urban vitality are essential to maintain a tax base that can keep our City great. - We need to become more progressive in our handling of stormwater, infiltration methods and use on sight must be encouraged and rewarded.</p>
12	<p>From: Julie Allen [mailto:jtallenok@gmail.com] Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2010 12:19 PM To: Alberty, Wayne Subject: Plan It Tulsa Housing and Land Use</p> <p>I disagree with the proposed citizens committee and the pursuance of historic designations. Individual property rights need to be protected. Julie Tate Allen</p>
13	<p>Name: Peggy Pianalto Neighborhood (optional): Midtown</p> <p>Something that isn't really addressed in the Plan is emphasis on greening Tulsa. Some of the things I'd like to see addressed are city-wide curbside recycling, the requirement that all new-built city structures use Leed and USGB green-building standards, and regulations regarding demolition, deconstruction and re-use of new construction materials.</p>