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What is the Peoria Ave. BRT?

New, fresh, branded service.

- Increased reliability
- 39 substantially upgraded stations
- Service frequency doubles – every 15 minutes
- 9 new buses
- Better security at stations
- Real-time arrival screens
- Traffic signal priority to keep bus on schedule
- Improved physical conditions around the stations
Why is BRT planned for Peoria?

Connecting Tulsa’s residents to jobs.

- Within a 10 minute walk of the corridor, there is access to 20% of the city’s jobs
- 1 in 7 residents lives within this 10 minute walk
- The corridor carries more passengers than any other existing transit route
- It was the top transit priority in the Tulsa Comprehensive Plan, PlaniTulsa
What are the Goals of the Land Use Study?

7 Station Areas

- Develop a long-term vision for the corridor that complements the transit + engineering study
- Public and private investments to boost economic development and livability around the stations
- Recommendations for public improvements, design character, and future land uses
- Implementation strategies for achieving the vision
What is the process?

**Phase 1: Engage**
- Project Start Meeting & Corridor Tour
- Key Stakeholder / Focus Group Interviews
- Community Workshop 1
- Field Work & Analysis
- Peoria Ave BRT Report

**Phase 2: Envision**
- Development and Design Concepts
- Community Workshop 2
- October 2016
- Community Input Summary

**Phase 3: Implement**
- BRT Land Use Framework Plan
- Implementation Strategies
- YOU ARE HERE
- Community Workshop 3
- December 2016
- TMAPC and City Council Presentation
- February 2017
- Revised Final Plan
To date…

6 public workshops, 3 walkshops, 2 days of focus group discussions/interviews

**URBAN DESIGN AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ARE VITAL TO SUCCESS.**

Attendees were delighted to see signs of economic development on the corridor and would like to see it continue. Many participants discussed the need for better urban design – specifically stating the hope for new development to be pedestrian-oriented – to include minimal setbacks to complement the potential transit, pedestrian, and bike facility upgrades likely to occur with the BRT project. Interim updates can be made leveraging “cheap and effective” public art.

**PEORIA AVENUE BRT CAN BE A SOLUTION.**

All of the attendees comprehended the potential for the Peoria BRT to greatly impact the corridor. They identified new sidewalks, bike facilities, technology infrastructure (real time bus arrival signs), and station amenities as the top improvements. Heavy emphasis was focused on creating a place out of the station areas, including external amenities as food trucks, new retail, and incorporation of current parks and bike routes.

Northern Area Walkshop participants discuss their thoughts while taking refuge from the heat at the Pine Street bus shelter.

Central Area Walkshop participants heading south along Peoria Avenue towards 11th Street.
Community Input…what we heard
61st Street and Peoria

MAP KEY
- LANDMARK
- PEDESTRIAN
- CONFLICTS
- PLACEMAKING
- OPPORTUNITY
- DEVELOPMENT
- OPPORTUNITY

LANDMARKS
Major landmarks include Oral Roberts University, CityPlex Towers, and Johnson Park.

PEDESTRIAN CONFLICTS
Key problem intersections, crossings, and sidewalks were identified at Peoria Avenue & 81st Street and 71st Street and Joe Creek. Other pedestrian conflicts exist at commercial development access points.

PLACEMAKING OPPORTUNITIES
Placemaking opportunities were identified at key community gathering spaces and intersections.

DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES
Most development opportunities were identified at the Peoria Avenue & 61st Street Station, along the Peoria Avenue corridor.
Community Input
Visual Preference

PLACEMAKING & URBAN DESIGN

Placemaking and Urban Design images that showed softer, more human-scaled elements were generally preferred. A notable exception is the desire to improve highway underpasses with brighter, and larger-scale murals.

REDEVELOPMENT

In general, visual preference survey respondents seemed to prefer redevelopment images that featured mixed-use buildings, or buildings with traditional storefronts. Another common element of the most popular Redevelopment images was the use of brick as a building material.
State of the Corridor Report

- Land Use Analysis
- Market Conditions
- Transportation Assessment
- Community Input Summary

www.peoriabrt.wordpress.com
Redevelopment + Urban Design Concepts

1. Used the Comprehensive Plan as a starting point for future land uses
2. Developed concepts for the vision
3. Supplemented with character images from the visual preference survey
4. Created 3D visualizations to depict urban form, building heights, and relationships to context
61ST STREET & PEORIA AVENUE

MARKET OVERVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>1/2-MILE RADIUS AROUND 61ST ST S &amp; PEORIA AVE</th>
<th>TULSA (CITY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (2016)</td>
<td>6,277</td>
<td>411,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2010)</td>
<td>6,263</td>
<td>391,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Change, 2010-2016</td>
<td>+9.8%</td>
<td>+5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households (2016)</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>170,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HH Size</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$24,187</td>
<td>$43,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units (2016)</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>106,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of business entities</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>28,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Retail Sales Leakage / Surplus</td>
<td>$(38,500,000)</td>
<td>$4,018,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANITULSA LAND USE BUILDING BLOCKS

STATION AREA OVERVIEW

DRAFT
61st Street Concept
61ST STREET & PEORIA AVENUE

DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

DEVELOPMENT CHARACTER

URBAN DESIGN CHARACTER
61\textsuperscript{st} Street & Peoria: North View
61st Street & Peoria: Southeast View
Building Transparency
- High first-floor transparency
- Transparency lowers as building height rises.

2-4 Stories
- Vertical and horizontal integration of residential uses.

Parking Behind
- Minimal curb cuts to access parking. No curb cut access via primary street. Building service functions also accessed via parking behind buildings.

Consistent, Shallow Setback
- Clearly defined public right-of-way with sidewalk, parkway strip, and street.

Uses
Moderate-density employment and mixed-use residential. Features residential, commercial, and entertainment uses. Intense uses at intersection, stepped down residential units in between.

Linear Form
Development is oriented along Peoria Avenue. Corridors are a neighborhood and community connector, transportation route, and magnet for mixed-use development and residential uses.
61st Street and Peoria Land Use Policy Application: Transit

**Vegetated Median**
- Traffic calming median features shade trees and shrubs. Pedestrian islands are located at intersections to improve safety of pedestrian crossings.

**Dedicated, Enhanced, BRT Station**
- A 60x10 BRT pull-off that features ticket vending machines.
- Next bus arrival information.
- Pedestrian illumination.
- ADA loading platform.
- Transit shelter (approx 6’x32’)

**Road Diet**
- Restriped 11’ four-lane transit-rich street with vegetated buffer along sidewalks to protect pedestrians from vehicular traffic.
- BRT to share lane with vehicles.
- Narrow Right-of-way prohibits dedicated BRT lane.
- Street design integrates pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular uses.

**Shared Bicycle Lanes**
- Lane marking’s identify shared bicycle lanes.
- Narrow right-of-way prohibits separate, dedicated bike lanes at this station location.
61st Street and Peoria Land Use Policy Application: Urban Design / Character

**Pedestrian Plaza**
- Street level frontage of mixed-use projects is developed with levels of pedestrian-oriented uses such as plazas and parks.

**Streetscape/site furnishing**
- The streetscape includes landscaping, lighting, public art, and other pedestrian amenities.
- Mixed use development supports sidewalks, restaurants, and café seating.

**Wide sidewalks**
- High intensity/density uses encourage high pedestrian activity. Wide (8'-12') sidewalks support the pedestrian traffic.
Potential Zoning Strategies
Existing Zoning
Current zoning somewhat unpredictable: does not ensure transit-supportive, walkable development patterns.

Development Under Existing Zoning
## BRT Station Area Zoning (typical)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RM-1</th>
<th>RM-2</th>
<th>RM-3</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>CH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Street Frontage (ft)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Street Setback (ft)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-to-Zone (Min-max. ft)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Building Coverage in BTZ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (ft)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Ground Floor Transparency (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density (UPA)</td>
<td>~24</td>
<td>~40</td>
<td>~100+</td>
<td>~40</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Facing Entrance Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mixed-use Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use/Function</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MX1, Neighborhood</td>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX2, Community</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX3, Regional</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N’hood Centers, Main Streets, Mixed-use Corridors, Downtown Neighborhood
** Town Centers, Main Streets, Mixed-use Corridors, Downtown Neighborhood
*** Regional Centers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Area</strong> (square feet)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Lot Width</strong> (feet)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Street Frontage</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min Outdoor Open Space per Unit</strong> (square feet)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build-to Zone (BTZ)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min/max (feet)</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min % of building in primary street BTZ</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min % of building in secondary street BTZ</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Parking Setbacks (feet)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary street</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary street or R zoning district</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential zoning district</td>
<td>0 or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min. Floor-to-Ceiling Height</strong> (feet)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum Transparency</strong> (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Street-facing Entrance Required</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Ground floor</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Upper floors</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MX zoning would better align with comp plan and support transit (BRT) investment.

No absolute density limits
MX-P and MX-U Character Designations

- A: lot width
- B: street frontage
- C: build-to zone
- D: min. parking setback
- E: ground floor transparency
- F: upper floor transparency
- G: street-facing entrance
MX-V Character Designations

A lot width
B street frontage
C build-to zone
D min. parking setback
E ground floor transparency
F upper floor transparency
G street-facing entrance
# BRT Station Area Zoning (Existing vs. MX)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RM-1</th>
<th>RM-2</th>
<th>RM-3</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>MX(P)</th>
<th>MX(U)</th>
<th>MX(V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Street Frontage (ft)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Street Setback (ft)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0–10</td>
<td>0–20</td>
<td>0–110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-to-Zone (Min-max. ft)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Building Coverage in BTZ (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>80/30</td>
<td>60/30</td>
<td>50/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (ft)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Ground Floor Transparency (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>35-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density (UPA)</td>
<td>~24</td>
<td>~40</td>
<td>~100+</td>
<td>~40</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street-Facing Entrance Required</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MX also has lower minimum parking requirements than most existing zones.
The Land Use Vision

FUTURE LAND USE ANALYSIS

LEGEND
- BUSY INTERSECTION
- VACANT BUILDING
- TRAIL
- PEDESTRIAN BARRIER
- WATER BODY
- ARKANSAS RIVER CORRIDOR
- DOWNTOWN CORE
- DOWNTOWN NEIGHBORHOOD
- REGIONAL CENTER
- TOWN CENTER
- NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER

MIXED-USE CORRIDOR
MAIN STREET
EXISTING RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD
NEW RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

DOES "NEW RESIDENTIAL" DESIGNATION ALLOW FOR ADEQUATE DENSITY?

RECONSIDER "MAIN STREET" DESIGNATION VERSUS "MIXED-USE CORRIDOR"
Mixed-Use
Zoning
Application
Existing Zoning
Possible Application of MX Zoning in Station Areas

1. CITY-INITIATED REZONING (AFTER OUTREACH AND EDUCATION PROCESS)
2. WAIVER OF FEES FOR OWNER-INITIATED REZONINGS
Economic Development Strategies and Tool and Incentives

Craft Economic Development Strategies for specific station areas

- Each station area should have its own unique economic strategy or role (wherever possible)*
- Guide business mix development
- Guide housing development (e.g. type of product; price point)
- Develop targeted tools and incentives to affect the station area strategies

*Some station areas will be better-suited for more “universal” strategies (e.g., “Convenience goods and services”).
Economic Development Strategies

Examples of economic development strategies could include:

- “Food & Home Furnishings” district at 41st & Peoria
- “University City” district at 81st & Lewis (Oral Roberts)

Strategies provide a framework and bring focus to types of new business and housing development. They would not mean that every new housing unit or business has to align with the strategy.
Economic Development Strategies

- Existing Tulsa Incentives, e.g.:
  - TIF
  - Special Assessment District
  - Tax Abatement
  - ‘Vision’ Package Incentive Programs

Examples of other tools and incentives:

- Restaurant development grants (Allentown, PA)
- University community rental and homeownership incentive (Detroit)
- Revolving loan fund to develop affordable housing along transit corridors (Seattle)
- Private developer fund like “Jumpstart Germantown” for targeted neighborhood redevelopment efforts (Philadelphia)
Where are we going?

The Peoria BRT Land Use Framework will show how to combine

- public infrastructure improvements,
- private development,
- modifications to zoning/development regulations and,
- economic development strategies and tools or incentives

for each of the station areas to create a phased or incremental approach to realizing the vision.
Next Steps

Feb. 1 and 2

- City Council presentation
- Public meeting
- Tulsa Development Authority Presentation

Create a Draft Land Use Framework Plan

- Refined visions/plans
- Zoning recommendations
- Economic development strategies
- Implementation outline
What are your thoughts on the following:

Land Use Mix
Urban Design
Development Character
Zoning Concept
116 West Illinois Street
Floor 7
Chicago, Illinois 60654
p 312.467.5445
f 312.467.5484
thelakotagroup.com