# AGENDA <br> CITY OF TULSA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT <br> Regularly Scheduled Meeting <br> Tulsa City Council Chambers <br> 175 East 2nd Street, 2nd Level, One Technology Center <br> Tuesday, October 12, 2021, 1:00 P.M. 

Meeting No. 1282
The City Board of Adjustment will be held in the Tulsa City Council Chambers and by videoconferencing and teleconferencing.

Board of Adjustment applicants and members of the public may attend and participate in the in the Board of Adjustment meeting via videoconferencing and teleconferencing by joining from a computer, tablet, or smartphone.

Attend in Person: 175 East 2nd Street, 2nd Level, One Technology Center
Attend Virtually: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81054331737
Attend by Phone: 312-626-6799 Meeting ID: 81054331737

If you wish to present or share any documents, written comments, or exhibits during the hearing, please submit them by 9:00 a.m. the day of the hearing. Remember to reference the case number and include your name and address.

Email: esubmit@incog.org
Mail or In Person: City of Tulsa BOA c/o INCOG, 2 W. 2nd St., Suite 800 Tulsa, OK 74103

## INTRODUCTION AND NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

At this Meeting the Board of Adjustment, in accord with and pursuant to applicable Board of Adjustment Policies and Procedures, will review, consider, discuss, and may take action on, approve, amend, modify, approve with amendment(s) or modification(s), deny, reject, or defer any action on any item listed on this Agenda.

Review and possible approval, approval with modifications, denial or deferral of the following:

1. Approval of Minutes of August 24, 2021 (Meeting No. 1279).
2. Approval of Minutes of September 14, 2021 (Meeting No. 1280).

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Review and possible approval, approval with modifications, denial or deferral of the following:
3. 23182-Jack In The Box - Dawn Bennyhoff and Shaun Steen

Variance to allow a drive-through facilities to be located on the street-facing side of the property (Section 55.100-C. 2); Variance to allow drive-through signs that exceed the maximum area of 36 square feet for the primary signs and 15 square feet for the secondary signs and to allow two secondary drive-through signs (Section 60.030-B.2). LOCATION: 8112 East 11th Street South (CD 5)

## 4. 23187-Omar Ahmadieh

Special Exception to increase the permitted driveway width in a Residential District (Section 55.090-F.3). LOCATION: 5508 South 30th West Avenue (CD 2)

## NEW APPLICATIONS

Review and possible approval, approval with modifications, denial or deferral of the following:
5. 23190—AAB Engineering, LLC - Ryan Graff

Special Exception to permit an animal boarding facility in a CS District (Section 15.020, Table 15-2). LOCATION: 9191 South Mingo Road East (CD 7)
6. 23191-AAB Engineering, LLC

Variance to reduce the required arterial street setback from 35 -feet to 20 feet in an RS-3 District (Section 5.030, Table 5-3). LOCATION: 1242 East 27th Place South (CD 4)
7. 23192-Jesse Bucelluni

Variance to increase the allowable display area for free standing signs in the CS District by 37.4 square feet (Section 60.080-C.3.b.1). LOCATION: 16415 East Admiral Place (CD 6)
8. 23193-Jim Beach

Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2 \& Section 70.120); Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 feet in an RS-3 District (Section 5.030, Table 5-3). LOCATION: 7777 South Lewis Avenue East (CD 2)

## NEW BUSINESS

## BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

## ADJOURNMENT

Website: tulsaplanning.org<br>E-mail: esubmit@incog.org<br>$C D=$ Council District

NOTE: If you require special accommodation pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, please notify Tulsa Planning Office at 918-584-7526. Exhibits, Petitions, Pictures, etc., presented to the Board of Adjustment may be received and deposited in case files to be maintained by the Tulsa Planning Office at INCOG. All electronic devices must be silenced.

NOTE: This agenda is for informational purposes only and is not an official posting. Please contact the Tulsa Planning Office at 918-584-7526 if you require an official posted agenda.


# BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CASE REPORT 

STR: 9312
Case Number: BOA-23182
CZM: 38
CD: 5

HEARING DATE: 10/12/2021 1:00 PM (Continued from 9/28/2021). The Board requested better clarification of the traffic flow on the site and a better articulated hardhip.

APPLICANT: Dawn Bennyhoff and Shaun Steen c/o Jack in the Box

ACTION REQUESTED: Variance to allow a drive-through facilities to be located on the street-facing side of the property (Section 55.100-C. 2) Variance to allow drive-through signs that exceed the maximum area of 36 square feet for the primary signs and 15 square feet for the secondary signs and to allow two secondary drive-through signs (Sec. 60.030-B.2)

LOCATION: 8102 E 11 ST S
PRESENT USE: Commercial

ZONED: CH
TRACT SIZE: 29146.12 SQ FT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PART OF LOTS SEVEN (7) AND EIGHT (8), BLOCK TWO (2), AMENDED PLAT OF LOTS ONE (1) TO EIGHT (8) INCLUSIVE, IN BLOCK ONE (1) AND LOTS ONE (1) TO EIGHT (8) INCLUSIVE, BLOCK TWO (2) FOREST ACRES ADDITION TO THE CITY OF TULSA, OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT NO. 1 063:
TRACT A
COMMENCING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 7; THENCE SOUTH 01¹7'06" EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF LOT 7 A DISTANCE OF 137.47 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTH 01¹7'06" EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF LOT 7 A DISTANCE OF 45.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $88^{\circ} 44{ }^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime}$ WEST PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF LOT 7 AND LOT 8 A DISTANCE OF 290.04 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 09^{\prime} 43 "$ WEST A DISTANCE OF 93.49 FEET: THENCE ALONG A NON TANGENT CURVE TURNING TO THE RIGHT WITH AN ARC LENGTH OF 106.65 FEET, WITH A RADIUS OF 155.90 FEET, WITH A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH $43^{\circ} 46^{\prime} 53^{\prime \prime}$ EAST , WITH A CHORD LENGTH OF 104.58 FEET; THENCE NORTH 88²43'14" EAST A DISTANCE OF 175.91 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 06{ }^{\prime \prime}$ EAST PARALLEL TO THE EAST LINE OF LOT 7 A DISTANCE OF 122.72 FEET; THENCE NORTH $88^{\circ} 21$ ' 14 " EAST A DISTANCE OF 39.89 FEET TO THE POINT BEGINNING;

## RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

Subject Property: None.

## Surrounding Properties:

BOA-14737; On 02.04.88 the board approved a variance to allow a roof sign. Property located 133H South Memorial.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of a "Town Center" and an "Area of Growth".

Town Centers are medium-scale, one to five story mixed-use areas intended to serve a larger area of neighborhoods than Neighborhood Centers, with retail, dining, and services and employment. They can include apartments, condominiums, and townhouses with small lot single family homes at the edges. A Town Center also may contain offices that employ nearby residents. Town centers also serve as the main transit hub for surrounding neighborhoods and can include plazas and squares for markets and events. These are pedestrian-oriented centers designed so visitors can park once and walk to number of destinations.

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is located at the SE/c of E. $11^{\text {th }}$ St. S. and S. Memorial Dr.

STAFF COMMENTS: The applicant is requesting Variance to allow a drive-through facilities to be located on the street-facing side of the property (Section 55.100-C. 2) Variance to allow drive-through signs that exceed the maximum area of 36 square feet for the primary signs and 15 square feet for the secondary signs and to allow two secondary drive-through signs (Sec. 60.030-B.2)
60.030-B Drive-through Signs

Drive-through signs are permitted in conjunction with drive-through uses, in accordance with the following regulations.

1. Location

Drive-through signs must be located within 10 feet of a drive-through lane.
2. Number and Dimensions

One primary drive-through sign not to exceed 36 square feet in area or 8 feet in height is allowed per order station up to a maximum of 2 primary drivethrough signs per lot. One secondary drive-through sign not to exceed 15 square feet in area or 6 feet in height is allowed per lot.

1. Stacking lanes must be located on the subject property. They may not be located within required driveways or drive aisles, parking spaces or loading areas and may not interfere with access to parking and ingress and egress from the street.
2. All areas associated with drive-through facilities, including drive-through signs, stacking lanes, trash receptacles, loudspeakers and service windows must be located to the rear or on the non-street-facing side of the property. Drive-through lanes must be set back at least 10 feet from abutting R- or AG-R-zoned lots, and a screening wall or fence must be provided along the common lot line in accordance with the F1 screening fence or wall standards of $\$ 65,070-C$.

STATEMENT OF HARDSHIP: We are requesting relief from the provision listed to be allowed to have the drive thru lane and window face 11th street. All other elements listed such as trash enclosure, speaker boards, etc. comply with the ordinance. Please note, that if the building was to be sited per the ordinance, then it would force the parking lot driveway to be very close to the intersection of Memorial and 11th Street and could potentially cause traffic flow.

There is an additional exhibit addressing a hardship for the signage.

## SAMPLE MOTION:

Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Variance to allow a drive-through facilities to be located on the street-facing side of the property (Section 55.100-C. 2) Variance to allow drive-through signs that exceed the maximum area of 36 square feet for the primary signs and 15 square feet for the secondary signs and to allow two secondary drive-through signs (Sec. 60.030-B.2)

- Finding the hardship(s) to be $\qquad$ .
- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions $\qquad$ .

In granting the Variance the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established:
a. That the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out;
b. That literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose;
c. That the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification;
d. That the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner;
e. That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief;
$f$. That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and
g. That the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of this zoning code or the comprehensive plan."


Facing East on $11^{\text {th }}$ St.


Subject property


Intersection of 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ and Memorial Dr.


Subject property

JACK IN THE BOX

August 10, 2021

## Hardship letter

"Jack in the Box is excited to share that this new restaurant project, J6155 @ 8112 E 11 th St, is the first test location in the company which incorporates this new building prototype and drive-thru design. As part of the sign package approval process, it has been determined that a variance is needed for Jack in the Box to be able to install the company's standard drive-thru menu board configuration. As with many companies during the pandemic, Jack in the Box developed strategies to better accommodate our guests' needs for more convenience, less direct interaction, and more social distancing. One of the outcomes of those learnings culminated in this test of a new restaurant prototype design and drive-thru configuration.

It is our understanding that there are (2) two concerns regarding the drive-thru menu board configuration that has been requested which is resulting in this variance request:

1. The primary speaker menu boards being submitted for approval are slightly larger in total cabinet SF area that what is allowable.
2. Full size preview menu board cabinets are no longer permitted.

In regard to the first concern, JIB uses standard size, printed, menu inserts for the drive-thru menu boards in all +2200 restaurants in the system. The menu boards already existing in the Tulsa restaurants will use the same size printed materials as the menu boards being submitted for variance approval - the surface area of the imagery is exactly the same. The reason the new menu boards are larger in total overall square-footage is that the former menu board design was flawed because they are prone to wind blowing-out the clear panels and printed menu board inserts. These new menu boards have been designed with a cabinet door system to eliminate the possibility of wind blow-outs. To reiterate, the actual image surface area of the printed menu board inserts are the same in this new menu board design as they are in the other menu boards existing in Jack in the Box restaurants in Tulsa.

In regard to the second concern, all existing JIB restaurants in Tulsa (as well as almost all in the system) use a full-size menu board for the both the preview board and speaker board positions in the drive-thru lane. As previously mentioned, Jack in the Box uses standard size printed materials that work across all restaurants. Customers have expressed their desire to have faster drive-thru service at quick serve restaurants, and many companies like Jack in the Box have responded to that need by developing a second drive-thru ordering positions. As mentioned above, this particular restaurant will be the first in the country for Jack in the Box to test both a new building prototype and dual lane drive-thru configuration. Jack in the Box is asking for approval to equip both drive thru lanes with the same type of equipment that all other single lane drive-thru Jack in the Box restaurants have in Tulsa.

Jack in the Box looks forward to being able to test our new guest convenience initiatives in the Tulsa market!

## Board Actlon:

On MOTION of WHITE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, White, Smith "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentlons"; Bradley, Quarles, "absent") to APPROVE a Varlance (Section 430.1 - Bulk and Area Requirements In Residentlal Districts - Use UnIt 1206) of setback from the centerline of Utica Avenue from $85^{\prime}$ to $60^{\prime}$ to allow for an existing carport; finding that the carport aligns with the front of the house, and that there are other structures that are as close to the street as the one in question; on the following described property:

Lot 5, Block 5, Hackathorn Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 14737

## Action Requested:

Varlance - Section 1221.3(k) - General Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unit 1221 - Request a varlance to allow for an existing roof sign, located $1133-\mathrm{H}$ South Memorial.

Presentation:
The applicant, Raymond Wolf, 1133 South Memorlal, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that he recently purchased a new sign for his buslness and asked the Board to allow a roof installation. He informed that all of the shops in the complex have roof signs. Photographs (Exhlbit T-1) were submitted.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Gardner asked the applicant if the old sign was installed on the roof, and Mr . Wolf replled that the new sign wlll replace the old roof sign, but is two feet longer.

Ms. White asked If the sign Is IIghted, and Mr. Wolf answered in the affirmative.

## Protestants: None.

## Board Action:

On WOTION of WHITE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, White, Smith "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentlons"; Bradley, Quarles, "absent") to APPROVE a Varlance (Section 1221.3(k) - General Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unit 1221) to allow for an existing roof sign; as shown in submitted photographs; finding that the previous sign was installed on the roof, as are all other signs in the strip; on the following described property:

Lot 9 and the west 51' of Lot 10, Block 2, Forrest Acres Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

DANNY WHITEMAN
SIGN PLANS EXAMINER TEL (918) 596-9664 EMAIL dwhiteman@cityoftulsa.org


LOD Number: 1

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

175 EAST $2^{\text {nd }}$ STREET, SUITE 450
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74103-3227

## SIGN PLAN REVIEW

July 8, 2021

Phone: 405-604-3636

## Shaun Steen

1634 SE $23^{\text {rd }}$ St.
Oklahoma City, OK 73129


## IMPORTANT INFORMATION

1. SUBMIT TWO (2) SETS OF REVISED OR ADDITIONAL PLANS. REVISIONS SHALL BE IDENTIFIED WITH CLOUDS AND REVISION MARKS.
2. INFORMATION ABOUT ZONING CODE, THE INDIAN NATION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (INCOG), BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (BOA), AND THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION (TMAPC) IS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT WWW.INCOG.ORG OR AT INCOG OFFICES AT 2 WEST $2^{\text {ND }}$ STREET, $8^{\text {TH }}$ FLOOR, TULSA, OK, 74103 OR TELEPHONE (918) 584-7526.
3. PRESENT THIS LETTER TO INCOG WHEN APPLYING FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION.
(Continued)

## REVIEW COMMENTS

SECTIONS REFERENCED BELOW ARE FROM THE CITY OF TULSA ZONING CODE TITLE 42 AND CAN BE VIEWED AT WWW.INCOG.ORG

Application No. S-2140, S-2141 8102 E. $11^{\text {th }}$ St.
July 8, 2021
This letter of deficiencies covers Sign Plan Review items only.
For ground, monument, pole \& outdoor advertising structure sign applications only, you may receive additional letters from ot her disciplines such as Water/Sewer/Drainage for additional deficiencies regarding Utility Easement placement which are not addressed in this letter.

## 1. 60.030-B. 2 Drive-through Signs

## Number and Dimensions

One primary drive-through sign not to exceed 36 square feet in area or 8 feet in height is allowed per order station up to a maximum of 2 primary drive-through signs per lot. One secondary drive-through sign not to exceed 15 square feet in area or 6 feet in height is allowed per lot.

Review Comments: Only one secondary drive through sign is permitted per lot. You may cancel one of these permits and remove one of the secondary drive through signs, or you may pursue a variance from the BOA to have two secondary drive through signs on one lot.

In addition, each of the proposed 32 square foot secondary drive through signs exceeds the permitted 15 square feet. You may reduce the sign area to 15 square feet or less, or you may seek a variance from the BOA to permit a secondary drive through sign to exceed the maximum surface area from 15 square feet to 32 square feet.

NOTE: Please direct all questions concerning variances, special exceptions, appeals of an administrative official, Planned Unit Developments (PUD), Corridor (CO) zoned districts, zoning changes, platting, lot splits, lot combinations, alternative compliance landscape plans and all questions regarding (BOA) or (TMAPC) application forms and fees to an INCOG representative at 584-7526. It is your responsibility to send the decision of any actions by the BOA or TMAPC affecting the status of your application for a Sign Permit to our office so we may continue to process your application. INCOG does not act as your legal or responsible agent in submitting documents to the City of Tulsa on your behalf.

## END - ZONING CLEARANCE AND SIGN CODE REVIEW

NOTE: THIS CONSTITUTES A PLAN REVIEW TO DATE IN RESPONSE TO THE SUBMITTED INFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE ABOVE REFERENCED APPLICATION. ADDITIONAL ISSUES MAY DEVELOP WHEN THE REVIEW CONTINUES UPON RECEIPT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED IN THIS LETTER OR UPON ADDITIONAL SUBMITTAL FROM THE APPLICANT.

KEEP OUR OFFICE ADVISED OF ANY ACTION BY THE CITY OF TULSA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OR TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AFFECTING THE STATUS OF YOUR APPLICATION FOR A CITY OF TULSA SIGN PERMIT.


Signtech

EAST 11 TH STREET


| SIGN LEGEND |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sicn \# | description | SIGN TYPE | SF | arr |
| A1 | 8x' CUBE PYLON SIGN | JTTB-PYL-96x96x300 | 64.0 | 1 |
| A2 | CUSTOM READERBOARD | JTTB-R8-36x96-CUSTOM THREE-SIDED | 24.0 | 1 |
| 81 | 140 WALL SIGN | JTTP- 40 | 37.0 | 1 |
| B2 | J40 Wall sign hall kit | JTTB-J40-HALO KIT | N/A | 1 |
| 日3 | J30 WALL SIGN | Јпb- 30 | 27.76 | 1 |
| 84 | J30 WALL SIGN | Ј1тe-J30 | 27.76 | 1 |
| B5 | J30 WALL SIGN | STтQ-330 | 27.76 | 1 |
| 01 | POSTER MARQUEE- SINGLE | JTT-WC-60x49-MAROUEE | 20.5 | 1 |
| C2 | POSTER MARQUEE-SINGLE | JTT-WC-60xat-MARQuEE | 20.5 | 1 |
| C3 | POSTER MAROUEE - SIIGLE | JTT-WC-60x49-MAROUEE | 20.5 | 1 |
| C4 | POSTER MAROUEE- SINGLE | JTB-WC-60x49-MAROUEE | 20.5 | 1 |
| C5 | POSTER MAROUEE- SIINGLE | JTB-WC-60x49-MAROUEE | 20.5 | 1 |
| - | ILUM. ADDRESS CABINET | JTTB-WC-16x42-ADDRESS-8112 | 4.7 | 1 |
| E | NEIGHBORHOOO LETIERS | JTte-CCO-AL-L-9 | N/A | 1 |
| F3 | SPEAKER MENU | MANUFACTURED BY OTHERS | 19.9 | 1 |
| F4 | SPEAKER MENU | MANUFACTURED BY OTHERS | 19.9 | 1 |
| G1 | DIR. SIGN - "RRIVE-THRU" |  | 23 | 1 |
| 62 | DIR. SIGN - "DRIVE-THAU" | JTE-DIP-17x 17x48-DRNETHRU-LEFT/RIGGTT | 2.3 | 1 |
| 63 | DIR. SIGN - TY/ONE' | JTT--IIP-17x $77 \times 48$-THANKYOUDONOTENTER | 23 | 1 |
| H | "ONLINE ORDER" LANE SIGN | JITE-H-BAR-120-ONUNE ORDERS | NA | 1 |
| 11 | JACK HEAD BLADE SIGN | JTB-BLD-DF-24x17 | 2.8 | 1 |
| 12 | JACK HEAD PLADE SIGN | JTTB-BLD-DF-24x17 | 2.8 | 1 |
| 」 | ILLUM. JACK HEAD LOGO | JTT-Cl-JACK HEAD | NA | 1 |
| K | RLUMINATED BOLLARDS | JTte-DIR-30x4 | NA | 13 |
| 11 | Canopy Lane id sign | JITB-WS-10x96 | NA | 1 |
| L2 | CANOPY LANEID SIGN | JITB-WS-10x96 | NA | 1 |
| M1 | "PICK UP" BLADE SIGN | JTTB-BLD-4287 | NA | 1 |
| M2 | "Pay Here" blade sign |  | NA | 1 |

Sales: Bob McCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood Design: JMc
date: $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-4/4/21-JMC quote:
project ID: J1B_6155_5


-(\$) Signtech

鲜

Sales: Bob McCarter
Sales: Bob McCarter
Coordinator: Steve Wood Coordinator: Stev
Design: JMc Engineering:
date: 6/2/21 drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-B//4/2i-JMc quote: project ID: JIB_6155_5


ITVPE JITB-PYL-96x96x300

MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL ONE (1) D/F INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED J67 PYLON SIGN CABINET: FABRICATED ALUMINUM WITH INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION
FACES: FORMED LEXAN WITH SECOND SURFACE GRAPHICS
POLE: STEEL POLE PER STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING
ILLUMINATION: LED - SLOAN PRISM 6500K WHITE

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4444 \text { Federal Bliva San Diego, CA } 92102 \\
& \text { (619) } 527-5100 \text { signtech.com }
\end{aligned}
$$

PAINT


JACK IN THE BOX
8112 E 11th St Tulta, OK 74112 USA

Sales: Bob McCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood Design: JMc Engineering:
date: $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-B/4/21-JM quote:
project ID: JIB_6155_5


JACK IN THE BOX
S112 E 114 St Tulse, OK 74.12 USA

Sales: Bob McCarter
Coordinator: Steve Wood Engineering:
drawing: PERMITquote: project ID; JIB_6155_5
INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED (LED) ALUMINUM CABINET
PAINTED TO MATCH MEDIUM GLOSS 'CAT BLACK
FRONT VIEW $\qquad$ SCALE: $1^{1 "}=1^{1}-0^{\prime \prime}$
WHITE LEXAN FACE WITH FIRST SURFACE APPLIED GRAPHICS


SIGNTYPE JITB-RB-36x96-CUSTOM THREE-SIDED
MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL THREE (3) INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED S/F READERBOARD CABINETS TO BE MOUNTED ON PYLON
CABINET BODY: SIGNCOMP ALUM. EXTRUSION PART NO. 2034, WITH INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION
CABINET RETAINERS: SIGNCOMP ALUM. EXTRUSION PART NO. 2056, PAINTED TO MATCH "P1"
FACES: 150 " THICK WHITE MODIFIED ACRYLIC FACE WITH FIRST SURFACE PRINTED DIGITAL GRAPHICS
CABINET BACK: .063" ALUM. PRE-PAINTED WHITE, PAINT BACK SIDE TO MATCH "P1"
ILLUMINATION: LED - SLOAN PRISM 5700K WHITE



SIDE VIEW SCALE: $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

SIGNTYPE JITB-J40
MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL ONE (1) S/F INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED J30 WALL SIGN(S) UPPER CABINET: FABRICATED ALUMINUM WITH INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION AND UL APPROVED DISCONNECT SWITCH
LOWER CABINET: FABRICATED ALUMINUM WITH INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION UPPER FACE: FORMED POLYCARBONATE WITH SECOND SURFACE GRAPHICS
LOWER FACE: ROUTED ACM WITH PUSH-THRU ACRYLIC COPY
LOGO BORDER: ACM
ILLUMINATION: LED

## - MAIERIALS <br> $31 / 2^{*}$ CHANNEL LETTER COI PRE-COATE 3 1/2" CHANNEL LETIER COIL PRE-COA MP 64691 "IBB RED" WITH SATIN FINISH

M4 उMM WHITE ACM ( $0.1188^{\text {S SKIN }}$ )
3MM SILVER ACM ( 0.118 " SKIN)3/4" CLEAR ACRYLIC


## JACK IN THE BOX <br> S112 E I1th St Tulss, OK 79112 USA

Coordiales: Bob McCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood Design: JMc Engineering:

[^0] quote:
project ID: JIB_6155_5

date: $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1--8/4/23-JMc quote:
project ID: JIB_6155_5


BAFFLE SECTION SCALE: FULL SIZE

B2 SIGNTYPE JITB-J40-HALO KIT
MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL ONE (1) JAO LED HALO KIT
BACKER: 3MM ACM (WHITE/BLACK)
BAFFLE: 2 " $\times 11 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 0.040^{\prime \prime}$ PRE-COATED WHITE ALUMINUM ANGLE
ILLUMINATION: WHITE AND PURPLE LED

4444 Federal Blva San Diego, CA 92102 619) 527-6100 signtech.com

## JACK IN THE BOX

$31: 2$ Enth sit tulsa, OK 74112 USA

Sales: Bob McCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood Design: JMC Engineering:
date; $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-JMc quote:
project ID: JIB_6155_5

$\frac{\text { FRONT VIEW SCALE: } 3 / 4^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}}{\text { 27.76 SQ. FT. }}$


## END VIEW

## B3 B4 B5 SIGNTYPE JITB-J30

MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL THREE (3) S/F INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED J30 WALL SIGN(S) UPPER CABINET: FABRICATED ALUMINUM WITH INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION AND UL APPROVED DISCONNECT SWITCH
LOWER CABINET: FABRICATED ALUMINUM WITH INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION
UPPER FACE: FORMED POLYCARBONATE WITH SECOND SURFACE GRAPHICS
LOWER FACE: ROUTED ACM WITH PUSH-THRU ACRYLIC COPY
LOGO BORDER: ACM
ILLUMINATION: LED

MATERIALS
$31 / 2^{*}$ CHANNEL LETTER COIL PRE-COATED MP 64691 SIB REO WITH SATN FNISH3MM WHITE ACM ( $0.118^{*}$ SKIN)3MM SILVER ACM ( $0.118^{*}$ SKIN)
M6 3/4" CLEAR ACRYLIC

P3 TO MATCH LACRYL SERIES 40 443 'DEEP RED' TRANSLUCENT PAINT


TO MATCH LACRYL SERIES 400
P5 L-403-W TRANSLUCENT PAINT
Pg TO MATCH MP 30136 'BRUSHED

4444 Federal Blva San Diego, CA 92102 619) 527-6100 signtech.com


## Sales: Boo MeCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood

 Design: JMcEngineering:
date: $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-JM quote: project ID: J1B_6155_5



C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 SIGNTYPE JITB-WC-60x49-MARQUEE
MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL FIVE (5) ILLUMINATED SINGLE POSTER MARQUEE PANEL(S)
FACE: ROUTED $3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ WHITE LEXAN WITH ATTACHED SNAP FRAME, INSERTS BY OTHERS
DUTER FRAME: FABRICATED . $063^{\circ}$ THICK ALUMINUM
ILLUMINATION: INTERNAL LED ILLUMINATION AND UL APPROVED DISCONNECT SWITCH


CALE: $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$


## ELECTRICAL LAYOUT

SCALE: $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$
 SCALE: $3 / 4^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

## POWDER COAT

PC3 TO MATCH RAL7022 W/ SATN FINISH 'UMBRA GREY

## MATERIALS

7 ALUMINUM SNAP FRAME W/ CLEAR ANODIIED SATIN FINISH


## JACK IN THE BOX



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { date: } 6 / 2 / 21 \\
& \text { drawing: PERMIT te } \\
& \text { quate: } \\
& \text { project ID: JIB_6155_5 }
\end{aligned}
$$



JACK IN THE BOX


[^1]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { date: } 6 / 2 / 21 \\
& \text { drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-B/4/21-dMe } \\
& \text { quote: } \\
& \text { project ID: J18_6155_5 }
\end{aligned}
$$
\]



## SIGNTYPE JITB-FCO-AL-IL-9

MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL ONE (1) CANOPY MOUNTED FLAT CUT-OUT HALO-ILLUMINATED SIGN
ETTERS: 1/8" WATERJET CUT ALUMINUM
ILLUMINATION: SLOAN PRISM 4000K LED WITH GOW POWER SUPPLY TO BE INSTALLED INSIDE CANOPY

PAINT
P1 PAINT TO MATCH MP 64691 JIIB- RED W/ SATIN FINISH
PAINT TO MATCH WALL
2 EXACT COLOR TBV
$\square$
M1 $1 / 8^{*}$ ALuminum


```
date: \(6 / 2 / 2\)
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-/M \(=\) quote:
```

project ID: JIB_6155_5


NOTE: MENU LUG-ON HARDWARE MUST
BE SPACED CORRECTLY FOR GRAPHICS TO FIT.


F3 F4 SIGNTYPE SPEAKER MENU BY OTHERS
INSTALL ONE (1) SPEAKER MENU BY OTHERS WITH LUG-ON HARDWARE PANELS

CABINET: MANUFACTURED BY NATIONAL SIGNS
POLE: 4 4 "x8" STEEL RECTANGULAR TUBE (SEE MENU CANOPY)


PC2 TO MATCH RAL 9004 'SIGNAL BLACK W/ SATIN FNISH

JACK IN THE BOX

$$
\text { s112 E 1i:h St Tulsa OK } 74112 \text { USA }
$$


(A) $211 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 301 / 4^{*}$ V.0. $/ 4.5$ SQ. FT. ( X 2$)=9$ sa. FT.
(B) $211 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 17^{\prime \prime}$ V. $0 . / 2.5 \mathrm{SQ}$. FT. $(\mathrm{x} 1)=2.5 \mathrm{SQ} . \mathrm{FT}$.
(C) $211 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 145 / 16^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{V} .0 . / 2.1 \mathrm{SQ}$. FT. $(x 4)=8.4 \mathrm{SQ}$. FT .

## TOTAL: 19.9 SQ.FI

SQUARE FODTAGE CALCULATIONS SCALE: $3 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\circ}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { date: } 6 / 2 / 21 \\
& \text { drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-JMC } \\
& \text { quote: } \\
& \text { project ID: JIB_6155_5 }
\end{aligned}
$$




[^2][^3]

## SIGNTYPE JITB-DIR-17×17×48-THANKYOU/DONOTENTER

MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL ONE (1) D/F INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED DIRECTIONAL SIGN(S)
CABINET: EXTRUDED ALUMINUM
POLE: 3 " $\times 3^{" ~ S T E E L ~ S Q U A R E ~ T U B E ~}$
ILLUMINATION: LED - PRINCIPAL OWIK MOD 3 6500k WHITE


V1 3M 3630-73 'DARK RE

Signtech

## JACK IN THE BOX




[^4]date: $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-JMC quote:
project ID: JIB_6155_5


JB-BLD-DF-24X17
MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL TWO (2) D/F INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED BLADE SIGNS WITH ROUTED AND BACKED FACES CABINET: ALUM. FABRICATION
FACES : : $125^{\circ}$ ALUM.
WHITE/PURPLE RING: $177^{*}$ THICK CLEAR ACRYLIC W/ FIRST AND SECOND SURFACE VINYL
RETURNS: $063^{\circ} \times 5^{\prime \prime}$ ALUM. STACK WELDED TO FRONT TRIM.
SUPPORT: $2^{*} \times 2^{*} \times 3 / 16^{\prime \prime}$ ALUM. SQUARE TUBE WELDED TO ATTACHMENT PLATE
ATTACHMENT PLATE: $1 / 4^{*}$ ALUM. PLATE - PLATE DETALLS TBV
ILLUMINATION: LEDS (WHITE AND PURPLE ON TIMER) WITH REMOTE POWER SUPPLY


Coordines: Bob McCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood Design: JMc Engineering:


NIGHT VIEW - PURPLE LED
SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$

JACK IN THE BOX
Sl12 E.1Th SI Tulsa, OK 74112 USA


NIGHT VIEW - WHITE LED
SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=1^{1}-0^{\prime \prime}$
SCALE:1" ${ }^{(1)}{ }^{\circ}$
$\qquad$

date: $6 / 2 / 21$ drawing:
quote:
project ID: JIB_6155_5


## FRONT VIEW

SCALE: 1:6


END VIEW
SCALE: 1:6

## JACK IN THE BOX



Sales: BoD McCarter Coordinator: Steve Wood
Design: JMc Engineering
date: $6 / 2 / 21$ drawing: PERMMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-JME drawing:
project ID: J1日_6155_5


SIGNTYPE JITB-CL-JACK HEAD
MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL ONE (1) INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED JACK HEAD LOGO CHANNEL SIGN

JACK IN THE BOX

$\qquad$

Sales: Bob McCarter Sales: Sob McCarter
Coordinator: Steve Wood Coordinator: Ste
Design: $J M$ Engineering:
date: $6 / 2 / 21$
drawing: PERMIT drawing: PERMIT
quote: project 1D: JIB_6155_5

(A) SECTION VIEW FULL SIZE

## 6 $\Gamma$ $\Gamma$

-(4) Signtech

Sales: Bob McCarter Sales: Bob McCarte
Coordinator: Steve Wood Coordinator: Steve Wc
Design: JMc Engineering:
date: $6 / 2 / 21$ drawing: PERMIT rev:R1-8/4/21-JMc quote: project ID: JIB $6155-5$



|  | JACK IN THE BOX 16165 B1:2 E 11th St Tulse. OK 74112 USA |
| :---: | :---: |

[^5]
L2 front view $\qquad$ SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=1^{1} \cdot 0^{\prime \prime}$

## SIDE VIEW

 SCALE: $1^{1 "}=1^{1-0}$
## SIGNTYPE JITB-WS-10x96

MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL TWO (2) INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED EMBEDDED CANOPY SIGNS
SIGN SLIDES INTO CAVITY IN CANOPY BY OTHERS AND SCREWS INTO FACE OF CANOPY WITH COUNTERSUNK SCREWS
 'UMBRA GREY' TBY

Signtech

## JACK IN THE BOX





## F1 F2 SIGNTYPE PREVIEW MENU BY OTHERS

0102 SIGNTYPE MENU EXTENDER GY OTHERS
INSTALL TWO (2) PREVIEW MENU BY OTHERS WITH
TWO (2) BREAKFAST EXTENDER BY OTHERS

POWDER COAT -
O Match ral 9004 'SIGNaL Black W/ SATN FNISH

| (A) | (B) | (A) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (C) | (C) | (B) | (C) | (C) |

(A) $211 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 301 / 4^{*}$ v.o. $/ 4.5$ SQ. FT. ( $\mathbf{x 2}$ ) $=9$ SQ. FT.
 (C) $211 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 145 / 16^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{V} .0 . / 2.1$ SQ. FI. $(x 4)=8.4 \mathrm{sQ} . \mathrm{FI}$. (D) $471 / 4^{-\times 11^{\prime \prime}}$ v.o. $/ 3.6$ sQ. FT. $(\mathbf{x} 1)=3.6$ sQ. FT. TOTAL: 26 SQ. FI

SQUARE FOOTAGE CALCULATION SCALE: $3 / 8^{\prime \prime}=1^{-1} 0^{\prime \prime}$

Sales: Bob McCarter
Sales: Bob McCarter
Coordinator: Steve Wood Design: JMC Engineering:
date: 6/2/21 drawing: 21-00865 rev:XX quate: project ID: J18_6155_5



POLE END CAP


POLE HAND HOLE COVER


## BASE PLATE DETAILS

| P1 P2 P3 P4 SIGNTYPE JITB-MB-POLE-5x5x68 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

MANUFACTURE AND INSTALL FOUR (4) MENU POLES


## JACK IN THE BOX



Sales: Bob McCarter
Coordinator: Steve Wood
Engineering:
date: $6 / 2 / 21$ drawing: 21-00865 rev: XX quote:

0
0
0
0




|  | Feet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 50 | 100 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Tract


Hardships for JIB include the following but not limited to:

1) Drive Aisle will cause major havoc with intersection.

Drive Aisle is closer to intersection
2) You have room for at most two cars to back up before it starts impacting roadway.
a. Back up into S Memorial
3) If we slide the drive closer to the building then we cannot install Canopy over the drive thru.
a. This is a critical design element for this building style
4) Reduced parking overall
5) Front Cross access with the adjacent property is not easily accomplished without major confusion.
6) Reduced building visibility along $11^{\text {th }} /$
a. JIB design intent is to have most prominent corner facing customers to maximize exposure.
7) The back of the building will be facing the intersection which is the least interesting portion of the building.
8) There is no good route for deliveries to be received from the 53' delivery truck
a. Truck will block main parking lot
9) Access to trash enclosure is restricted
a. DT exit will be blocked during pick up
b. JIB prefers a head on pick up vs side

## THIS PAGE

## INTENTIONALLY

## LEFT BLANK



# BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CASE REPORT 

STR: 9234
Case Number: BOA-23187
CZM: 46
CD: 2
HEARING DATE: 10/12/2021 1:00 PM (Continued from 9/28/2021). Applicant was not present at 10/12/21 hearing.

APPLICANT: Omar Ahmadieh
ACTION REQUESTED: Special Exception to increase the permitted driveway width in a Residential District (Section 55.090-F.3)

LOCATION: 5508 S 30 AV W
ZONED: RS-3
PRESENT USE: Residential $\quad$ TRACT SIZE: 8851.43 SQ FT
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LT 1 BLK 8, MOUNTAIN MANOR ADDN
RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS: None.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of an "Existing Neighborhood" and an "Area of Stability".

An Existing Neighborhood is intended to preserve and enhance Tulsa's existing single-family neighborhoods. 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.

The Areas of Stability include approximately $75 \%$ of the city's total parcels. Existing residential neighborhoods, where change is expected to be minimal, make up a large proportion of the Areas of Stability. The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and smallscale infill projects. The concept of stability and growth 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. The concept of stability and growth 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.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is located at the SW/c of W. $55^{\text {th }}$ Street S . and S. $30^{\text {th }} \mathrm{W}$. Ave.

STAFF COMMENTS: The applicant is requesting Special Exception to increase the permitted driveway width in a Residential District (Section 55.090-F.3)
3. In RE and RS zoning districts, driveways serving residential dwelling units may not exceed $50 \%$ of the lot frontage or the following maximum widths, whichever is less, unless a greater width is approved in accordance with the special exception procedures of Section 70.120 , or, if in a PUD, in accordance with the amendment procedures of Section_30.010-1.2. (Refer to the City of Tulsa Standard Specifications and Details for Residential Driveways \#701704).

Maximum Driveway Width

| Lot Frontage | $75^{\prime}+$ | $60^{\prime}-74^{\prime}$ | $46^{\prime}-59^{\prime}$ | $30^{\prime}-45^{\prime}$ | Less than 30' [2] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Driveway Within Right-of-Way (feet) [1] | $27^{\prime}$ | $26^{\prime}$ | $22^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $12^{\prime}$ |
| Driveway Within Street Setback (feet) | $30^{\prime}$ | $30^{\prime}$ | -- | -- | -- |

The applicant is proposing a driveway width of 32 ' on the lot and inside the right-of-way.


## Subject property

The photo taken during a site visit shows a Recreational Vehicle parked in the proposed location of the new driveway. Attached are the supplemental regulations for parking and storing of Recreational Vehicles. Those regulation would prevent the applicant from parking the Recreational vehicle within the street yard. Included in your packet is a copy of Sec. 45.150 of the zoning code.

SAMPLE MOTION: Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Special Exception to increase the permitted driveway width in a Residential District (Section 55.090-F.3)

- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions (including time limitation, if any):
- Suggested Condition: Applicant to obtain permit for construction in the right-of-way.

The Board finds that the requested Special Exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.
45.120-C Office support services must have internal access from the subject office building. External entrances are also allowed.

## Section $45.130 \quad$ Parking and Storage of Commercial Trucks

No vehicle required to be registered as a "commercial truck" pursuant to OAC 710:60-3-91 may be parked or stored on a lot within a residential zoning district. This provision is not intended to prohibit deliveries and pickups by common carrier delivery vehicles (e.g., postal service, united parcel service, FedEx, et al.) of the type typically used in residential neighborhoods

Section $45.140 \quad$ Parking and Storage of Inoperable or Unlicensed Motor Vehicles in R or AG-R districts, parking or storage of inoperable or unlicensed motor vehicles is prohibited within street yards.

## Section $45.150 \quad$ Parking and Storage of Recreational Vehicles

45.150-A Other than for purposes of loading and unloading, which must take place within a 48 -hour period, recreational vehicles located in an AG, AG-R, R or MX district may be parked or stored only in the following locations:

1. Within a garage;
2. Within a rear building setback, provided it is set back at least 3 feet from all lot lines;
3. Within a side yard but not within a required side building setback;
4. Within a side building setback if the recreational vehicle is no more than 6 feet in height, excluding the height of any outboard motor or windshield, and the recreational vehicle is screened along the lot line nearest to the vehicle and extending for the vehicle's the full length by an F1 screening fence or wall in accordance with $\$ 65.070-\mathrm{C}$; or
5. Within the street yard, provided that the development administrator determines that all of the following conditions exist:
a. Space is not available or there is no reasonable access to either the side yard or rear yard;
b. Parking inside the garage is not possible due to the height or width of the recreational vehicle;
c. The recreational vehicle is parked perpendicular to the street lot line;
d. The body of the recreational vehicle is at least 12 feet from the face of the curb or travel lanes of the street and does not extend over a sidewalk; and
e. No more than one recreational vehicle is parked or stored in the street yard.
6. For purposes of these provisions:
a. A corner lot is always deemed to have reasonable access to the rear yard;
b. A fence does not necessarily prevent reasonable access to a yard; and
c. A boat loaded on a boat trailer is considered one recreational vehicle.
45.150-B The parking and storage of recreational vehicles in an R or AG-R district is permitted in accordance with $845,150-\mathrm{A}$, provided that:
7. The vehicle is not used for dwelling purposes;
8. The vehicle is not permanently connected to sewer lines, water lines, or electricity; and
9. The vehicle is not used for storage of goods, materials, or equipment other than those items considered to be a part of the recreational vehicle or essential for its use as a recreational vehicle.
45.150-C If the siting regulations of 545.150-A cannot be met, parking or storage of recreational vehicles in the street yard requires approval in accordance with the special exception procedures of Section 70.120.

## Section 45.160 Residential Support Service

45.160-A Residential support services include restaurants and retail sales of convenience goods provided primarily to serve the needs of residents of residential buildings.
45.160-BResidential support services are allowed in the RM-3 district and all MX districts as an accessory use to any principal group living use and in apartment/condo buildings.
45.160-C Residential support services must be located in the same building as the principal residential use, and occupy, in aggregate, floor area of no more than 4,000 square feet or $10 \%$ of the floor area of the principal residential use, whichever is less.
45.160-DResidential support services must have internal access from the principal residential building، External entrances are also allowed.

## Section $45.170 \quad$ Rooming Units

Rooming units that are accessory to household living uses are allowed, provided that the total number of unrelated persons residing on the property does not exceed the number permitted in the household.

## Section $45.180 \quad$ Satellite Dish Antennas

45.180-A Where Allowed

1. Satellite dish antennas up to 40 inches in diameter are permitted as of right as an accessory use to all lawfully established principal uses in all zoning districts. They are subject to all applicable accessory structure setback regulations.
2. Satellite dish antennas over 40 inches in diameter, up to 120 inches in diameter, are permitted as of right as an accessory use to all lawfully established principal uses in mixed-use and nonresidential zoning districts. They are subject to all applicable accessory structure setback regulations.

Jeff S. Taylor Zoning Official Plans Examiner III TEL(918) 596-7637 jstaylor@cityoftulsa org

Omar Ahmadieh info@newcreteok.com

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

175 EAST $2^{\text {nd }}$ STREET, SUITE 450 TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74103

ZONING CLEARANCE PLAN REVIEW

8/23/2021

APPLICATION NO: ZCO 2234 (PLEASE
REFERENCE THIS NUMBER WHEN CONTACTING OUR OFFICE)
Project Location: 5508 S $30^{\text {th }} \mathrm{W}$ Ave
Description: Driveway Expansion

## INFORMATION ABOUT SUBMITTING REVISIONS

OUR REVIEW HAS IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING CODE OMISSIONS OR DEFICIENCIES IN THE PROJECT APPLICATION FORMS, DRAWINGS, AND/OR SPECIFICATIONS. THE DOCUMENTS SHALL BE REVISED TO COMPLY WITH THE REFERENCED CODE SECTIONS.

## REVISIONS NEED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

1. A COPY OF THIS DEFICIENCY LETTER
2. A WRITTEN RESPONSE AS TO HOW EACH REVIEW COMMENT HAS BEEN RESOLVED
3. THE COMPLETED REVISED/ADDITIONAL PLANS FORM (SEE ATTACHED)
4. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT APPROVAL DOCUMENTS, IF RELEVANT

REVISIONS SHALL BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO THE CITY OF TULSA PERMIT CENTER LOCATED AT 175 EAST $2^{\text {nd }}$ STREET, SUITE 450, TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74103, PHONE (918) 596-9601. THE CITY OF TULSA WILL ASSESS A RESUBMITTAL FEE. DO NOT SUBMIT REVISIONS TO THE PLANS EXAMINERS.

SUBMITTALS FAXED / EMAILED TO PLANS EXAMINERS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

## IMPORTANT INFORMATION

1. SUBMIT TWO (2) SETS [4 SETS IF HEALTH DEPARTMENT REVIEW IS REQUIRED] OF REVISED OR ADDITIONAL PLANS, REVISIONS SHALL BE IDENTIFIED WITH CLOUDS AND REVISION MARKS.
2. INFORMATION ABOUT ZONING CODE, INDIAN NATION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (INCOG), BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (BOA), AND TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION (TMAPC) IS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT WWW.INCOG.ORG OR AT INCOG OFFICES AT 2 W. $2^{\text {nd }}$ ST., $8^{\text {th }}$ FLOOR, TULSA, OK, 74103, PHONE (918) 584-7526.
3. A COPY OF A "RECORD SEARCH" [ IIS [ $x$ IIS NOT INCLUDED WITH THIS LETTER. PLEASE PRESENT THE "RECORD SEARCH" ALONG WITH THIS LETTER TO INCOG STAFF AT TIME OF APPLYING FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION AT INCOG. UPON APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, INCOG STAFF WILL PROVIDE THE APPROVAL DOCUMENTS TO YOU FOR IMMEDIATE SUBMITTAL TO OUR OFFICE. (See revisions submittal procedure above.).
(continued)

## REVIEW COMMENTS

## SECTIONS REFERENCED BELOW ARE FROM THE CITY OF TULSA ZONING CODE TITLE 42 AND CAN BE VIEWED AT hittp:I/tulsaplanning. org/plans/TulsaZoningCode pdf

Note: As provided for in Section $\mathbf{7 0 . 1 3 0}$ you may request the Board of Adjustment to grant a variance from the terms of the Zoning Code requirements identified in the letter of deficiency below. Please direct all questions concerning variances, special exceptions, appeals of an administrative official decision, Master Plan Developments Districts (MPD), Planned Unit Developments (PUD), Corridor (CO) zoned districts, zoning changes, platting, lot splits, lot combinations, alternative compliance landscape and screening plans and all questions regarding (BOA) or (TMAPC) application forms and fees to an INCOG representative at 584-7526. It is your responsibility to submit to our offices documentation of any appeal decisions by an authorized decision making body affecting the status of your application so we may continue to process your application. INCOG does not act as your legal or responsible agent in submitting documents to the City of Tulsa on your behalf.
Staff review comments may sometimes identify compliance methods as provided in the Tulsa Zoning Code. The permit applicant is responsible for exploring all or any options available to address the noncompliance and submit the selected compliance option for review. Staff review makes neither representation nor recommendation as to any optimal method of code solution for the project.

| Maximum Driveway Width |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Frontage | 75'+ | $60^{\prime}-74^{\prime}$ | $46^{\prime}-59^{\prime}$ | $30^{\prime}-45^{\prime}$ | Less than $30^{\prime}$ [2] |
| Driveway Within Right-of-Way (feet) [1] | $27^{\prime}$ | $26^{\prime}$ | $22^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | 12' |
| Driveway Within Street Setback (feet) | $30^{\prime}$ | $30^{\prime}$ | - | -. | -- |

[1] Maximum width applies to the composite of all driveways if multiple curb cuts are provided.
55.090-F3 Surfacing. In RE and RS zoning districts, driveways serving residential dwelling units may not exceed the following maximum widths unless a greater width is approved in accordance with the special exception procedures of Section 70.120. Maximum Driveway Width is $27^{\prime}$ within ROW and $30^{\prime}$ in the street setback on your lot.

Review Comments: The submitted site plan proposes a driveway width of more than $30^{\prime}$ in width on the lot in the street setback and more than 27 ' wide in ROW which exceeds the maximum allowable driveway widths both within and outside of the ROW. Revise plans to indicate the driveway shall not exceed the maximum allowable widths in the table or apply to the BOA for a special exception, one for the proposed driveway width within the ROW and also for the proposed driveway width outside of the ROW

This letter of deficiencies covers Zoning plan review items only. You may receive additional letters from other disciplines such as Building or Water/Sewer/Drainage for items not addressed in this letter. A hard copy of this letter is available upon request by the applicant.

Please Notify Plans Examiner By Email When You Have Submitted A Revision. If you originally submit paper plans, revisions must be submitted as paper plans. If you submit online, revisions must be submitted online

## END -ZONING CODE REVIEW

NOTE: THIS CONSTITUTES A PLAN REVIEW TO DATE IN RESPONSE TO THE SUBMITTED INFORMATION ASSOCIATED WITH THE ABOVE REFERENCED APPLICATION. ADDITIONAL ISSUES MAY DEVELOP WHEN THE REVIEW CONTINUES UPON RECEIPT OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED IN THIS LETTER OR UPON ADDITIONAL SUBMITTAL FROM THE APPLICANT.

KEEP OUR OFFICE ADVISED OF ANY ACTION BY THE CITY OF TULSA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OR TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION AFFECTING THE STATUS OF YOUR APPLICATION FOR A ZONING CLEARANCE PERMIT.



Feet
Subject Tract


BOA-23187
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# BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CASE REPORT 

STR: 8419
Case Number: BOA-23190
CZM: 58
CD: 7

HEARING DATE: 10/12/2021 1:00 PM
APPLICANT: Ryan Graff c/o AAB Engineering, LLC
ACTION REQUESTED: Special Exception to permit an Animal Boarding Facility in a CS District ( Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2)

LOCATION: 9191 S MINGO RD E
PRESENT USE: Vacant

## ZONED: CS

TRACT SIZE: 193842.79 SQ FT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PART OF GOVERNMENT LOT ONE (1), SECTION NINETEEN (19), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE FOURTEEN (14) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF AND MORE FULLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID GOVERNMENT LOT ONE (1); THENCE SOUTH 01¹0'47" EAST ALONG THE WEST LINE THEREOF, A DISTANCE OF 355.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $88^{\circ} 56$ '55" EAST, A DISTANCE OF 58.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $88^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 421.50 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 456.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $88^{\circ} 565^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 429.50 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47$ " WEST, A DISTANCE OF 166.10 FEET; THENCE NORTH $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 8.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 289.88 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. CONTAINING 193,532.39 SQUARE FEET OR 4.44 ACRES.
LEGAL DESCRIPTION BASIS OF BEARINGS IS THE WEST LINE OF GOVERNMENT LOT ONE BEING NORTH 01¹0'47" WEST.

## RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

Subject property:
Z-7463; On 11.09.18 the TMAPC recommended approval and the City Council approved on 12.19 .18 a re-zoning from AG to CS w/ an Optional Development to permit a Private Street Commercial Development.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of a "Regional Center" and an "Area of Growth".

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to
increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.
Regional Centers are mid-rise mixed-use areas for large-scale employment, retail, and civic or educational uses. These areas attract workers and visitors from around the region and are key transit hubs; station areas can include housing, retail, entertainment, and other amenities. Automobile parking is provided on-street and in shared lots. Most Regional Centers include a parking management district.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is located South of the SE/c of E. $91^{\text {st }} \mathrm{St}$. S. and S. Mingo Rd.

STAFF COMMENTS: The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to permit an Animal Boarding Facility in a CS District ( Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2)

| USE CATEGORY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Supplemental |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Subcategory Specific use | OL | OM | OMH | OH | CS | CG | CH | CBD | IL | IM | 1 H | Regulations |
| COMMERCIAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animal service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Section 40.020 |
| Boarding or shelter | - | - | - | - | S | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |
| Grooming | - | - | - | - | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |
| Veterinary | - | - | - | - | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |  |

Animal Service uses are subject to the supplemental regulations of Sec. 40.020:

## Section $40.020 \quad$ Animal Services <br> Whenever an animal services use is located on a lot abutting an R- or AG-R-zoned lot, a screening wall or fence must be provided along the common lot line in accordance with the F1 screening fence or wall standards of $\$ 65.070-\mathrm{C}$.

SAMPLE MOTION: Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Special Exception to permit an Animal Boarding Facility in a CS District ( Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2)

- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions (including time limitation, if any):

The Board finds that the requested Special Exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.


Property immediately West of subject property across Mingo.


Facing North on Mingo


Subject property

FEET; THENCE N01 ${ }^{\circ} 08^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime}$ W FOR A DISTANCE OF 394.04 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.
8. Z-7463 Global Development LLC (CD 7) Location: South of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road requesting rezoning from CO and AG to CS with optional development plan (Related to Mingo Commercial Center)

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

## SECTION I: Z-7463

## APPLICANTS DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:

Mingo Commercial Park is a proposed 4 lot commercial subdivision on the east side of Mingo Road south of $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South. This optional development plan has been submitted along with a request to rezone the property from AG to CS. The owner plans to develop the property using a common mutual access drive along the center of the property. This plan is provided to allow lots to be created without frontage along a street in accordance with the current subdivision regulations. It sets out the method for measuring the required bulk and area requirements and setbacks.

## SECTION II: Optional Development Plan Standards:

## GENERAL PROVISIONS:

1. All district use regulations, supplemental regulations, building types, lot and building regulations, along with other relevant regulations shall conform with the provision of the Tulsa Zoning Code for development in a CS zoning district except that lots are not required to have public street frontage.

## PRIVATE STREETS AND MAINTENANCE OBLIGATIONS FOR COMMON

 AREAS AND IMPROVEMENTS:1. All lots within the subdivision shall include direct vehicular access to a private street. All private streets shall be included in a reserve area or mutual access easement as defined on the face of the final plat. The
reserve area or easement shall include provisions that provide common use and benefit of the owners of the lots, their guest and invitees for providing vehicular and pedestrian access to and from the various residential lots and to and from public streets.
2. All operations and maintenance responsibilities for improvements in reserve areas shall be assigned to a Property Owners Association. Such obligation must be provided for in the plat. Each property owner, by acceptance of a deed to a property within the development, will be deemed to have agreed to be a member of the property owner's association and be subject to assessments for maintenance of the common areas and public or private improvements.
3. Provisions shall be made to allow access to the City of Tulsa, the United States Postal Service, private parcel delivery services, public utility providing service to the subdivision and to any refuse collection service which provides service within the subdivision the right to enter and traverse the private street and to operate thereon all service, emergency and allow government vehicles including, but not limited to, police and fire vehicles and equipment.
4. Private streets and sidewalks abutting private streets shall be constructed to meet or exceed the City of Tulsa Engineering standards for minor residential streets and must satisfy the provisions of the Tulsa Metropolitan Area Subdivision and Development Regulations.
5. Private streets intersecting with public streets must have a vehicular turn around area before any entrance gate that allows a complete turnaround completely outside the street right of way of the intersecting public streets. Gate designs, security systems and access controls must be reviewed and approved by the technical advisory committee before installation.

## MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACKS FROM PRIVATE STREETS:

1. No building shall be located closer than 35 feet as measured to the center of the mutual access easement.

## LANDSCAPING:

1) All landscaping shall conform with or exceed the landscape standards of the Tulsa Zoning Code at the time a building permit for new building construction is submitted. Additionally, the following standards shall apply to street yard landscaping which shall be provided along the mutual access drive as follows:
i) A landscape strip with a minimum width of 12 feet from the edge of pavement shall be established and maintained as a landscaped area.
ii) Within that landscape strip trees shall be installed and maintained with a maximum spacing of one tree for each 50 linear feet along both sides of the drive.

## PLATTING REQUIRMENT:

A final plat meeting or exceeding the minimum standards of the City of Tulsa shall be filed at the Tulsa County Courthouse prior to receipt of any commercial building permit.

## DETAILED STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Z-7463 requesting CS with the optional development plan as outlined in Section II is consistent with the Regional Center land use designation of the Tulsa comprehensive plan and,

CS zoning is non-injurious to the surrounding property owners.
CS zoning is consistent with the expected development pattern in the area therefore,

Staff recommends Approval of Z-7463 as outlined in Section II above.

## SECTION III: Supporting Documentation

## RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

Staff Summary: CS zoning with the optional development plan is consistent with the Regional Center land use vision of the comprehensive plan.

## Land Use Vision:

Land Use Plan map designation: Regional Center
Regional Centers are mid-rise mixed-use areas for large-scale employment, retail, and civic or educational uses. These areas attract workers and visitors from around the region and are key transit hubs; station areas can include housing, retail, entertainment, and other amenities. Automobile parking is provided on-street and in shared lots. Most Regional Centers include a parking management district.

## Areas of Stability and Growth designation: Area of Growth

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases,
develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

Areas of Growth are found throughout Tulsa. These areas have many different characteristics but some of the more common traits are proximity to or abutting an arterial street, major employment and industrial areas, or areas of the city with an abundance of vacant land. Also, several of the Areas of Growth are in or near downtown. Areas of Growth provide Tulsa with the opportunity to focus growth in a way that benefits the City as a whole. Development in these areas will provide housing choice and excellent access to efficient forms of transportation including walking, biking, transit, and the automobile."

## Transportation Vision:

Major Street and Highway Plan: Secondary Arterial with out additional designations.

Trail System Master Plan Considerations: The Tulsa Trail Plan illustrates a proposed trail system along the south edge of this site. During the plat process accommodations for a 20' wide trail easement should be included during the plat process.

See Trail Plan Snippet on next page:


Small Area Plan: None
Special District Considerations: None
Historic Preservation Overlay: None
DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS:
Staff Summary: The site is undeveloped and was a homesite with some agricultural uses evident.

Environmental Considerations: None except the floodplain area adjacent to the south boundary of the site.

Streets:

| Exist. Access | MSHP Design | MSHP R/W | Exist. \# Lanes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| South Mingo Avenue | Secondary Arterial | 100 feet | 5 includes center <br> turn lane |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |

Utilities:
The subject tract has municipal water and sewer available.
Surrounding Properties:

| Location | Existing <br> Zoning | Existing Land <br> Use <br> Designation | Area of <br> Stability or <br> Growth | Existing Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | CS | Regional Center | Growth | Convenience store |
| East | AG | Regional Center | Growth | Empty lot |
| South | CO | Regional Center | Growth | Floodplain lot empty |
| West | AG | Regional Center | Growth | Floodplain empty lot |

## SECTION III: Relevant Zoning History

ZONING ORDINANCE: Ordinance number 11834 dated June 26, 1970, established zoning for the subject property.

Subject Property: No relevant history

## Surrounding Property:

BOA-22091 June 2016: The Board of Adjustment approved a special exception to permit a dynamic display sign for Forest Park Christian Church in the AG District, on property located at the southwest corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road.

Z-6910-SP-2 April 2006: All concurred in approval of a proposed Corridor Site Plan on a $4.45+$ acre tract of land for commercial and medical office use and to establish the aggregate floor area of 27,380 square feet for office development, on property located east of southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road.

Z-7003/PUD-721 January 2006: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning and approval of a proposed Major Amendment to PUD on a $40 \pm$ acre tract of land from AG to CS/OL/RS-3/PUD to permit office, commercial, and residential uses on property located on the northwest corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and south Mingo Road.

Z-6910-SP-1 December 2003: All concurred for approval of the proposed Corridor Site plan on a 4.5+ acre tract for a 4-story bank and medical office
building located east of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street and South Mingo Road.

Z-6910 November 2003: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a $4.5 \pm$ acre tract from AG to CO, for office and bank use, on property located east of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street and South Mingo Road.

Z-6467/PUD-628 March 2000; All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning and approval of a proposed Major Amendment to PUD on a $15.86 \pm$ acre tract of land from AG/CO to CO/PUD to permit a medium intensity office park to include assisted living facility and elderly/retired housing, on property located on the northeast corner of the Mingo Valley Expressway and South Mingo Road.

Z-6538/Z-6538-SP-1 July 1996: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a $3.4 \pm$ acre tract of land from AG to CO, on property located south and east of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road. Approval was also granted for a Corridor Site plan for an inline hockey facility.

Z-6467/Z-6467-SP-1 January 1995: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a $15 \pm$ acre tract of land from AG/CO to CO on property located south and east of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road. Approval was also granted for a Detail Corridor Site Plan to allow a golf center with a driving range, practice, and instructional facilities.

Z-6194 July 1988; All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a 3.45 $\pm$ acre tract of land from AG to CO on property located east of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road.

Z-5916 December 1987: All concurred in approval of a request for rezoning a $2 \pm$ acre tract of land from AG to CS on property located on the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road.

The applicant indicated his agreement with staff's recommendation.

## There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

## TMAPC COMMENTS:

Mr. Walker asked what the use was going to be,
Staff stated he was unsure of the use, but the applicant was present if more details were needed.

TMAPC Action; 9 members present:
On MOTION of DIX, TMAPC voted 9-0-0 (Covey, Dix Fothergill, Krug, Millikin, Reeds, Ritchey, Shivel, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; none "abstaining"; Doctor,

Fretz, "absent") to APPROVE Z-7463 rezoning from CO to AG and CS with optional development plan per staff recommendation.

## Legal Description of Z-7463:

The West Four hundred seventy-nine and Five tenths (479.5) Feet of the South Four hundred fifty-six (456) feet of the North Eight hundred eleven (811) feet of Government Lot One (1), Section Nineteen (19), Township Eighteen (18) North, Range Fourteen (14) East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U.S. Government Survey thereof, LESS AND EXCEPT Beginning at a point Fifty (50) feet East and Three hundred fifty-five (355) feet South of the Northwest Corner of Section Nineteen (19), Township Eighteen (18) North, Range Fourteen (14) East of the Indian Base and Meridian, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the U.S. Government Survey thereof; thence Eight (8) feet Easterly and perpendicular to the West line of Section 19; thence Southerly Two hundred ninety (290) feet; thence Westerly Eight (8) feet; thence Northerly Two hundred ninety (290) feet to the Point of Beginning.
9. Mingo Commercial Center (CD 7) Preliminary Plat, Location: South of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road (Related to Z-7463)

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Related to Z-7463 rezoning from AG/CO to CS
South of the southeast corner of East $91^{\text {st }}$ Street South and South Mingo Road
This plat consists of 4 lots, 1 block on $4.45 \pm$ acres.
The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) met on November 1, 2018 and provided the following conditions:

1. Zoning: The property is currently zoned primarily AG (Agriculture) with a very small area of CO (Corridor) along the southern boundary. All property is under application to be rezoned to CS (Z-7463). The rezoning must be approved and effective prior to the approval of a final plat.
2. Addressing: City of Tulsa addresses and street names must be assigned and affixed to the face of the final plat.

MINGO COMMERCIAL LEGAL DESCRIPTION:
GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC, AN OKLAHOMA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, IS THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY AS DEPICTED ON THE ATTACHED PLAT AND IS HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE "OWNER", SAID PROPERTY BEING MORE COMPLETELY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT:

A PART OF GOVERNMENT LOT ONE (1), SECTION NINETEEN (19), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE FOURTEEN (14) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF AND MORE FULLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID GOVERNMENT LOT ONE (1); THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG THE WEST LINE THEREOF, A DISTANCE OF 355.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $88^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 58.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $88^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 421.50 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 456.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $88^{\circ} 56^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 429.50 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 166.10 FEET; THENCE NORTH $88^{\circ} 49^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, A DISTANCE OF 8.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $01^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, A DISTANCE OF 289.88 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. CONTAINING 193,532.39 SQUARE FEET OR 4.44 ACRES.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION BASIS OF BEARINGS IS THE WEST LINE OF GOVERNMENT LOT ONE BEING NORTH 01 ${ }^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ WEST.

THE OWNER HAS CAUSED THE ABOVE DESCRIBED TRACT OF LAND TO BE SURVEYED, STAKED, PLATTED AND COMBINED INTO FOUR (4) LOTS, ONE (1) BLOCK AND TWO (2) RESERVES, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE ACCOMPANYING PLAT, AND HAS DESIGNATED THE SUBDIVISION AS "MINGO COMMERCIAL CENTER", A SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA (HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS "MINGO COMMERCIAL CENTER" OR THE "SUBDIVISION").
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## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CASE REPORT

Case Number: BOA-23191
CZM: 36
CD: 4

HEARING DATE: 10/12/2021 1:00 PM
APPLICANT: Alan Betchan
ACTION REQUESTED: Variance to reduce the required arterial street setback from 35 -feet to 20 feet in an RS-3 Zoning District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3)

LOCATION: 1242 E 27 PLS ZONED: RS-3
PRESENT USE: Vacant
TRACT SIZE: 22874.32 SQ FT
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LTS 32 \& 33, BLK 19, SUNSET TERRACE

## RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

## Subject property:

BOA-21709; On 05.08.14 the Board approved a Special Exception to permit a 8' 7" high wall in the required front yard.

## Surrounding properties:

BOA-20013; On 03.22.05 the board approved a Variance of the required setback from 70' to $40^{\prime}$ from the Center of Peoria Ave. Property located 1308 E. $27^{\text {th }}$ PI. S.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of an "Existing Neighborhood " and an "Area of Stability".

An Existing Neighborhood is intended to preserve and enhance Tulsa's existing single-family neighborhoods. 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.

The Areas of Stability include approximately $75 \%$ of the city's total parcels. Existing residential neighborhoods, where change is expected to be minimal, make up a large proportion of the Areas of Stability. The ideal for the Areas of Stability is to identify and maintain the valued character of an area while accommodating the rehabilitation, improvement or replacement of existing homes, and smallscale infill projects. The concept of stability and growth 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. The concept of stability and growth 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.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is located West of Peoria Ave between E. $28^{\text {th }}$ Street South and E. $27^{\text {th }}$ St. S. The property is a part of the Sunset Terrance Subdivision that is currently being re-developed.

STAFF COMMENTS: The applicant is requesting a Variance to reduce the required arterial street setback from 35 -feet to 20 -feet in an RS-3 Zoning District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3)

Table 5-3: $R$ District Lot and Building Regulations

| Regulations | RE | RS-1 | RS-2 | RS-3 | RS-4 | RS-5 | RD | RT | RM-0 | RM-1 | RM-2 | RM-3 | RMH |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Min. Building Setbacks (ft.) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Street [3] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Arterial or fwy service rd. | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 35 |
| Other streets | 35 | 35 | 30 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 25 |
| Side (interior) [4] | 15 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5[5] | 5[6] | 5[6] | 5[6] | 5[7] | 10 |
| Rear [4] | 25 | 25 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 15 |

The subject proeprty has frontage on Peoria Ave. but will access the property through a mutual Access easement from $28^{\text {th }}$ Street. Althoguh per the code the front lot line is from the Peoria, in practice the Peoria Ave. lot line will serve as a rear lot line.

## STATEMENT OF HARDSHIP:

The original plat predates the full build out of Peoria and a redevelopment of lots that once fronted Peoria. Rotating the lot to front an internal road and eliminating curb cuts onto Peoria creates a read yard setback on an arterial in a location that was not originally contemplated as a rear yard. This creates a hardship for home construction on the property.

SAMPLE MOTION: Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Variance to reduce the required arterial street setback from 35-feet to 20-feet in an RS-3 Zoning District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3)

- Finding the hardship(s) to be $\qquad$ .
- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions $\qquad$ .

In granting the Variance the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established:
a. That the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out;
b. That literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose;
c. That the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification;
d. That the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner;
e. That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief;
f. That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and
g. That the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of this zoning code or the comprehensive plan."


Facing South on Peoria from intersection of $28^{\text {th }}$ and Peoria.


Facing North on Peoria from intersection of $28^{\text {th }}$ and Peoria.


Entrance to the subdivision where the subject property is located.
not saying human dead. They are not saying animal dead or pet dead. In the reality of our society pets are part of the family, and they need a process where the death can be dealt with respectfully and regulated. The code does not stipulate human or pet funeral home, it just states funeral home.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked if Use Unit 27 was quoted because of the animal rendering. Ms. Miller answered affirmatively. She stated that even though the previous interpretation was made that a pet crematory could be an accessory use to a human funeral home, now the question is the funeral home difference.

Mr. White asked Mr. Swiney, would a motion made similar to page 3.8 in the Board's agenda packet be sufficient to grant the relief Mr. Joyce is seeking, or does the Board need to state that they are going to uphold the appeal or both. Mr. Swiney stated there are two actions before the Board. One is the appeal and the other is the interpretation. Mr. Swiney stated that in his opinion the Board would have two votes.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

## Comment and Questions:

None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of WHITE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell absent) to UPHOLD the Appeal of the Determination of an Administrative Official that a Pet Crematory is a designated Use Unit 27 and a Code Interpretation Section 1211 - Funeral Homes includes funeral homes for pets. This approval is also to reiterate the interpretation that the Board made previously where animal crematories, small animals of 200 pounds or less may be cremated as an accessory use to a funeral home, including a pet funeral home. The Board is excluding a crematory as an accessroy use to kennels and veterinary clinics; for the following property:

PRT SE SE BEG 354.62W SECR SE SE TH W100 N303.45 SE110.47 S256.78 POB LESS S35 \& N16.5 FOR RDS SEC 161913 .52AC, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

## 21709-Eller and Detrich - Lou Revnolds



## Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a screening wall or fence height increase in the requried front yard from $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to $8^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$ to the top of the column end cap (Section 210.B. 3 and Section 212.A.2). LOCATION: NW/c of South Peoria Avenue and East $28^{\text {th }}$ Street (CD 4)

## BOA-21709

## Presentation:

Lou Reynolds, 2727 East $21^{\text {st }}$ Street, Tulsa, OK; stated he is representing Dr. David Bell and his wife Ann, and they are the owners of the subject property. The subject property is comprised of nine lots that comply with the zoning code. Mr. Reynolds had several exhibits shown on the overhead projector for his presentation, showing other walls and fences in the area. The highest point of the proposed fence is 7.6 feet which are the pillars at the main gate. The ornamental iron fence is $6^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ tall. There will be two gates on $28^{\text {th }}$ Street, the west gate will be the main gate and will serve five lots. The existing house uses Peoria Avenue for their access but they will no longer utilize that access point, but will be using the east gate from $28^{\text {th }}$ Street to serve the existing house. There will be two other houses built on the subject property. There will be a screening wall on Peoria and the highest point will be $8^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$ for the pillars, while the wall itself will be approximately eight feet high. The gated doorways into each of the lots will be $6^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$ and they have been approved by the Fire Department. They will have Knox locks placed on them, and it is the preferred way for the development of the subject property. The proposed walls will be on private property. All the lots have frontage on Peoria but they will not be using that frontage for access to the street, and the Street Department does not want driveways on Peoria because of people slowing down to turn or stopping completely for a turn. There is an existing sidewalk on Peoria but there is no sidewalk on $28^{\text {th }}$ Street, but there will be a sidewalk installed running east and west the south side of the subject property on $28^{8^{\text {th }}}$ Street.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Mr. Reynolds how many lots were fronting Peoria. Mr. Reynolds stated there are six lots that front Peoria and as the lots are developed there will be three along the Peoria frontage.

Mr. Swiney asked Mr. Reynolds about the doors that are proposed in the screening wall. Mr. Reynolds stated the doors will be for emergency use, though they could be used for daily use but that is not the intent.

## Interested Parties:

Greg Bledsoe, 1304 East $26^{\text {th }}$ Place, Tulsa, OK; as a neighbor he wanted to commend the applicant for developing the property in an appropriate way and consistent with the neighborhood. As a long time resident in the area he would like to state that if the special exception is approved as per the plan submitted on $28^{\text {th }}$ Street he will have no objections to the project. It is desireable as far as the neighborhood is concerned. He does have concerns about Peoria. Currently the property, as you drive down Peoria, it is very open and very visible with a wonderful park like atmosphere. He would be interested to finding another way instead of erecting the Great Wall of China built along Peoria. The house that is diagnol from the subject property has a wrought iron fence that is open with a base that is two or three feet tall. There is a house west of The Philbrook that has an appearance of blocking views and it is not compatible with the neighborhood. The proposed screening wall is going to make a tremendous change in how Peoria appears. The eight foot fence on the side yard is fine but it is the screening fence on the wall that is questionable. He would like to request the owner to consider

## BOA-21709

some method to allow for wrought iron in the screening fence to preserve the open space affect.

## Rebuttal:

Lou Reynolds came forward. The owner's existing house is going to be reconfigured and will be redirected with the frontage on $28^{\text {th }}$ Street and the rear along Peoria. The proposed screening fence will provide more privacy for that rear yard and that is the reason for the proposed design. The other two proposed houses will also have the rear yard along Peoria.

Mr. Henke asked Mr. Reynolds if there would be landscaping in front of the proposed screening fence. Mr. Reynolds stated there would be landscaping.

## Comments and Questions:

None:

## Board Action:

On MOTION of VAN DE WIELE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell absent) to APPROVE the request for a Special Exception to permit a screening wall or fence height increase in the requried front yard from $4^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ to $8^{\prime}-7^{\prime \prime}$ to the top of the column end cap (Section 210.B.3 and Section 212.A.2), subject to the conceptual plans as submitted today, May 13, 2014, showing the Peoria Avenue frontage and the $28^{\text {th }}$ Street frontage, and page 5.11 to show the height increase layout along the Peoria Avenue frontage. Finding the Special Exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; for the following property:

> LT 28 BLK 19, LTS 29-30-30A-31-32-33 BLK 19, SUNNYCREST ACREAGE, SUNSET VIEW ADDN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

## 21708-Maren Christensen

## Action Requested:

Variance of the required side yard from 5 feet to 3 feet in RS-3 District to permit the construction of a detached one-car garage (Section 403, Table 3). LOCATION: 1351 East $21^{\text {st }}$ Street South (CD 4)

## Presentation:

Grant Christensen, 1351 East $21^{\text {st }}$ Street, Tulsa, OK; stated he is the home owner of the subject property. Mr. Christensen did not make a formal presentation but was available for any questions from the Board.

The buildings on the adjoining properties abut the building on this property. In the front of the building there is a wide sidewalk. Parking in the front would disrupt the unique pedestrian feel of the neighborhood and require removing the sidewalk. The space at the rear is the only realistically available area for parking. Most of the neighboring properties have more parking spaces available at the rear or on adjacent parking lots. The changes in the zoning code since this structure was built would cause an unnecessary hardship from the literal enforcement of the code. There is no adverse affect on the neighborhood by decreasing one parking space, since there is ample street parking along Boston Avenue. Mr. Schuller referred the Board to the letter of support from Mr. Joe Westervelt, a neighboring property owner (Exhibit D-1).

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On Motion of Paddock, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Paddock, Stead, Henke "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Stephens "absent") to APPROVE a Variance from the required number of parking spaces from 9 to 8 to permit office use (Section 1211.D), finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan; and finding the building was constructed before zoning code requirements for offstreet parking; the lots were smaller and did not take parking into consideration; this is a high-intensity, urban area; and the buildings in the surrounding area have similar issues for parking and this would not be detrimental to the neighborhood; and there is ample parking on the street, on the following described property:

LT 10 BLK 2, CODY ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

## Case No. 20013

## Action Requested:

Variance of the required 70 ft setback from the centerline of S . Peoria Avenue to 40 ft . (Section 403); and a Variance of the allowable height for a fence in the required front yard from 4 ft to 8 ft for a stucco screening wall (Section 210.B.3)

## Presentation:

Richard Winn, 1530 South Harvard, is the architect and represented the property owner. He stated the hardship is that the 70 ft . setback would limit them to a 55 ft . frontage. He added that would make it difficult to build an estate type home with that little frontage. The required 35 ft , right-of-way imposed on this property reduces the lot area, as well as the frontage, and essentially creates a nonconforming lot.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham questioned if the existing house encroaches on the setback requirement. Mr. Winn replied there are 53 ft . from the centerline of Peoria, about 13 ft . more than they proposed. Mr. Dunham noted the variance for the fence height also. Mr. Winn replied that the fence height would provide more security and sound barrier from the heavy vehicular and pedestrian traffic. He also referred to five such variances granted in this neighborhood, three of them on this street. Mr . Dunham suggested they need to provide a sight triangle for traffic safety. Mr. Winn stated that the improvement exceeds the existing encroachment in the sight triangle. Ms. Stead asked if the new fence would be to the east of the trees along Peoria. Mr. Winn thought the trees were slated for removal. Mr. Winn agreed to a condition that the fence would not encroach into the sight triangle.

Staff advised the Board that the request to vary the fence height is actually allowed by a special exception. It is listed as a variance but the Board should take action on the fence height variation as a special exception.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On Motion of Stead, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Paddock, Stead, Henke "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Stephens "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of the required 70 ft setback from the centerline of S. Peoria Avebue to 40 ft . (Section 403), finding this to be a non-conforming lot by the narrowness of the RE-zoned lot; and that the literal enforcement of the code would work a hatdship on this lot; and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public,good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan.

On Motion of Paddock, the Board voted 3-1-0 (Dunham, Paddock, Henke "aye"; Stead "nay"; no "abstentions"; Stephens "absent") to APPROVE and a Special Exception of the allowable height for a fence in the required front yard from 4 ft to 8 ft for a stucco screening wall (Section 210.B.3), with condition: that the fence not encroach into the sight triangle, finding it will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code, and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; and it will not encroach into the sight triangle, on the following described property:

BEG AT A PT 1771 N \& 18.5E OF SWC OF SEC 18 TH N194 E121.5 S194 W121.5 POB SEC 1819 13, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma
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# BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CASE REPORT 

STR: 9402
Case Number: BOA-23192
CZM: 40
CD: 6

HEARING DATE: 10/12/2021 1:00 PM
APPLICANT: Jessie Bucelluni
ACTION REQUESTED: Variance to increase the allowable display area for free standing signs in the CS District by 37.4 square feet (Sec. 60.080-C.3.b.1)

LOCATION: 16415 E ADMIRAL PL N ZONED: CS
PRESENT USE: Arby's
TRACT SIZE: 91380.54 SQ FT
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: BEG 501.50E \& 40N SWC LT 4 TH N313.89 SE162.85 CRV LF 122 E85.56 TO W R/W 164TH E AVE TH S242.50 TO N R/W E ADMIRAL PL TH W358.01 POB LESS S10 FOR ST SEC 21914 2.097ACS,

## RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

## Subject property:

BOA-19378; On 06.25.02 the board approved a variance of the maximum permitted height for a pole sign from 50 ' to 65 ' in height.

BOA-16105; On 08.25.92 the Board approved a variance to increase the allowed aggregate display area for a sign form 420 square feet to 620 square feet.

BOA-16150; On 10.13.92 the Board approved a variance of the maximum permitted height for a pole sign from 50' to 70' in height.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of an area of "Employment" and an "Area of Growth".

Employment areas contain office, warehousing, light manufacturing and high tech uses such as clean manufacturing or information technology. Sometimes big-box retail or warehouse retail clubs are found in these areas. These areas are distinguished from mixed-use centers in that they have few residences and typically have more extensive commercial activity. Employment areas require access to major arterials or interstates. Those areas, with manufacturing and warehousing uses must be able to accommodate extensive truck traffic, and rail in some instances. Due to the special transportation requirements of these districts, attention to design, screening and open space buffering is necessary when employment districts are near other districts that include moderate residential use.

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter
auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is located at the NW/c of N. $165^{\text {th }}$ E. Ave. and E. Admiral PI.

STAFF COMMENTS: The applicant is requesting Variance to increase the allowable display area for free standing signs in the CS District by 37.4 square feet (Sec. 60.080-C.3.b.1)

## b. Lots with Frontage on Major Streets

(1) The maximum aggregate sign area of all on-premise projecting and freestanding signs and off-premise outdoor advertising signs allowed on lots with frontage on one or more major streets may not exceed the limits established in Table 60-3:

Table 60-3: Maximum Aggregate Sign Area

[1] Off-premise outdoor advertising signs are prohibited outside of freeway sign corridors and prohibited in MX districts.
(2) In addition to the maximum aggregate sign area limits, individual onpremise projecting and freestanding signs may not exceed 500 square feet in area. Individual off-premise outdoor advertising signs may not exceed 672 square feet in area.

The applicant would be allowed 370 square feet per code and is asking to be allowed an additional 37.4 square feet for a total of 407.4 square feet for an Arby's restaurant. The hardship stated by the applicant explains that the hardship is that there are two businesses that are on the same lot. Staff feel that is a hardship that is self-imposed by the property owner. The property owner could apply for a lot split and limit the size of the sign for the other business.

STATEMENT OF HARDSHIP: Due to the odd platting 2 business are considered along the same frontage and have reduced allowable signage square footage below the necessary threshold for visibility along a major highway. Arby's has removed all other freestanding signage property and will only have signage visibility along l-44 therefor we are requesting an increase of allowable sq. footage of 37.4 sq . ft.

SAMPLE MOTION: Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Variance to increase the allowable display area for free standing signs in the CS District by 37.4 square feet (Sec. 60.080-C.3.b.1)

Finding the hardship(s) to be $\qquad$ .

- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions $\qquad$ .

In granting the Variance the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established:
a. That the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out;
b. That literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose;
c. That the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification;
d. That the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner;
e. That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief;
f. That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and
g. That the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of this zoning code or the comprehensive plan."


Subject property
the setback on Lot 1, Block 1, on OL lot. He stated that E. $111^{\text {th }}$ St. becomes a one lane road, then dead ends at Louisville. He added that another residential development will begin on the other side of that dead end, so $\mathrm{E} .111^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. will not become an arterial.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr . Dunham agreed that $\mathrm{E} .111^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. would not be opened up as an arterial.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Perkins, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Cooper "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of required setback from East $111^{\text {th }}$ Street from $100^{\prime}$ from centerline to $83^{\prime}$ from centerline, finding the hardship to be that $111^{\mathrm{th}} \mathrm{St}$. will probably never be continued any further west than it exists now, and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

Lot 1, Block 1, South Yale Park, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.

## NEW APPLICATIONS

## Case No. 19378

## Action Requested:

Variance of maximum height permitted for a sign on a lot where abutting street is a designated freeway on the Major Street Plan from required 50' to 65' in a CS district, located 16415 E. Admiral PI.

## Presentation:

Terry Howard, 4411 S. Sheridan Rd., stated the property is in a depression abutting the expressway. Traffic coming from the west can barely see the sign because of the elevation and a grove of trees block view of the sign for traffic from the east. A site plan was provided (Exhibits C-1a and 1b).

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

## Board Action:



On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnto perkins "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Cooper "absent") to APPROVE a Varlagce of maximum height permitted for a sign on a lot where abutting street is a desigrtated freeway on the Major Street Plan from required $50^{\prime}$ to $65^{\prime}$ in a CS district, per plan,
finding the hardship to be the particularly low property along an interstate highway, and other signs were approved for elevation in the area, on the following described property:

Beg. 501.5' E \& 40' N of SW/c of Lot 4; thence $\mathrm{N} 313.89^{\prime}$ SE $162.85^{\prime}$ curve length $122^{\prime} \mathrm{E} 85.56^{\prime}$ to W right-of-way of $164^{\text {th }} \mathrm{E}$. Ave. thence $\mathrm{S} 242.50^{\prime}$ to N right-ofway of Admiral PI. thence W 358,01' to POB, less S $10^{\prime}$ for street, Section 2, T-19-N, R-14-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.*.*....*.*.*.*.*.*.

## Case No. 19379

## Action Requested:

Variance of required rear yard of $\mathbf{2 5}^{\prime}$ down to $16.9^{\prime}$. SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 6; and a Variance of side yard abutting a non-arterial street of $20^{\prime}$ (for a garage) down to 17.5'. SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, located 5106 E. $22^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{PI}$.

## Presentation:

Chet Cross, 5106 E. $22^{\text {nd }}$ PI., stated he was in the process of having a garage built. He submitted a packet of information (Exhibit B-1) to the Board. He planned for a paved driveway in front of the garage. The hardships are the sewer line across his property and a mature Catawba tree, and he would like to keep the continuity of the architecture of the house. He obtained affidavits from his neighbors in support of the application.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Perkins "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Cooper "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of required rear yard of $25^{\prime}$ down to 16.9'; and a Variance of side yard abutting a non-arterial street of 20' (for a garage) down to 17.5', per plan, finding the hardships to be the sewer line, Catawba tree, and there are numerous similar variances in the immediate area, on the following described property:

Lot 1, Block 3, Gracemont $3^{\text {rd }}$, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

```
*.*..*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.
```


## Case No. 19380

Action Requested:
Special Exception to use adjoining lot, under same ownership, to meet the parking requirements ( 12 spaces required) on a lot other than where the principal use is located. SECTION 1301.D., located E of SE/c E. Admiral \& S. Lewis.

Action Requested:
Variance of the required side yard from $5^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$; variance of the lot width from $60^{\prime \prime}$ to $43^{\prime \prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$; variance of lot area from 6,900 sf to $5,089 \mathrm{sf}$; variance of land area; and a variance of livability space from 4,000 sf to 2,347 sf to permit a lot split - sECTION 403. BULK AND area requirements in the residential districts - Use Unit 6 , located east of the NW/C of Xanthus and 14th Place.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Jones informed that the applicant, Honey Karr, has requested by letter (Exhibit C-1) that Case No. 16101 be withdrawn.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of WHITE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to WITHDRAW Case No. 16101, as requested.

## Case No. 16105

Action Requested:
Variance of the aggregate display surface area of 3 sq ft per lineal foot of building wall to permit a backlit awning - SECTION 1221.D.1. CS District Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unit 12, located NW/C South 164th East Avenue and East Admiral Place.

Comments and Questions:
Mr. Gardner asked if the backlit awnings are a part of the building structure, or if the wall height will be increased by the sign.

## presentation:

The applicant, Oklahoma Neon, 6550 East Independence, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by Mr. Tucker, who stated that the portion of one sign that is above the building will be backed with sheet metal. He explained that Arby's signs throughout the City are being changed, and one of the signs will extend $2^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}$ above the building, with the total copy area of each sign being approximately 80 sq ft . He informed that the signs will comply with the lighting standards proposed to the City Council.

## Comments and Questions:

In response to Mr. Doverspike, Mr. Tucker stated that the signs that are in place are in bad repair, and the Arby's corporation is attempting to upgrade signage.

Case No. 16105 (continued)
Mr. Bolzle inquired as to the amount of signage requested, and Mr. Tucker stated that he is requesting a variance from the required 420 sq ft to $620 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$.

Mr. Doverspike pointed out that on September 24, 1991, the Board minutes reflect that Councilor Polishuk reported that amendments regarding lighted awnings will be adopted and all hearings on the issue will be completed by December 1, 1991. He noted that this statement was made approximately one year ago, and it was determined at that time that all future applications of this nature would not be favorably considered until the amendments were adopted. Mr. Doverspike stated that, while he does not disagree with the request, in his opinion, the Board does not have the authority to grant the variance, and that the Board should not act on applications of this nature until the city Council has passed the technical amendments to the sign ordinance.

## Protestants:

None.
Board Action:
On MOTION of CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-2-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, , T. White, "aye"; Doverspike, S. White, "nay"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of the aggregate display surface area from 420 sq ft to 620 sq ft . to permit a backlit awning - SECTION 1221.D.1. CS District Use Conditions for Business Signs Use Unit 12; subject to the lettering being equal to or less than 80 sq ft , and that lighting for the awning be no greater than 25 footcandles measured at 2'; finding that similar signs have previously been approved by the Board, and that the sign in question will comply with the proposed ordinance change currently being reviewed by the City Council; on the following described property:

Beg. 501.5' E and $40^{\prime} \mathrm{N} S W / \mathrm{c}$ of Lot 4, thence N 313.89' SE 162.85' curve length 122' E, 85.5' E to West R/W of 164th E. Ave. thence S 242.50 to $N \mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ Admiral Pl. thence $W$ 558.01' to POB, less $S 10^{\prime}$ for street, Section 2, T-19-N, R-14-E; City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Action Requested:
Variance of the permitted sign height from 50' to $70^{\prime}$ sECTION 1221.D.1. Cs District Use Conditions for Business signs - Use Unit 12, located 16415 East Admiral Place.

## presentation:

Oklahoma Neon was represented by Glen Tucker, who informed they have a problem with visibility of their existing sign, because the restaurant on the subject property is built in a depression. He submitted photographs (Exhibit $\mathrm{K}-1$ ) and explained them. The sign is approximately 15 feet lower in height because of the topography of the area. There is limited visibility from west to east and no visibility from east to west. He would like to raise the sign 20 feet higher at the same location. Mr. Tucker informed that the subject tract is located in the lowest elevation within a two mile section.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Gardner explained that the subject property is next to an elevated expressway, and the zoning code allows a $60^{\prime}$ sign on properties located next to elevated expressways. He stated that the elevation of the property in question, which is much lower than the abutting properties, could be a unique physical hardship.

Mr. Doverspike asked about the staff comment that this approval could set a precedent for additional signage, and Mr. Gardner informed that would be true only if there is not a legitimate hardship.

Mr. Doverspike asked if raising the sign 60 feet would be enough relief, and Mr. Tucker informed it would not be.

Mr . Bolzle informed he is not sure that relief of 20 feet is necessary. Mr. Tucker suggested that the Board approval require that the sign be no taller than any sign within 300 yards. Mr. Tucker described other signs in the area.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of DOVERSPIRE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bolzle, Doverspike, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Chappelle, $S$. White, "absent") to APPROVE a variance of the permitted sign height from 50' to the lesser of $70^{\prime}$ or the highest elevation above sea level of the top of the Quik Trip sign to the east as it presently exists sECTION 1221.D.1. Cs District Use Conditions for Business Bigns - Use Unit 12; finding the hardship to be the

Case No. 16150 (continued) topography and elevated expressway; on the following described property:

Beginning 501.5' E and $40^{\circ} \mathrm{N} \mathrm{SW} / \mathrm{C}$ of Lot 4, the N 313.89' SE 162.85' curve length 122' E 85.66' to West R.W. of 164 th E. Avenue, then $S 242.50^{\prime}$ to North R.W. Admiral Place then West 358.01 ' to the Point of Beginning less $\mathrm{S} 10^{\prime}$ for Street, Section 2, Township 19 North, Range 14 East.

## Case No. 16151

Action Requested:
Variance of the required front yard setback from 35' to 25' to permit the replacement of an existing carport SBCTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 6, located 2855 East 36th Place.

## presentation:

The applicant, Peter Rommel, 2855 East 36th place, submitted some protographs (Exhibit $L-1$ ) and informed that he does not want to build any further out than the existing building. The footprint of the new carport will be the same as the existing footprint except that it will be 2 feet wider. Mr. Rommel submitted a petition (Exhibit L-2) with 10 signatures of the immediate neighbors which indicates their support of this application.

## Comments and Ouestions:

Mr. Doverspike asked the applicant if the west line of the carport lines up with the west side of the house, and Mr . Rommel informed it is approximately one foot in.

There was discussion about the type of building materials which will be used on the carport.

Mr. Doverspike asked if there are other carports in this neighborhood, and Mr. Romel informed there are no others on this street, but there is one on Florence and one on 35th Place.

Mr. Doverspike asked how long the existing carport had been there, and Mr. Rommel informed they have lived at this location for five years and the carport was there when they moved in.

Mr. Bolzle stated they do not know if the existing carport is nonconforming or just an illegal carport.

## DEVELOPMENTSERVICES

175 EAST $2^{\text {nd }}$ STREET, SUITE 450
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74103-3227

## SIGN PLAN REVIEW

July 23, 2021
LOD Number: 1

Todd Adair
1225 N. Lansing Ave.
Tulsa OK 74106

| APPLICATION NO: <br> Location: <br> Description: | S-3273 (PLEASE REFERENCEWHEN CONTACTING OUR office) 16415 E. Admiral PI. <br> Freestanding sign |
| :---: | :---: |
| INFORMATION ABOUT SUBMITTING REVISIONS |  |
| OUR REVIEW HAS IDENTIFIED THE FOLLOWING CODE OMISSIONS OR DEFICIENCIES IN THE PROJECT APPLICATION FORMS, DRAWINGS, AND/OR SPECIFICATIONS. THE DOCUMENTS SHALL be revised to comply with the referenced code sections. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| REVISIONS NEED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING: <br> 1. A COPY OF THIS DEFICIENCY LETTER |  |
|  |  |
| 2. A WRITTEN RESPONSE AS TO HOW EACH REVIEW COMMENT HAS BEEN RESOLVED |  |
| 3. THE COMPLETED REVISED/ADDITIONAL PLANS FORM (SEE ATTACHED) |  |
| REVISIONS SHALL BE SUBMITTED DIRECTLY TO THE CITY OF TULSA PERMIT CENTER LOCATED |  |
| AT 175 EAST $2^{\text {nd }}$ STREET, SUITE 450, TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74103, PHONE (918) 596-9601. |  |
| THE CITY OF TULSA WILL ASSESS A \$55 RESUBMITTAL FEE. DO NOT SUBMIT REVISIONS TO THE |  |
| PLANS EXAMINERS. |  |

SUBMITTALS FAXED/EMAILED TO PLANS EXAMINERS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

1. SUBMIT TWO (2) SETS OF REVISED OR ADDITIONAL PLANS. REVISIONS SHALL BE IDENTIFIED WITH CLOUDS AND REVISION MARKS.
2. INFORMATION ABOUT ZONING CODE, THE INDIAN NATION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT (INCOG), BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (BOA), AND THE TULSA METROPOLITAN AREA PLANNING COMMISSION (TMAPC) IS AVAILABLE ONLINE AT WWW.INCOG.ORG OR AT INCOG OFFICES AT 2 WEST $2^{\text {ND }}$ STREET, $8^{\text {Th }}$ FLOOR, TULSA, OK, 74103 OR TELEPHONE (918) 584-7526,
3. PRESENT THIS LETTER TO INCOG WHEN APPLYING FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION.
(Continued)

## REVIEW COMMENTS

SECTIONS REFERENCED BELOW AREFROM THECITY OF TULSA ZONING CODE TITLE 42 AND CAN BE VIEWED AT WWW.INCOG.ORG

Application No. S-3273 16415 E. Admiral PI. July 23, 2021
This letter of deficiencies covers Sign Plan Reviewitems only.
For ground, monument, pole \& outdoor advertisingstructure sign applications only, you may receive addifional letters from other disciplines such as Water/Sewer/Drainage for additional deflciencies regarding Utility Easement placement which are not addressed in this letter.

### 60.080-C.3.b. 1 Sign Budget. Maximum Area, Lots with Frontage on Major Streets

The maximum aggregate sign area of all on premise projecting and freestandingsigns and off premise outdoor advertising signs allowed on lots with frontage on one or more major streets may not exceed the limits established in Table 60-3:

Toble 60-3: Maximum Aggregare Sign Area
On-premise Projecting and Freestanding Signs \& Off-premise Outdoor Advertising Signs
(sq. ft. per linear foot of major street frontage)

| Zoning District | Not Within Freeway Sign Corridor[1] |  | Within Freeway Sign Corridor |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | If More than 1 <br> Such Sign | If Only 1 <br> Such Sign | If More than 1 <br> Such Sign | If Only 1 <br> Such Sign |
| MX, CO and CS | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| CG, CH, CBD, IL, IM and IH | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |

[1] Off-premise outdoor advertising signs are prohibited outside of freeway sign corridors and prohibited in MX districts.

Review Comments: The proposed freestanding sign has a display area of 211.83 square feet. The maximum allowable display area for signage on the I44 frontage of this lot is 370 square feet, based on the 370 ' length of the north property line. There is an existing sign on this CS zoned lot; no measurement is provided for the existing sign but it appears that the proposed sign and the existing sign will exceed 370 square feet of total display area. You may reduce the sign display area to accommodate the 370 square foot of total display area allowed, or you may pursue a variance from the BOA to permit a freestanding sign to exceed the permitted maximum display surface area on a CS zoned lot.

NOTE: Please direct all questions conceming variances, special exceptions, appeals of an administrative official, Planned Unit Developments (PUD), Corridor (CO) zoned districts, zoning changes, platting, lot splits, lot combinations, altemative compliance landscape plans and all questions regarding (BOA) or (TMAPC) application forms and fees to an INCOG representative at 584-7526. It is your responsibility to send the decision of any actions by the BOA or TMAPC affecting the status of your application for a Sign Permit to our office so we may continue to process your application. INCOG does not act as your legal or responsible agent in submitting documents to the City of Tulsa on your behalf,

## END - ZONING CLEARANCE AND SIGN CODE REVIEW

[^6]
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# BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT CASE REPORT 

STR: 8308
Case Number: BOA-23193
CZM: 52
CD: 2

HEARING DATE: 10/12/2021 1:00 PM
APPLICANT: Jim Beach
ACTION REQUESTED: Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Sec.5.020, Table 5-2, Sec. 70.120) Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 -feet in an RS-3 District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3)

LOCATION: 7777 S LEWIS AV E
PRESENT USE: University

ZONED: RS-3
TRACT SIZE: 6527954.47 SQ FT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: BLK 1 LESS BEG SWC TH N22 SE31.19 W22 POB, ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HGTS

## RELEVANT PREVIOUS ACTIONS:

BOA-23170; On 08.10.21 the board approved a Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Sec.5.020, Table 5-2, Sec. 70.120) Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 -feet in an RS-3 District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3)

BOA-17831-A; On 12.08.2015 the board approved a modification to a previously approved plan for a digital sign.

BOA-21495; On 11.13.12 the Board approved a variance to allow 2 wall signs in an $R$ district.
BOA-21488; On 10.23.2012 the Board approved a variance to allow a wall sign in an $R$ district.
BOA-17831; On 09.23.97 the Board approved an amendment to a previously approved exception for a sponsor sign and a variance of the maximum square feet for a sponsor sign.

BOA-9273; On 11.04.76 the Board voted to uphold the appeal to the building inspector from decision of the building inspector for refusing to issue a zoning clearance permit to construct quarters on the University Campus to be operated in conjunction with the University Medical Campus.

BOA-9197; On 11.04.76 the Board approved an exception to permit the use of the property for university uses per the development standards submitted and the plot plan " $F$-2".

BOA-7769; On 02.01.73 the Board approved an exception to operate a community service, cultural and recreation facility (Mabee Center) in an R district.

BOA-7721; On 11.30.72 the Board approved a Minor variance to modify the allowed height and size of a sign in an RS-3 District.

BOA-3760; On 02.14.192 the Board approved the subject property for school purposes.

## Surrounding properties:

BOA-7964; on 07.050 .73 the Board approved an Exception for Athletic facilities for Oral Roberts University. property Located Immediately East of the subject Tract.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The Tulsa Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property as part of a "Regional Center " and an "Area of Growth".

Regional Centers are mid-rise mixed-use areas for large-scale employment, retail, and civic or educational uses. These areas attract workers and visitors from around the region and are key transit hubs; station areas can include housing, retail, entertainment, and other amenities. Automobile parking is provided on-street and in shared lots. Most Regional Centers include a parking management district.

The purpose of Areas of Growth is to direct the allocation of resources and channel growth to where it will be beneficial and can best improve access to jobs, housing, and services with fewer and shorter auto trips. Areas of Growth are parts of the city where general agreement exists that development or redevelopment is beneficial. As steps are taken to plan for, and, in some cases, develop or redevelop these areas, ensuring that existing residents will not be displaced is a high priority. A major goal is to increase economic activity in the area to benefit existing residents and businesses, and where necessary, provide the stimulus to redevelop.

ANALYSIS OF SURROUNDING AREA: The subject tract is located at the NE/c or E. $81^{\text {st }}$ Street South and S. Lewis Ave.

## STAFF COMMENTS:

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Sec.5.020, Table 5-2, Sec. 70.120) Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 -feet in an RS-3 District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3) to allow an addition for a training center.

BOA-23170 was the most recent Board case involving the University site plan. Included in your packet is a copy of that approved plan.

The Board may also wish to refer the applicant to re-zone the property to a zoning classification that would allow the Use by right. Currently the Land Use Designation as Regional Center would support a higher intensity zoning district. The lowest intensity Zoning Category that would allow this use by right would be OM (Office-Medium).

## SAMPLE MOTION:

## Special Exception:

Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Sec.5.020, Table 5-2, Sec. 70.120)

- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions (including time limitation, if any):

The Board finds that the requested Special Exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

## Variance:

Move to $\qquad$ (approve/deny) a Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 -feet in an RS-3 District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3)

- Finding the hardship(s) to be $\qquad$ .
- Per the Conceptual Plan(s) shown on page(s) $\qquad$ of the agenda packet.
- Subject to the following conditions $\qquad$ .

In granting the Variance the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established:
a. That the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out;
b. That literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose;
c. That the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification;
d. That the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner;
e. That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief;
$f$. That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and
g. That the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of this zoning code or the comprehensive plan."

Ms. Rodriguez asked what she is to do after this, will she receive a letter? Mr. Henke stated that if the Board denies the Special Exception requests the manufactured home will have to be removed. Ms. Rodriguez stated that she has lived in Tulsa all her life and could not find a house in her neighborhood, and she is a single parent with two children and she has done everything that the permit center has told her. This is not the first time a mobile home is going to be on a lot in the State of Oklahoma. Mr. Henke said he was sorry that the Board could not be more helpful but Ms. Rodriguez needs to find another location. Ms. Rodriguez stated that is her lot and it is her home. Ms, Rodriguez informed Ms. Rodriguez that she could build a house on the lot but in terms of having permission to have a manufactured home on the lot he does not think the permission will be given by the City of Tulsa. Ms. Rodriguez stated that this is outrageous and she is confused.

Comments and Questions:
None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of FLANAGAN, the Board voted 3-0-1 (Henke, Flanagan, Snyder "aye"; no "nays", White "abstaining"; Van De Wiele absent) to DENY the request for a Special Exception to permit a mobile home in the RS-3 District (Section 401, Table 1); Special Exception to extend the one-year time limit on a mobile home (Section 404.E.1) based on this out of character with the neighborhood and it would be injurious and detrimental to the public welfare and the existing homes in the neighborhood; for the following property:

## LT 1 BLK 4, OAK RIDGE ADDN - TULSA, NEW HAVEN ADDN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. White re-entered the meeting at 3:49 P.M.

## 17831-A-A-MAX Sign Company

## Action Requested:

Modification of a previously approved plan (BOA-17831). LOCATION: 7777 South Lewis Avenue (CD 2)

## Presentation:

Brian Ward, 9520 East $55^{\text {th }}$ Place, Tulsa, OK; stated that in the early 1970 s when ORU Mabee Center was built there was an accompanying sign structure. When it was built it had light bulb technology. As technology progresses there is a need to replace the boards every 10 to 12 years. The first sign lasted until approximately 1980 and it was replaced, and about every ten years the sign is being replaced. In 1997 the sign came before the Board and that was the last case on this particular sign, and what was approved was a 317 square foot message board and that is basically what is there now.

## BOA- 178 . 1-A

Mr. Ward stated sometime, and he is not sure when, the configuration of the sign is different in physical shape although it is about the same square footage. When he applied for a permit application it was denied based on the physical size being different from what was approved in 1997. Although the sign is five square feet less in the application than what was approved in 1997 the permit center denied the application based on the Board's approval of the plans submitted. What he is asking for is approval of a new message board to be installed and for the Board to approve 317 square feet of message board so when this technology become obsolete the sign can be replaced without needing to come back before the Board.

## Mr. Hence left the meeting at 3:50 P.M.

Mr. Flanagan asked Mr. Ward to confirm that he wants approval for the square footage that exists but was not corrected from the 1997 plan. Mr. Ward stated the plan was approved in 1997 for 317 square feet and the sign is now approximately 315 square feet. So he is asking for approval for the square footage rather than approval per plan so in ten years when the equipment becomes obsolete it is not necessary to appear before the Board.

Mr. Hence re-entered the meeting at 3:53 P.M.

Mr. Ward stated that if the Board is to approve this request he would like to motion to stipulate that the digital portion of the sign is not exceed 317 square feet.

Interested Parties:
There were no interested parties present.
Comments and Questions:
None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of SNYDER, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Hence, Flanagan, Snyder, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Van De Wiele absent) to APPROVE the request for a Modification of a previously approved plan (BOA-17831) to approve the sign that says Mate Center on Exhibit 8.14, that would be a $12 \times 26$ foot digital sign. The digital part of the sign will never exceed 317 square feet. This insures that the modification is compatible with and not injurious to the surrounding area and meets the previously granted Board relief other than what was just stipulated and it meets the zoning requirements per Code; for the following property:

BLK 1 LESS BEG SWC TH N22 SE31.19 W22 PB, ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HGTS, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA


# LT 1 BLK 13, SUNSET TERRACE, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA 

## 21495-Mark Bragg

## Action Requested:

Variance to allow two (2) wall signs in an RS District (Section 402.B.4). LOCATION: 7777 South Lewis Avenue (CD 2)

## Presentation:

The applicant was not present.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

## Comments and Questions:

None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of VAN DE WIELE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none absent) to APPROVE the request for a Variance to allow two (2) wall signs in an RS District (Section 402.B.4), subject to conceptual site plan on page 9.13 , page 9.14 , and page 9.15 . Finding that the signage in question is necessary to guide student and visitor traffic on the campus. By reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances, which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan; for the following property:

BLK 1 LESS BEG SWC TH N22 SE31.19 W22 POB, ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HGTS, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

## *.*.*.*................

## OTHER BUSINESS

## Request for Tulsa Zoning Code Interpretation:

A. Where, and when, is serving and sale of intoxicating beverages and/or low point beer allowed as accessory or customary to an indentified use?

# 1940s era home was built before the code went into effect, and the unique orientation of the home on the corner lot poses a hardship justifying the approval of the variance. Finding by reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances, which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan; for the following property: <br> LT-1-BL2, LOUISE ADDN OF L1 J P HARTERS SUB, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA 

## 21488-Mark Bragg

Action Requested:
Variance to allow a wall sign in a Residential District (Section 402.B.4). LOCATION: 2601 East $81^{\text {st }}$ Street (CD 2)

## Presentation:

Mark Bragg, KSQ Architects, 1624 South Detroit, Tulsa, OK; stated Oral Roberts University had remodeled the subject building and would like to have a building sign honoring the donor. The sign will be on the southwest face of the subject building and will not be illuminated.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

## Comments and Questions:

None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of VAN DE WIELE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Henke absent) to APPROVE the request for a Variance to allow a wall sign in a Residential District (Section 402.B.4), subject to site plan on pages 12.10, 12.11 and 12.12. Finding that for identification and location purposes the university sign is necessary. By reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances, which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan; for the following property:

# BLK 1 LESS BEG SWC TH N22 SE31.19 W22 POB, ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY 

 HGTS, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA21489-Mark Bragg

## Action Requested:

Variance to increase the permitted floor area from 1,006 square feet ( $40 \%$ ) to 1,188 square feet (47\%) (Section 402.B.1.d); Variance of the accessory building height and coverage area in required rear yard from 1 story to 2 story and increase maximum covered area in the rear yard from 300 square feet ( $30 \%$ ) to 540 square feet (54\%) (Section 210.B.5.a) in the RS-3 District. LOCATION: 1621 South Detroit Avenue East (CD 4)

## Presentation:

Mark Bragg, KSQ Architects, 1624 South Detroit, Tulsa, OK; stated he lives across the street from the subject property and has lived there for four years. When he first moved into the neighborhood it was entirely rental property and over the years the neighborhood has vastly improved. In the interim the neighborhood has achieved historic zoning. He purchased the subject property across the street because he wanted to downsize without moving out of the neighborhood. Currently the house does not have a garage, but it did have at one time. Mr. Bragg would like to replace the previous garage with another larger garage, larger than what the zoning code allows. The foundation of the previous garage still exists. Mr. Bragg has a letter from the previous owner stating that when she moved into the house the garage had burned down, and that the previous garage had been a two-story garage. Mr. Bragg has support of his application from 17 of his neighbors.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Mr. Bragg if the footprint of what he was proposing to build is the same as the previous garage. Mr. Bragg stated it is basically the same but not exactly. The new garage will be a little wider to accommodate today's cars.

Mr. White asked Mr. Bragg if he had received his Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Bragg stated that he had been approved and does have a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Bragg stated that he also has a Certificate of Appropriateness for the house.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Mr. Bragg if he intended for the second story of the garage to be a future garage apartment. Mr. Bragg stated that he had no intentions of using the second story as a garage apartment at this time, but he will file an application and come back before the Board to ask permission If he wants to have a rental unit.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

1940s era home was built before the code went into effect, and the unique orientation of the home on the corner lot poses a hardship justifying the approval of the variance. Finding by reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances, which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan; for the following property:

## LT-1-BL2, LOUISE ADDN OF L1 J P HARTERS SUB, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

## 21488-Mark Bragg

## Action Requested:

Variance to allow a wall sign in a Residential District (Section 402.B.4). LOCATION: 2601 East $81^{\text {st }}$ Street (CD 2)

## Presentation:

Mark Bragg, KSQ Architects, 1624 South Detroit, Tulsa, OK; stated Oral Roberts University had remodeled the subject building and would like to have a building sign honoring the donor. The sign will be on the southwest face of the subject building and will not be illuminated.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

## Comments and Questions:

None.
Board Action:
On MOTION of VAN DE WIELE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Henke absent) to APPROVE the request for a Variance to allow a wall sign in a Residential District (Section 402.B.4), subject to site plan on pages 12.10, 12.11 and 12.12. Finding that for identification and location purposes the university sign is necessary. By reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances, which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan; for the following property:

BLK 1 LESS BEG SWC TH N22 SE31.19 W22 POB, ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HGTS, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

## 21489-Mark Bragg

## Action Requested:

Variance to increase the permitted floor area from 1,006 square feet ( $40 \%$ ) to 1,188 square feet (47\%) (Section 402.B.1.d); Variance of the accessory building height and coverage area in required rear yard from 1 story to 2 story and increase maximum covered area in the rear yard from 300 square feet (30\%) to 540 square feet (54\%) (Section 210.B.5.a) in the RS-3 District. LOCATION: 1621 South Detroit Avenue East (CD 4)

## Presentation:

Mark Bragg, KSQ Architects, 1624 South Detroit, Tulsa, OK; stated he lives across the street from the subject property and has lived there for four years. When he first moved into the neighborhood it was entirely rental property and over the years the neighborhood has vastly improved. In the interim the neighborhood has achieved historic zoning. He purchased the subject property across the street because he wanted to downsize without moving out of the neighborhood. Currently the house does not have a garage, but it did have at one time. Mr. Bragg would like to replace the previous garage with another larger garage, larger than what the zoning code allows. The foundation of the previous garage still exists. Mr. Bragg has a letter from the previous owner stating that when she moved into the house the garage had burned down, and that the previous garage had been a two-story garage. Mr. Bragg has support of his application from 17 of his neighbors.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Mr. Bragg if the footprint of what he was proposing to build is the same as the previous garage. Mr. Bragg stated it is basically the same but not exactly. The new garage will be a little wider to accommodate today's cars.

Mr. White asked Mr. Bragg if he had received his Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Bragg stated that he had been approved and does have a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Bragg stated that he also has a Certificate of Appropriateness for the house.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Mr. Bragg if he intended for the second story of the garage to be a future garage apartment. Mr. Bragg stated that he had no intentions of using the second story as a garage apartment at this time, but he will file an application and come back before the Board to ask permission If he wants to have a rental unit.

Interested Parties:
There were no interested parties present.

Case No. 17830

## Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit church use on property zoned RS-3. SECTION 1217.C.1. USE UNIT 17. AUTOMOTIVE AND ALLIED ACTIVITIES; Use Conditions, located 10023 East 39th Place South.

## Presentation:

The applicant, Rick L. Frie, withdrew his case prior to the hearing,

## Case No. 17831

## Action Requested:

Approval of an amendment to a previously approved special exception. SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 2 and a Variance of the maximum 15 SF of sponsor sign. SECTION 1202.c. 12 USE UNIT 2 AREA-WIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES; Use Conditions, located East side of South Lewis Avenue, North of East $81^{\text {sl }}$ Street.

## Presentation:

The applicant, Charles E. Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower, representing Oral Roberts University ("ORU"), submitted a site plan (Exhibit L-1), a computer generated photograph (Exhibit L-2) and photographs (Exhibit L-3). Mr. Norman stated the existing message sign was approved as an accessory use to the University 25 years ago. He indicated that the message sign has become obsolete and worn out. He proposes to replace the electronic component center and leaving the stone columns in place. Mr. Norman requested the Board's approval of the new electronic component as an amendment to the previously approved special exception. The message sign is adjacent to the Mabee Center, which is located on 40 acres of the 200 acres of ORU campus. Mr. Norman described the local businesses located across the street from the ORU campus, which had been constructed since the Mabee Center was constructed. He commented that when the ordinance was written dealing with signs associated with educational institutions, which limit the sign of the sponsor name and logo to only 15 SF , was actually suppose to be $15 \%$ of the size of the sign. He stated that he suspects that every stadium scoreboard and sponsor logo in the City are considerably larger than the 15 SF . Mr. Norman indicated that the proposal replacement will have four (4) sponsor locations. He explained that the replacement cost of the message board is in excess $\$ 400,000$ and obviously it is necessary for ORU to secure more than one (1) sponsor to obtain the contribution for the facility. The sponsor logos are $5^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}$ or 45 SF for the total of 180 SF , which when compared to the size of the sign (approximately 1150 SF ) is $15 \%$ of the face of the sign. Mr. Norman indicated that the height of the sign will be reduced approximately $2^{\circ}$ and the total size of the sign is approximately $50^{\circ}$ less than its present configuration.

## Case No. 17831 (continued)

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. White asked the applicant to address the concerns of the staff that the video display might be a distraction to the traffic? Mr. Norman stated that experience has proven that the changeable signs are not distracting in a dangerous way. The Board recently approved a similar sign for the Performing Arts Center, much smaller in size, but has rapidly changing messages and has potential for displays to reflect the event that is going on. This proposed sign will be operated in accordance with considerations of liability, which has been discussed by ORU. The sign will not be operated in a way that will be distractive to drivers along south Lewis. There will not be any live videos of the activities going on, except maybe a one (1) or two (2) second replay of a basketball going into a hoop. He assured the Board that there will not be a message component that will have a continual message, which would attract driver's attention as they drive by the sign.

In response to the Board's concerns with the video image components creating a traffic problem or distraction, Mr. Norman stated that the typical driving speed is approximately 30 mph and the message board will not be visible for more than two (2) or three (3) seconds by any particular vehicle driving by. He commented that you rarely see the end of the message from the typical traffic speed. He concluded that the message board will be primarily used to advertise the next event taking place at the Mabee Center, If there are any problems with the operation, he is sure that there will be discussion with the traffic engineer and ORU's insurance underwriters about the operation of the sign.

## Board Action.

On MOTION of DUNHAM, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Cooper, Dunham, Turnbo, White, "aye"; no "rays" na "abstentions"; none "absert") to APPROVE an amendment to a previously approved special exception SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 2 and a Variance of the maximum 15 SF of sponsor sign. SECTION 1202.c. 12 USE UNIT 2 AREA-WIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES; Use Conditions; per plan submitted; finding that the requirements for a variance in Sec. 1607.C. have boen met. on the following described property:

N 200; S 1000; Block 1. Oral Roberts University Heights Addition. City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Beginning at a point in the South line of said Section 36 , said point being $2,820.00^{\prime}$ West of the Southeast corner of said Sec tion 36 ; thence South $89^{\circ}-59^{1}-40^{\prime \prime}$ West along the South line of sald Section 36, a distance of $483.00^{\prime}$ to a point thence North $00^{\circ}-06^{\prime}-40^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of $1,071,42^{\prime}$ to a point; thence due East a distance of $135.00^{\prime}$ to a point; thence due South a distance of $15.88^{\prime}$ to a point; thence due East a distance of 400.98 ${ }^{\prime}$ to a point; thence due South a distance of $475.00^{\prime}$ to a point; thence due West a distance of $39.18^{\prime}$ to a point; thence due South a distance of $90.00^{\prime}$ to a point; thence South $03^{\circ}-24^{\prime}-43^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of $254.02^{\prime}$ to a point; thence South $11^{\circ}-18^{\prime}-53^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of $50.00^{\prime}$ to a point; thence Easterly along a curve to the right having a radius of $405.00^{\prime}$ a distance of $30.02^{\prime}$ to a point; thence South $07^{\circ}-04^{\prime}-03^{\prime \prime}$ West a distance of $134.11^{\prime}$ to a point; thence South $00^{\circ}-05^{\prime}-54^{\prime \prime}$ East a distance of $50.00^{\prime}$ to the point of beginning, said described tract containing 12.39 acres, more or less.

Action Requested:
Exception (Section 410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts - Section 440 (2) - Home Occupations) for permission to operate a home beauty shop in an RS-2 District located at 5510 South Sheridan Road.

Presentation:
Upon request by the protestant's attorney who could not attend this meeting, a delay of two weeks to November 18, 1976, was requested.

Protests: None.
Board Action:
On MOTION of JOLLY, the Board of Adjustment voted unanimously ( $4-0$ ) to continue application 9272 until November 18, 1976, 1:30 p.m., Langenheim Auditoruim, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center.

Action Requested:
Appeal (Section 1650 - Appeals from the Building Inspector) from a decision of the Building Inspector for refusing to issue a zoning clearance permit to construct animal quarters on the University Campus to be operated in conjunction with the University Medical School. The location of the animal quarters is within the campus of the University, previously approved by the Board and the facility is a customary facility in connection with the scientific and educational purposes of the University; and an Exception (Section 410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts - Section 1205 - Comanity Services, Cultural and Recreational Facilities) for permission to construct animal quarters on the University Campus to be operated in conjunction with the University Medical School located NW of 81 st Street and Delaware Avenue.

Presentation:
Charles Norman, attorney, presented the detailed floor plans (Exhibit "I-1") and described the proposed use. He noted this land was within the City's floodplain moratorium area, but they had sought and received an exception by the City Commission.

Mr. Gardner stated that the Board was made aware by the Staff that portions of Oral Roberts University were in the flood area and have been furnished a map of the flood boundaries.

## Protests: None.

## Board Action:

On MOTTON of JOLLY, the Board voted unanimously (4-0) to uphold the Appeal to the Building Inspector (Section 1650 - Appeals from the Building Inspector) from a decision of the Building Inspector for refusing to issue a zoning clearance permit to construct animal quarters on the University Campus to be operated in conjunction with the University Medical School. The location of the animal quarters is within the campus of the University, previously approved by the Board and the facility is a customary facility in connection with the scientific and educational purposes of the University; and to grant an Exception (Section 410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts - Section 1205 - Commanity Services, Cultural and Recreational Facilities) for permission to construct animal quarters on the University Campus to be operated in confunction with the University Medical School on the following described tract:

The SE/4, SW/4 of Section 8, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

## Action Requested:

Exception (Section 310 - Principal Uses Permitted in the Agriculture District - Section 1209 - Mobile Homes) for permission to locate a mobile home in an AG District; and a Variance (Section 330 - Bulk and Area Requirements in the Agriculture Districts - Under the Provisions of Section 1670 - Variances) Eor a variance of the frontage requitements in an AG District from $300^{\prime}$ to $199^{\circ}$; and Variance (Section 340 . Special Exception Requirements in the Agriculture Districts - Under the Provisions of Section 1670 - Variances) for a variance of the fiveacre minimum Eor a mobile home in an AG District located at 13326 North 85th East Avenue.

## Presentation:

Neil York, the applicant, stated there were approximately 30 mobile homes in the area and the area was a "wildcat" subdivision.

Protests: None.
Board Action:
On MOTION of SMITH, the Board vored unanimously ( $4-0$ ) to approve an
Exception (Section 310 - Principal Uses Permitted in the Agriculture
District - Section 1209 - Mobile Homes) for permission to locate a

## 9120 (continued)

Presentation:
The applicant, Earl Reynolds, was not present. Following questioning by the Chair, the Staff stated the applicant and protestant, George Owens, both were notified of this meeting.

## Protests:

George Owens' representative stated it was the understanding of the protestant that this case was to be continued.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of JOLLY, the Board (3-0) continued application 9120 to January 6, 1977, 1:30 p.m., Langenhefm Auditorium, City Hall, Tulsa Civic Center. The Staff was requested by the Board to write the applicant notifying him of the concinuance date; and to also notify in writing the protestants and applicants of the following case numbers that their applications will be continued from November 18, 1976 to January 6, 1977, to allow the Supreme Court to make a decision involving them: $8461,8770,8799,9068,9120$, and 9142.

## Action Requested:

Exception (Section 410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts; Section 1205 - Community Services, Cultural and Recreational Facilities) for permission to use property for university purposes, located south and east of 75 th Street and Lewis Avenue.

## Presentation:

Attorney Charles Norman represented the applicant, Oral Roberts University. He stated this application was continued from a previous meeting to permit readvertising to include additional property and for further consideration of proposed perimeter development standards that were submitted at the earlier meeting. An additional copy of the proposed perimeter development standards which was presented (Exhibit "A-1") and was given to the Board by Mr. Norman, followed by his review of the application which was presented at the last Board meeting. He noted the spplicant is asking for approval of the north $165^{\prime}$ as well as the right-of-way of two streets being closed by the City Commission which includes property south of 75 th Street on Birmingham Avenue and along 76th Street be approved for university purposes. The applicant also requests the east $165^{\prime}$ of the 40 acres which has been previously approved for athletic purposes also be approved for general university use. It was noted by Mr. Norman that since 1962, all the buildings constructed under the original approval of the Board were submitted to the Building Inspector without being submitted to the Board on an individual basis. The applicant is requesting the same procedure be applied to the remainder of the campus which is being brought before the Board this date for approval, subject to the proposed perimeter development standards (Exhibit "A-1").

Board Member Tom Jolly pointed out Mr. Norman met with him since the last Board meeting, complying with his request, and resolved his questions regarding the development standards.

David Pauling of the Legal Department felt the addition of "sbove the top plate" following "exceeding 15 feet" at the end of the first sentence of the proposed perimeter development standards was needed for clarity.

## Protests: None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of JOLLY the Board (3-0) approved an Exception (Section 410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts - Section 1205 - Commuity Services, CuItural and Recreational Facilities) for permission to use the property for university purposes, per plot plan (Exhibit " $\mathrm{F}-2^{\prime \prime}$ ), submitted at meeting 非20, September 16, 1976 and subject to the Perimeter Development Standards submitted, in RS-1 and RS-3 pistricts on the following described tract:

The North $165^{\circ}$ and the East 165' of the SW/4 of Section 8, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; and the $W / 2$ of the $W / 2$ of the $S E / 4$ of Section 8 , Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; and the vacated right-ofway of South Birmingham Avenue from the South Boundary of East 75th Street South to the North Boundary of 76th Street South, created in part, by dedication in Plat of Southern Hills Estates, a subdivision of the $\mathrm{S} / 2$ of the $\mathrm{NW} / 4$ of Section $8, \mathrm{~T}-18-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R}-13-\mathrm{E}$, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, filed on August 3, 1950 and being numbered 1626. Also created, in part, by dedication in plat of Lavelle Heights, a subdivision of the $\mathrm{S} / 2^{\text {e }}$ of the $\mathrm{NW} / 4$ of section $8, \mathrm{~T}-18-\mathrm{N}$, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, filed on April 28, 1924 (subject to closing by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa and vacation by the District Court of Tulsa County, Oklahoma); and the vacated right-of-way of East 76th Street South from the Eastern Boundary of South Lewis Avenue, created by dedication on Plat of LaFelle Heights, a subdivision of the $\mathrm{S} / 2$ of the $\mathrm{s} / 2$ of the $\mathrm{NW} / 4$ of Section 8, T-18-N, R-13-F, filed on April 28, 1924. Enlarged by dedication on Plat No. I626, Southern Hills Estates, filed on August 3, 1950, and Plat No. 2390 Oral Roberts Unlversity Heights, filed February 9, 1962 (subject to closiag by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa and vacation by the District Court of Tulsa County, Oklahoma) ; and the South $430^{\prime}$ of Lots $1,2,3$, and 4 and the South 379' of Lots 5, 6, 7, and 8 in Block 3 of Southern Hills Estates Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Okla.; and Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, Block 4, LaVelle Heights, a subdivision of a part of the $\mathrm{S} / 2$ of the $\mathrm{NW} / 4$ of $\sec$ tion $8, \mathrm{~T}-18-\mathrm{N}$, R-13-E, Tu1sa County, Oklahoma; and the South 379' of the vacated right-of-way of South Delaware Avenue from the South Boundary of East 75 th Street South to the North Line of the $\mathrm{S} / 2$ of Section 8 , $\mathrm{T}-18-\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{R}-13-\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{Tu} 1 \mathrm{sa}$ County, Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof (subject to closing by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Tulsa; and Lots 13, 14, 15 and 16, Block 4, LaVelle Heights, a subdivision of a part of the $S / 2$ of the $N W / 4$ of Section 8, T-18-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Interested Party:

Board Action:

7721 Communication:

Robert Scott, 2930 West 51st Street, advised the Board that there is a hill one lot from the proposed location of the clinic, which will create a traffic hazard when the clinic is constructed. He suggested that the Traffic Engineer check the traffic situation again before the application is approved.

Mrs. Owen Halford, 2823 West 51st Street, advised that the traffic situation in this area is bad and that the hill causes a sight problem when driving. She stated that the clinic will generate more traffic in the area and add to the safety hazard that now exists.
$M x$. Reece advised the interested parties and the Board that the Traffic Engineer has checked the traffic situation and approved the location of the clinic, stating that if a driveway is established at the west end of the property, there would be no sight problem.

On MOTION of REEDS, the Board $(4-0)$ determined that the City-County Health Clinic, a community facility, is included in Use Unit 5 and approved an Exception (410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts) to permit a City-County Health Cinic as a Community Service, Use Unit 5 , on the following described tract;

Beginning at a point 35 feet South of the Northwest corner of the $N E / 4$, $N W / 4$, of
Section 34, Township 19 North, Range 12
East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma; thence East
100 feet; South 230 feet; West 100 feet;
North 230 feet to the point of beginaing.
This communication for interpretation of the Ordinance was continued from the January 18, 1973 meeting.

7769
Action Requested:
Exception (Section 410 - Principal Usea Permitted in Residential Districts) for permission to operate a community service, cultural and recreation facility in e residential district, and

Variance (Section 420.2 (d) (1) - Accessory Uses in Residential Districts - Accessory Use Conditions Signs) to vary the requirements of the constant light requirements to permit a slgn for the John Mabee Center in accord with plans and specifications submitted, in an RS-3 District located at 81st St., and Lewis Avenue.

Presentation:

Remarks:

Protests:
Board Action:

Clarke Ford, representing Oral Roberts Univeraity, advised that the subject application is an attempt to resolve all problems involving the Mabee Center and particularly the constant light sign. Rather than leaving the 40 acre tract of the Mabee Center under the pre-existing approval of the 160 acre tract for educational and university purposes, it is hoped that this spplication would be approved and allow the 40 acre Mabee Center tract to be included in Use Unit 5, Community Services, Cultural and Recreational Facilities. A variance of the requirements of access uses is also requested, since the facility is rather unique and seats 12,000 . Mr . Ford felt that both the request for variance of the heighth and size of the sign and the request for variance of the requirement of constant light were in order. He advised that the Traffic Engineering Department recommends that the capability of the sign be restricted so as not to allow a message change in less than 10 seconds, which the University will agree upon. In handling the exception and variance in this manner, an additional interpretation of the meaning of constant light will be unnecessary, unless the Protective Inspections Office feels it is important to them for other applications.

Mr. Ford presented the plot plan (Exhibit "A-1") to the Board explaining that when basketball scores are changed, in not less than 10 seconds, the scores would cover approximately $10 \%$ of the sign. The remainder of the sign would not change more than once In every 24 hours. Mr. Ford advised that the University does not feel the sign has the capability of being a travelling sign, and they do not intend to use the sign as such. The usage of the aign would be a change of message and not a continuous moving sign.

Charles Banks, Protective Inspections Office, advised the Board that the Building Inspector's Office has withdrawn its previous request for interpretation, stating that even though the sign may have the capability of a travelling sign, it will not be used as such.

None .
On MOTION of COHEN, the Board ( $4-0$ ) approved an Exception (Section 410 - Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts) for permission to operate the 40 acre tract of Mabee Center as a community service, cultural and recreation facility under Use Unit 5 in an RS-3 District, and

Minor Variances: (continued)
7721

Action Requested:

Presentation:

Remarks:

Protests:

Board Action:

Minor Variance (Section 420.2 (d) (1.) - Accessory Use Conditions - Signs - Under the Provisions of Section 1470) for a modification of heighth and size of a sign ( $48^{\prime}$ high and size $28^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime} \times 48^{\prime}$ ) in an RS-3 District located at 7777 South Lewis Ave.

A representative of the architect for Oral Roberts University was present and submitted the plot plan (Exhibit "p-1") to the Board.

The Chair stated that the sign as proposed was not a continuous moving message sign such as was shut down at 2lst Street and Columbia Avenue.

None.
On MOTION of COHEN, the Board ( $4-0$ ) approved a Minor Variance (Section 420.2 (d) (1.) -Accessory Use Conditions - Signs - Under the Provisions of Section 1470) for a modification of heighth and size of a sign ( $48^{\prime}$ high and size $28^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime} \times 48^{\prime}$ ) according to the plot plan submitted and stating for the record that the sign is not within the setback area and does not require a waiver of the Major Street Plan, in an RS-3 District on the following described tract:

Block 1, Oral Roberts University Heights Addition to the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma,

Action Requested:

Presentation:

Protests:
Board Action:

Minor Variance (Section 430 - Bulk and Area Requirements in Residential Areas - Under the Provisions of Section 1430) for permission to erect a residence $52.8^{\prime}$ from the centerline of 124 th East Avenue in an RS-3 District located at the SE corner of 14 th St ., and 124 th East Avenue.
E. E. Boyd, the applicant, presented the plot plan (Exhibit "Q-1") to the Board.

None .
On MOTION of REEDS, the Board ( $4-0$ ) approved a Minor Variance (Section 430 - Bulk and Area Requirements In Residential Districts - Under the Provisions of Section 1430) for permission to erect a residence $52.8^{\prime}$ from the centerline of 124 th East Avenue, according to the plot plan submitted, in an RS-3 District on the following described tract:
11.30.72:125(15)

Case No. 3760-A
Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association, Inc. Pt. SW, of Section 8-18-13

Case No. $3761-A^{\prime}$
Prattville Methodist Church - Part of the NW, NW, NW, of Section 26-19-11
8. The present use increases the valuation of the property as noting else is compatible to this strip of land.

Mr. Seth Hughes stated he leased the property for 10 years for a par 3 golf course and that the Board of Adjustment had granted a per init for a golf course on this property. That the property had been used as a driving range at night.

Mr. Luther Lane stated he was in favor of the goif course that it was an asset to the City of Tulsa.

Mrs. Sgyder who lives across the street from the golf course objected to the noise and the miniature golf course but stated she had no objection to a putting course.

Mr. Cassidy objected strenously to the miniature golf course and stated it was almost impossible to live next to the course in the summer time because of the noise.

After considerable discussion it was,
MOVED by Sublett (Avery) that this application be approved subject to a letter or agreement from the owners of the golf course that they will close at 11:00 p. M. and that they be given permission to operate until their lease expires on December 31, 1966.
All members voting yea.
Carried.
This being the date set down for public hearing on the application of the Oral Roberts E angelistic Association, Inc, for permission to use the following described property for schoollpurposes:

The Southwest Quarter of Section 8, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, less the North 165 feet and the East 165 feet.

There appeared Mr. Saul A. Yager on behalf of the applicant. No protest was offered.

MiOVED by Galbreath (Shaull) that this matter be approved. All members voting yea.

Carried.
This being the date set down for public hearing on the application of the Prattville Methodist Church for permission to erect a church on the following described property:

$8.23$

## 23170-Jim Beach

## Action Requested:

Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2 \& Section 70.120); Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 -feet in an RS-3 District (Section 5.030, Table 5-3). LOCATION: 7777 South Lewis Avenue East (CD 2)

## Presentation:

Jim Beach, Wallace Design Collective, 123 North Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, Tulsa, OK; stated this application is for the ORU Welcome Center and Library which will be built near the praying hands which is the main entry from Lewis Avenue; the library will be to the east of the welcome center. The two subject buildings are being planned and the Special Exception to modify the previous site plan will allow the two buildings.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Beach to state the hardship for the Variance request.
Mr. Chapman explained his staff report, there are several approvals on the subject site. Some are convoluted on what was approved. Mr. Chapman stated that he included a previous aerial that he felt reflected what was approved previously. All the previous approvals the height seemed to be taken by the Board as approval of the site plan. On a new application staff felt the applicant needed a Variance on the height for the proposed buildings.

Mr. Beach stated the overall height is approximately 42 feet and it might be 50 feet if the screening of the roof top units is added. The height limit in the RS-3 District is 35 feet and this is not a typical RS-3 use. There are many buildings on campus that are far taller than 50 feet. The scale of the site, the scale of the buildings on the site, the appropriate character of the buildings and proportions call for it to be the proposed height. This will be a possible three-story library building with a research facility within. The welcome center is below the 35 -foot height.

Ms. Radney asked Mr. Beach to state the hardship for the Variance request. Mr. Beach stated the hardship lies in the fact that the zoning is RS-3, and it poses a height limit which is uncharacteristic of a use of this sort.

Mr. Wilkerson asked Mr. Beach if there had been any discussions with ORU about rezoning the site. In 1969 this may have been the best option but at some point it seems that it would be beneficial to ORU to consider IMX zoning that would this by right. Mr. Beach stated that he understands Mr. Wilkerson's point, it has been discussed but the project was so far along that it was necessary to follow the same pattern of requesting a Special Exception for the scheduling. Mr. Beach stated that he has advised the architect working on the project that it would be worth a discussion in considering future projects. Mr . Wilkerson stated that same conversation has been going on for 50 years and the idea of changes in the Code would be beneficial to ORU. This site has incrementally changed so much over time that he thinks it would be a more honest representation of what is expected for the future growth of the campus to consider rezoning.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Beach about the parking for the two buildings. Mr. Beach stated that a parking study has been performed and the parking that has been provided, it has been analyzed and it has been concluded that the parking spaces that are in a practical distance there are more than adequate parking spaces available.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

## Comments and Questions:

None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of BROWN, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Brown, Radney, Wallace "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Barrientos, Bond absent) to APPROVE the request for a Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a university in a residential district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2 \& Section 70.120); Variance to increase the maximum permitted height of 35 -feet in an RS-3 District (Section 5.030, Table 5-3), subject to conceptual plans $7.25,7.26,7.27,7.28,7.29,7.30,7.31,7.32,7.33$ and 7.34 of the agenda packet. The Board has found the hardship to be the existing zoning of the site is restrictive to development in keeping with the current use. The Board finds that the requested Special Exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare. The Board finds the hardship to be In granting the Variance the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established:
a. That the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out;
b. That literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose;
c. That the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification;
d. That the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner;
e. That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief;
$f$. That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and
g. That the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of this zoning code or the comprehensive plan; for the following property:

BLK 1 LESS BEG SWC TH N22 SE31.19 W22 POB, ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HGTS, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Proposed in BoA-23193
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