



Chapman, Austin

From: Ken Dornblaser <KDornblaser@johnson-jones.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 8:30 AM
To: Scott Pohlenz; Chapman, Austin
Cc: Jordan Maxwell
Subject: RE: Case Number BOA-23045

Scott & Austin: Although I plan on attending the meeting virtually or at least listening in, based on the information Scott has supplied I have no objection to the proposal, provided that a condition is made by the board on the approval to require screening consistent with what is shown on Scott's drawings provided to me yesterday (as Scott noted/suggested in his email below).

I appreciate you taking the time prior to the meeting to answer my questions/concerns so thoroughly.

Regards,

Ken

Kenneth E. Dornblaser

Johnson & Jones, P.C.
Two Warren Place
6120 S. Yale Avenue, Suite 500
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136
Phone: 918-584-6644
Email: kdornblaser@johnson-jones.com

From: Scott Pohlenz [mailto:scott@pohlenzcm.com]
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 5:57 PM
To: Chapman, Austin
Cc: Ken Dornblaser; Jordan Maxwell
Subject: Re: Case Number BOA-23045

Hi Ken, thank you. My commitment this evening changed, so here are my responses in Red

Scott, thank you, this is helpful.

Just for some context, can you tell me approximately how high the floor of the deck will be from ground level. We had a site survey with topography carried out when we started planning.

At the existing northwest corner (back) wall, the dimension finish grade up to the finish floor of the second floor at master bedroom is 8'-4" above grade. The elevation per the survey is about 1' higher at the back of the proposed addition, putting it about 7'-4" above grade at the proposed north building line. The quick visual is that the sill of the door on the second floor to the master bedroom is the proposed deck level. Our finished roof would be slightly below this, but we are proposing a "raised" flooring that allows drainage to work under the wood decking. In any event, the raised area would not exceed the existing door sill height.

I can get some context of the top of the pergola based on the roof line of the existing house, but was wanting some additional feel for the deck level. Also, while I realize this is preliminary, about how much of the western exposure is "open" at each end where the plants are located in these sketches. The total length of the west wall is 23' (24' including

the fireplace bumpout) of the 23', we have proposed a 14' wide pergola which has the full height screen. This leaves about 9' as currently proposed (about 3' to south of pergola and about 6' to north of pergola. We can make the pergola width larger, but if we do it will start to increase the size of the wood structure and we want to keep this as thin as possible, visually.

Finally, because my practice doesn't really get into "city variance" issues, can either Austin or you tell me, since the plans are conceptual at this stage, if the Board approves the proposal tomorrow without final plans, what type of "guarantee" do the adjacent homeowners have that the owner will actually follow through with these "screening" concepts? I saw Austin's response regarding the approval on schematic plans. This is the norm. The second phase to this to give you some more assurance is, after Variance approval is made, we have to submit a building permit application that then gets reviewed by the permit center. this would be detailed drawings with dimensions, sections etc. Part of this permit review / approval process is for zoning compliance. Any conditions attached to the approval have to be met by us in order for the permit to be granted. What I can say to you is that if the in principle screening solution on our sketches takes care of your concerns, I am happy to accept a condition made by the board on the approval to require screening consistent with what is shown on our attached drawings as Austin suggested. Like I said, we might ultimately suggest raising the 42" height to 6' or 7', but we would not be allowed to go below 42" in any event due to the code requirement.

Hope this helps. Please let me know if you would like any further explanation.

Kindest Regards

Scott

On Mon, Dec 7, 2020 at 5:06 PM Scott Pohlenz <scott@pohlenzcm.com> wrote:

Hi Ken. I am tied up for next couple of hours but If you can bear with me, I'll provide all of these answers later this evening when I'm back in front of my computer. In meantime, if you can see the bottom of the double doors at Juliet balcony, that is where we proposed the finish "deck" level. From there, the lower walls at open area extend 42" minimum up from there. We can make those walls a little higher too but can't go lower due to code. Another option would be to run the full height screen all along the west wall but my opinion that would not look as nice from either direction, but open to incorporate full height if that makes everyone happy. Client is a super guy and doesn't want to turn his nose to anyone.

Regards

Scott

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 7, 2020, at 4:15 PM, Chapman, Austin <AChapman@incog.org> wrote:

With regard to the approval, the Board will typically approve per conceptual plan which ties the applicant to the relief, so they would not be able to get closer to the lot lines in this case than what is shown on the plans. It is certainly within the power of the Board to place a condition on the approval to require screening consistent with what is shown by Mr. Pohlenz in the drawings below.

From: Ken Dornblaser <KDornblaser@johnson-jones.com>
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 4:02 PM
To: Scott Pohlenz <scott@pohlenzcm.com>; Chapman, Austin <ACHapman@incog.org>
Cc: Jordan Maxwell <jordan@pohlenzcm.com>
Subject: RE: Case Number BOA-23045

Scott, thank you, this is helpful. Just for some context, can you tell me approximately how high the floor of the deck will be from ground level. I can get some context of the top of the pergola based on the roof line of the existing house, but was wanting some additional feel for the deck level. Also, while I realize this is preliminary, about how much of the western exposure is "open" at each end where the plants are located in these sketches. Finally, because my practice doesn't really get into "city variance" issues, can either Austin or you tell me, since the plans are conceptual at this stage, if the Board approves the proposal tomorrow without final plans, what type of "guarantee" do the adjacent homeowners have that the owner will actually follow through with these "screening" concepts?

Thanks again,

Ken

From: Scott Pohlenz [<mailto:scott@pohlenzcm.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 3:22 PM
To: Chapman, Austin
Cc: Ken Dornblaser; Jordan Maxwell
Subject: Re: Case Number BOA-23045

Hi Austin,

Thank you for passing on Mr. Dornblaser's letter of 7 December.

I would first like to express that Mr. Dornblaser's comments are well received and appreciated. I have attached three sketches to give some visual context and hopefully this will alleviate any concerns he, or any other neighbor might have regarding my client's proposal. Please do note, that these plans are schematic at this stage, but do represent the conceptual solution accurately, in terms of scale and intent.

1. The tandem garage addition is a single story addition that provides our client with the ability to have a two car garage.

2. The proposed addition extends off of the north west corner of the house and immediately above the existing garage is the master bedroom with an existing Juliet balcony opening to the North.

3. Our client is proposing to use the roof over the garage as a balcony off of their private master bedroom for their private use.

4. Our client is also very keen to ensure their own privacy as well as the privacy of the adjacent neighbors, so we have incorporated various design elements to address this.

- Immediately on the axis with the master bedroom door, we have proposed a stone chimney (matching the stone already on the house) and creating a fireplace. The width of this chimney is around 8' , which gives a primary block looking north.

- As a secondary visual block to the north, my client is proposing to plant several Juniper taylor's or something similar (15' - 20' high full height) , to create a year round screen of green both looking out, and looking in. These would be higher than the 42" high solid guardrail height wall that is shown on our sketches.

- To block the views toward the west, my client is proposing to create a solid screen that would be a combination of the 42" high guard rail facing west and utilizing mature potted plants on the deck level where the screening is not full height. The main screen that would provide a solid visual block is the west wall of the pergola. In this area, it is proposed to make the screen solid at the pergola, which is approximately 14' long. This leaves a couple of spots as seen in the sketches where our client intends to use landscaping to block off the view. We are open to take the solid screen full height on the entire wall, but in our opinion to have some green "live screening" would feel like a softer solution and more aesthetically pleasing to the neighbors and our client.

- Also, please note that at the back of our client's home, the garage finish floor is already sitting 18" below grade at the back wall, so the height of the finish floor from back of grade is approx 7'-0" above grade, so the relative height of the second floor is much lower than if the garage slab was at grade.

5. We did propose an open guard rail facing east, but there are no homes on the east side of this property (its right on the corner of lewis and 26th)

If I understand Mr. Dornblaser's concerns correctly, he does not have any objection if the proposed structure is merely an extension of the existing garage and roof line, but is concerned about the impact of privacy as an open deck. I hope that my explanation is thorough and the attached sketches demonstrate how we have approached the privacy factor for all parties and hope this addresses his concerns.

ps. sketch 1 is looking west , sketch 2 looking straight north when exiting the existing master bedroom door, sketch 3 is looking east showing impact from the next door neighbor to the west.

kindest Regards

<image001.jpg>

<image002.jpg>

<image003.jpg>

M. Scott Pohlenz, AIA, NCARB

Architect

On Mon, Dec 7, 2020 at 12:41 PM Chapman, Austin <ACHapman@incog.org> wrote:

Mr. Dornblaser,

I have received your comments and will forward them to the Board members. Attached is an updated site plan that came in after the notice went out. It clarifies the setback from the Western property lines. I've copied Jordan Maxwell and Scott Pohlenz on this email, they are the architects for this case. They may be able to provide more information about the proposed structure to address some of your concerns.

Best,

<image004.png> **Austin Chapman**

Planner, City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment

Tulsa Planning Office

2 W. 2nd St., 8th Floor | Tulsa, OK 74103

918.579.9471

achapman@incog.org

Determining compliance to zoning or building code requirements is not a function of this o

The Building Permits Division will address compliance upon application for a building per
permit. {(918) 596-9456}

From: Ken Dornblaser <KDornblaser@johnson-jones.com>

Sent: Monday, December 7, 2020 12:27 PM

To: esubmit <esubmit@incog.org>

Subject: Case Number BOA-23045

To the members of the Board of Adjustment:

Please find attached a comment that I wish to submit to the Board in connection with the
above-referenced matter, which is set for hearing during tomorrow's meeting.

Regards,

Kenneth E. Dornblaser

Johnson & Jones, P.C.

Two Warren Place

6120 S. Yale Avenue, Suite 500

Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136

Phone: 918-584-6644

Email: kdornblaser@johnson-jones.com

--

SCOTT POHLENZ, AIA, NCARB

principal / owner

pohlenz

3402 S Peoria Ave | Tulsa, OK 74105

p: +1 918 749 5144

pohlenzcm.com

--

SCOTT POHLENZ, AIA, NCARB

principal / owner

pohlenz

3402 S Peoria Ave | Tulsa, OK 74105
p: +1 918 749 5144
pohlenzcm.com