Introduction and Notice to the Public
The City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment (BOA) is empowered by state law to grant variances due to hardships, and special exceptions to the zoning code. At this meeting, BOA, in accordance with and pursuant to applicable policies and procedures, will review, consider, discuss, and may take action on, approve, approve with conditions, amend or modify, deny, reject, or defer action on any item listed on the agenda.

How to Participate
You may attend the hearing to express your opinions or have someone appear on your behalf. If you wish to present documents or exhibits during the hearing, please submit them by 9:00 a.m. the day of the hearing. Please reference the case number and include your name and address. Any exhibits presented will become part of the public record of the case.

To comment on cases, email planning@cityoftulsa.org.
Mail: Tulsa Planning Office, 175 E. 2nd St., Suite 480, Tulsa, OK 74103

All electronic devices must be silenced during the hearing. Note: If you require special accommodations pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, please notify the Tulsa Planning Office at 918-596-7526.

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes

1. Minutes from Meeting 1335, April 9, 2024

Unfinished Business

2. BOA-23667
   Location: Southwest Corner of East 5th Place & South Quaker Avenue
   City Council District: 5
   Applicant: Justin DeBruin, Wallace Design Collective
   Action(s) Requested: Variance to allow parking serving a residential use to be located on another lot (Sec. 55.080.D, Sec.90.090-A); Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for apartment/condo uses in the CH District (Sec. 55.050-K)

3. BOA-23680
   Location: 2304 E. 4th Pl.
   City Council District: 1
   Applicant: Mark D. Crowl
   Action(s) Requested: Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-4 zoning district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5)
4. **BOA-23688**
   Location: 2809 E. 81st Pl.
   City Council District: 2
   Applicant: Raul Cisneros
   Action(s) Requested: **Special Exception** to permit duplexes in the RS-5 zoning district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5)

5. **BOA-23692**
   Location: 2427 E. 27th St. N.
   City Council District: 1
   Applicant: Martha Gibson
   Action(s) Requested: **Special Exception** to permit a Manufactured Housing Unit in the RS-3 zoning district (Sec. 5.020, Table 5-2.5); **Special Exception** to extend the 1-year limit for a Manufactured Housing Unit (Sec. 40.210-A)

**New Applications**

6. **BOA-23695**
   Location: 15009 E. 39th Pl.
   City Council District: 6
   Applicant: Sandra Callero
   Action(s) Requested: **Special Exception** to allow a Type 2 Home Occupation in an RS-3 District to permit a Nail Salon (Sec. 45.100)

7. **BOA-23696**
   Location: 1602 N. Denver Ave.
   City Council District: 1
   Applicant: David Valderrama
   Action(s) Requested: **Variance** to allow parking serving a residential use to be located on another lot (Sec. 55.080.D); **Special Exception** to reduce the required parking ratio for Apartment/Condo uses in the CH District (Sec. 55.050-K)

8. **BOA-23697**
   Location: 6415 E. Apache St. N.
   City Council District: 3
   Applicant: T.L. Carter
   Action(s) Requested: **Special Exception** to permit a Personal Vehicle Sales & Rentals use in the CS Zoning District (Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2)

9. **BOA-23698**
   Location: 3855 S. Birmingham Pl. E.
   City Council District: 9
   Applicant: Robert Bell
   Action(s) Requested: **Special Exception** to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A)

10. **BOA-23699**
    Location: 1251 S. 61st Ave. W.
    City Council District: 4
    Applicant: Robert Bell
    Action(s) Requested: **Special Exception** to reduce the required parking ratio for Cottage House Development in the RM-2 District (Sec. 55.050-K)
11. **BOA-23700**
   
   **Location:** 2206 S. Lewis Ave.
   
   **City Council District:** 4
   
   **Applicant:** Justin Debruin
   
   **Action(s) Requested:** Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A)

12. **BOA-23701**
   
   **Location:** 2807 E. 3rd St.
   
   **City Council District:** 4
   
   **Applicant:** Cody Holbrook
   
   **Action(s) Requested:** Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an RS-3 District (45.031-D); Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A, 45.031-D.6)

13. **BOA-23702**
   
   **Location:** 5722 E. 5th Pl.
   
   **City Council District:** 3
   
   **Applicant:** Richard Rokeby
   
   **Action(s) Requested:** Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A); Variance to allow an accessory unit to exceed to exceed 10 feet in height to the top of the top plate in the rear setback (Section 90.090-C)

14. **BOA-23704**
   
   **Location:** 4553 N Hartford Ave.
   
   **City Council District:** 1
   
   **Applicant:** Tommy Harris
   
   **Action(s) Requested:** Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5)

**Other Business**

**Board Members’ Comments**

**Adjournment**
**Owner and Applicant Information**

Applicant: Justin DeBruin, Wallace Design Collective  
Property Owner: Halona Development LLC

**Property Location**

SW/c of East 5th Place and South Quaker  
Tract Size: ±3.11 acres

**Location within the City of Tulsa**  
*(shown with City Council districts)*

---

**Request Summary**

Variance to allow parking serving a residential use to located on another lot (Sec. 55.080.D); Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for Apartment/Condo uses in the CH District (Sec. 55.050-K);

**Zoning**

Zoning District: CH  
Zoning Overlays: NIO

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use**

Land Use Plan: Multiple Use, Neighborhood, Employment  
Small Area Plans: Pearl District  
Development Era: Streetcar

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: Commercial/CBD Collector  
planitulsa Street Type: Main Street  
Transit: TOD Area  
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Bike Lane  
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: N/A

**Environment**

Flood Area: N/A  
Tree Canopy Coverage: 0-10%  
Parks & Open Space: N/A

**Case History:**

04/09/2024: First appearance on the agenda, item continued to provide time to meet with interested party.  
04/23/2024: Item continued to provide time to meet with interested parties and for staff to review the proposed alternative compliance landscape plan.  
04/14/24: Item continued to provide site plan with additional parking.
**Staff Analysis**

The applicant is proposing Variance to allow parking serving a residential use to located on another lot (Sec. 55.080.D, Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for Apartment/Condo uses in the CH District (Sec. 55.050-K);

Applicant is seeking to have a portion of their required parking in the right of way along E. 5th Pl. and to locate their parking lot on a separate parcel across Quaker Ave. from the apartment building.

**55.080-D  Off-site Parking**

1. When Allowed
   
   All or a portion of required off-street parking for nonresidential uses may be provided off-site, in accordance with the regulations of this section. Required accessible parking spaces (see Section 55.110) and required parking for residential uses may not be located off site.

The applicant is also seeking to reduce their parking requirement to allow 0.78 spaces per dwelling unit for a total of 164 spaces.

**55.050-K  Alternative Compliance**

The motor vehicle parking ratios of this chapter are not intended to prevent development and redevelopment or to make development and redevelopment economically impractical. In order to allow for flexibility in addressing the actual expected parking demand of specific uses, alternative compliance parking ratios may be approved through the special exception procedures of Section 70.120 only if:

1. The board of adjustment determines that the other allowed parking reduction alternatives of Section 55.050 are infeasible or do not apply; and

2. The board of adjustment determines that the reduced parking ratios proposed are not likely to cause material adverse impacts on traffic circulation and safety or on the general welfare of property owners and residents in the surrounding area.

**Statement of Hardship:** Please see attached.

**Relevant Case History**

- Z-7755, 1/3/2024, Rezone from IM to CH

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as Multiple Use, Neighborhood, and Employment. The Employment designation is intended to accommodate offices, warehousing and storage, manufacturing and assembly, and industrial processes. The “Industrial Site Suitability” map corresponds to the Employment land use designation and indicates where uses that are potentially incompatible with sensitive land uses are best suited to locate. This directs industrial uses to particular areas of the city while discouraging industrial in close proximity to Neighborhood areas. Multiple Use areas are “Mostly Commercial or Retail Uses” which include restaurants, shops, services, and smaller format employment uses. This land use designation is most common in areas of the city from earlier development patterns, with Local
Centers being more commonplace in newer parts of the city. For single properties that are commercial but surrounded by Neighborhood, Multiple Use is the preferred designation. **Neighborhoods** are “Mostly Residential Uses” which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low-intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off of an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access off of a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

### Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>IM/NIO</td>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>CH/NIO</td>
<td>Employment/Neighborhood</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>MPD-FBC1</td>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>CH/NIO</td>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Small Area Plans
The subject properties are within the Pearl District small area plan. In general, the plan is supportive of paring modification in order to support infill development. Additionally the plan would encourage shared parking arrangement among users of mixed use spaces.

### Development Era
The subject property is in an area developed during the Streetcar Era (1910s-30s), prior to the proliferation of automobiles, when streetcars facilitated growth beyond downtown. Land uses range from fully integrated to somewhat separated, on a half-mile grid, with a mix of housing options. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, commercial districts, and well-designed streetscapes.

### Transportation
**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Commercial/CBD Collector

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** Main Street

**Transit:** TOD Area

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** Bike Lane

**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** N/A

**Arterial Traffic per Lane:** N/A

### Environmental Considerations
**Flood Area:** The subject property is not within a flood area.

**Tree Canopy Coverage:** Tree canopy in the area is 0-10% The area would benefit from additional trees, which also capture and treat runoff before it enters the river.

**Parks & Open Space:** N/A
Sample Motion

Special Exception:
I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for Apartment/Condo uses in the CH District (Sec. 55.050-K);
• per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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, that the other allowed parking alternative of Section 55.050 are infeasible or do not apply and the reduced parking ratios proposed are not likely to cause material adverse impacts on traffic circulation and safety or on the general welfare of property owners and residents in the surrounding area.

Variance:
I move to approve or deny a Variance to allow parking serving a residential use to located on another lot (Sec. 55.080.D, Sec.90.090-A);

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.
Property Description:

A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN GOVERNMENT LOT TEN (10) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (GL10, SW/4) OF SECTION SIX (6), TOWNSHIP NINETEEN (19) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN (I.B.&M.), CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, AND ALSO BEING A PART OF LOTS ONE (1), TWO (2), THREE (3), AND FOUR (4) OF BLOCK EIGHT (8), FACTORY ADDITION AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT FOUR (4), BLOCK EIGHT (8) FACTORY ADDITION (P.O.B) THENCE S88°56'53"W AND ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT FOUR (4), BLOCK EIGHT (8), FACTORY ADDITION FOR A DISTANCE OF 146.00 FEET; THENCE S01°12'56"E FOR A DISTANCE OF 36.09 FEET; THENCE S88°56'53"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 130.00 FEET; THENCE N01°12'56"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 475.13 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT FOUR (4), BLOCK EIGHT (8) FACTORY ADDITION, AND THE EAST LINE OF LOTS ONE (1), TWO (2), THREE (3), AND FOUR (4) OF BLOCK EIGHT (8), FACTORY ADDITION, FOR A DISTANCE OF 437.71 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING (P.O.B.); SAID TRACT CONTAINING 2.89 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

AND

A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN GOVERNMENT LOT TEN (10) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (GL10, SW/4) OF SECTION SIX (6), TOWNSHIP NINETEEN (19) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN (I.B.&M.), CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SURVEY THEREOF, AND ALSO BEING A PART OF LOT SIX (6), BLOCK TWO (2), SUNSET ADDITION, AND A PART OF LOTS ELEVEN (11), TWELVE (12), THIRTEEN (13), FOURTEEN (14), FIFTEEN (15), AND SIXTEEN (16), BLOCK TWO (2) OF FACTORY ADDITION, AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT:
BEGINNING (P.O.B.) AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT THIRTEEN (13) BLOCK TWO (2) OF FACTORY ADDITION; THENCE S89°13'22"W AND ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF LOTS THIRTEEN (13) FOURTEEN (14), FIFTEEN (15), AND SIXTEEN (16) BLOCK TWO (2), FACTORY ADDITION FOR A DISTANCE OF 180.00 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT SIXTEEN (16), BLOCK TWO (2); THENCE N01°12'56"W AND ALONG THE WEST LINE OF LOT SIXTEEN (16), FACTORY ADDITION, AND LOT SIX (6), BLOCK TWO (2), SUNSET ADDITION, FOR A DISTANCE OF 178.30 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT SIX (6), BLOCK TWO (2); THENCE N89°13'22"E FOR A DISTANCE OF 180.00 FEET; THENCE S01°12'56"E AND ALONG THE EAST LINES OF LOTS ELEVEN (11), TWELVE (12) AND THIRTEEN (13), BLOCK TWO (2), FACTORY ADDITION FOR A DISTANCE OF 178.30 FEET TO THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT THIRTEEN (13), BLOCK TWO (2), FACTORY ADDITION AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING (P.O.B.); SAID TRACT CONTAINING 0.74 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Variance Response
6th and Peoria (55.080.D)

1. That the physical surroundings, shape, or topographic 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.

This infill redevelopment is located on a small, urban block which provides no opportunity to add additional surrounding parcels to the property. This is limited by required alleys and existing roadways.

2. That the literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision’s intended purpose.

Though it is not possible to expand the lot proposing development, the parking anticipated directly to the east will satisfy requirement to be within one-thousand foot radius, per Section 55.080.D.1. All accessible parking will be located appropriately on the proposed, western development lot.

3. 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.

As recognized in the Neighborhood Infill Overlay district and Pearl District text, infill development with the desired uses (ex. multi-family) is difficult due to the existing infrastructure in place that may not be conducive. The development site cannot be expanded, so creative solutions are required.

4. That the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner.

Being an infill development, the hardships on the site are pre-existing.

5. That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief.

The requested variance is necessary and expected to provide necessary parking for the multi-family development.
6. 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.

   If the variance is granted, the proposed multi-family apartment is a desired use for the neighborhood and is an opportunity to improve the essential character.

7. 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.

   The variance, if granted, would assist in developing a use that is in furtherance of the public good and in spirit with the intent of the zoning code, comprehensive plan, and other relevant studies for this area.
BOA Narrative
6th and Peoria

The attached application is associated with a five-story, multi-family development to be located northeast of 6th and Peoria. The project site in its current state includes minimal use and vacant land; however, the vision is to provide quality, high-density residential housing in proximity to commercial activity and public amenities in a location encouraging multi-modal transportation options. Multi-family housing is supported and encouraged by the associated Neighborhood Infill Overlay (NIO) and Pearl District Small Area Plan, while also being a permitted use in the CH zoning district. Due to the constrained nature of this urbanized site, requested is one variance and a special exception to the city’s parking standards.

Variance Request – Chapter 55, Section 55.080.D – Location of off-street parking

The nature of developing infill on an existing, urbanized block brings insurmountable difficulties. Urban blocks are small and are bounded by streets that do not allow the option to combine with adjacent properties to allow for a larger development footprint. The limited developable space and existing business on the block create a need to provide off-site parking, which is proposed directly to the east and under common ownership. This additional space will allow for more residential parking that also within one-thousand food radius of the use served by the parking, required per Section 55.080.D.1 of the zoning code.

Special Exception – Chapter 55, Section 55.020 – Minimum parking ratios

The development will include 209 residential units containing both one- and two-bedroom units, 89% of which will be one-bedroom units. Per the parking requirements outlined in Section 55.020 of the Zoning Code, 247 parking spaces would be required. The proposed site plan can provide 164 spaces, leaving a deficit of 84 spaces from the required code. There are currently no public parking spaces on this block, so in addition to 164 spaces, 14 public on-street parking spaces are also proposed.

The concept for this project, including the reduced parking, is based on successful experiences from other communities in U.S. finding creative solutions to provide much needed housing in appropriate areas. Based on the content of related City of Tulsa plans and future goals, this type of development would be a great opportunity to find a creative solution.

Austin, TX is a great example of a community who eliminated parking minimum standards to fight climate change and spur the development of more affordable housing options. The list of cities that have acted similarly include, but are not limited to: Portland, Minneapolis, San Jose, TX, Raleigh, NC, and Auburn, ME. Understanding these are examples of city-wide policy change, we are requesting consideration of these principals to allow for the subject variance and special exception.

The higher density concept on a reduced footprint has proven to compliment multi-modal transportation, which this area is primed for. The site is directly accessible to designated bike lanes along East 6th Street.
South, along Veterans Parks, and continuing to the primary, Midland Valley Trail along Highway 75, creating excellent mobility (Graphic 4). This network of trails also provides direct access to downtown Tulsa. Further bike route connectivity is also proposed, per the City of Tulsa GO Plan, serving South Peoria and continuing the connection along East 6th Street South (Graphic 2). South Peoria also serves as a major public transit route, hosting the innovative AERO Peoria Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), as shown on Graphic 3. Lastly, this location is already part of comprehensive sidewalk grid, providing quality, safe pedestrian access and connectivity. Having quality sidewalks, bike routes, and access to public transit support a reduced need for parking.

From the perspective of existing Tulsa code and relevant studies, the subject property is located in the NIO zoning district, which came about the 2020 Downtown & Surrounding Neighborhood Housing Study & Strategy that recognized site and zoning barriers to new housing development. It determined that there are zoning related burdens on housing development in and near downtown neighborhoods. This area is also located within the Pearl District Small Area Plan, which states that a primary goal is to support compatible infill and reinvestment and even explore modifying on-site parking requirements in certain cases. These area plans encourage the revitalization and redevelopment of vacant properties, along with higher density development in transit rich areas, which the proposal exemplifies.

In summary, reducing parking requirements for infill development can have multiple benefits for the city and its residents. First, it can encourage more housing diversity and affordability. Second, it can reduce the environmental impact of development by discouraging car dependency and promoting alternative modes of transportation, such as walking, biking, or public transit. Third, it can enhance the urban design and livability of neighborhoods by creating more active and attractive streetscapes, rather than large surface parking lots that disrupt the pedestrian environment. Therefore, reduced parking requirements for infill development can support Tulsa’s goals of creating more sustainable, equitable, and vibrant communities. The use is encouraged by the city, which also recognizes the hardships of revitalizing and redeveloping urbanized infill land.
Graphic 1: Tulsa Metropolitan Area: Bicycle & Pedestrian Trails

Graphic 2: GO Plan: Proposed Bike Facilities
**Graphic 3**: Tulsa Transit System – AERO Peoria Route Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

**Graphic 4**: Map of cities that reformed or eliminated parking minimum standards – Strong Towns, Advocacy Group
City of Tulsa
Board of Adjustment
planning@cityoftulsa.org

RE: Case Number: BOA-23667

Dear Board Members:

The purpose of this letter is to ask that you deny the requested parking variance.

We are the owners of Be Love Yoga Studio for the last ten years and the proposed variance will have a negative impact on our ability to conduct business. We chose to locate our business in the pearl district, because of its accessibility and inclusivity. We admire that 6th st is a micro community of downtown and that the business owners of this hub are in good relation and collaboration. If this variance would be passed it would not only be aesthetically displeasing, but would put a great strain on the ease of access to our mission.

The developer on this project is creating a self-imposed hardship – one that can be easily addressed via planning and design. Our existing business has neither of those options. It is unfair to shift the burden from this development onto the businesses that have been operating in the area for years.

Please advocate for better, more community driven solutions.

We respectfully request that you deny the proposed variance and ask the applicant to find a more appropriate solution complimentary to this neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Joe Picorale, Owner
Hailey Boswell, Owner
Hannah Bell, Manager

Be Love Yoga Studio
beloveyogastudio.com
Big Om Yoga Retreat
bigomyogaretreat.com
918-605-8221
Download the Be Love Yoga Studio app in the app store on your smart phone!
From: Tiffany Riley
To: Tulsa Planning Office
Subject: Case BOA-23667
Date: Monday, April 22, 2024 11:27:11 AM
Attachments: Doc Apr 22, 2024, 11.25.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not reply, forward, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please report using the Phish Alert button in the Outlook Desktop Client if this message contains potentially unsafe content.

Sent from my iPhone
City of Tulsa  
Board of Adjustment  
planning@cityoftulsa.org

RE: Case Number: BOA-23667

Dear Board Members:

The purpose of this letter is to ask that you deny the requested parking variance.  
I am the owner of LivyLu and the proposed variance will have a negative impact on my ability to conduct business. We love The Pearl District! However, there is already a lack of parking that negatively effects our business. We need more parking in the area, not less. If the parking situation gets worse, we will need to relocate out of the area.

The developer on this project is creating a self-imposed hardship – one that can be easily addressed via planning and design. Our existing business has neither of those options. It is unfair to shift the burden from this development onto the businesses that have been operating in the area for years.

Please advocate for better, more community driven solutions.

I respectfully request that you deny the proposed variance and ask the applicant to

Sincerely,

Tiffany Riley  
Owner, LivyLu
To whom it concerns,

Attached please find my letter to the Board of Adjustment asking them to deny the proposed variance for case number BOA-23667

Thanks,

Eric Richards  
CORE Associates  
401 s. boston ave. #900 | tulsa, ok 74103  
918 295 8053 | eric@coreassociatesllc.com

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not reply, forward, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please report using the Phish Alert button in the Outlook Desktop Client if this message contains potentially unsafe content.
City of Tulsa
Board of Adjustment
planning@cityoftulsa.org

RE: Case Number: BOA-23667

Dear Board Members:

The purpose of this letter is to ask that you deny the requested parking variance.

I recently purchased 3 buildings in the Pearl District along 6th Street (1338 E 6th St, 1336 E 6th St and 1328 E 6th St) and the proposed variance will have a negative impact on my ability to lease out these buildings. These buildings have been vacant and/or underutilized for decades and once they are properly leased, they will add approximately 15,000 new square feet of new businesses to the district. While my project has the capability to have some parking for my future tenants on site, Case Number: BOA-23667 will unquestionably create a parking issue not only for myself but also all the other businesses, homeowners, and landlords in the area. In addition, the developer has assembled and purchased almost 4 acres of real property in the immediate vicinity of the proposed apartment project. It seems like this accumulation of land should be more than enough to meet the parking needs for the project in a way that does not penalize all surrounding properties. Parking is at a premium on the Pearl.

I believe that the developer on this project is creating a self-imposed hardship – one that can be easily addressed via planning and design. It is unfair to shift the burden from this development onto the businesses, homeowners and landlords that currently operating in this district.

Please advocate for better, more community driven solutions.

I respectfully request that you deny the proposed variance and ask the applicant to

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Good morning Austin,

We would like to request a continuance on the 6th and Peoria (above) case until the May 14 meeting. We have made great progress communicating with the neighbors, but would appreciate more time for more communication. I will plan to attend the meeting to make sure the continuance moves forward, unless you suggest otherwise. Thank you, sir.

Justin DeBruin, AICP

civil engineering

structural • civil • landscape • survey
123 north martin luther king jr boulevard
tulsa, oklahoma 74103
918.584.5858 o • 918.806.7430 d

atlanta • denver • kansas city • nashville • oklahoma city •
tulsa

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not reply, forward, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please report using the Phish Alert button in the Outlook Desktop Client if this message contains potentially unsafe content.
My name is Grace Smith, and I am a property owner at 647 S Quaker Ave. I've lived in the Pearl District for over six years and worked here for over eight. I am thrilled at the prospect of urban infill and density in my neighborhood. I think this will be a great addition to the area.

While I do not believe that the application is fully transparent as to the extent of available parking space on the subject lot or adjacent lots, I am in favor of granting the variance to allow for off-site parking for this project.

However, when it comes to the special exception to reduce the required parking ratios, I have doubts and questions. I would like to respectfully ask the Board to request additional data and evidence of site-specific analysis for this project before making their decision about the special exception.

I do not believe the application meets the burden of showing that approving their requested special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of this zoning code or that it will not be detrimental to the public’s welfare. More specifically, it does not show that other available parking reduction alternatives were considered but are infeasible or do not apply—such as motorcycle and scooter parking, car-share and bike-share services, and shared parking agreements.

The application also does not show that the requested reduced parking ratios are not likely to cause material adverse impacts on the safety and general welfare of property owners and residents in the surrounding area. Until the Pearl District is truly the walkable neighborhood that it has the potential to be, this is the reality:

- Residents in the area have the true practical difficulty of lots that are not sized to include off-street parking and therefore, rely on street parking for our homes.
- Not having available parking within a reasonable distance of our homes would be a detriment to our safety.

Several of the cities listed in the application as a model for eliminating parking minimums have shifted to a “transportation demand management” approach. For example, Portland has eliminated parking minimums, but added requirements for a transportation demand analysis report and management plan to be submitted for commercial/mixed-use and multifamily development for review and approval.

The requirements include:

- Information about the proposed development, such as estimated trip generation and parking needs
- Existing and projected land uses and traffic conditions in the surrounding area and
- Creative strategies to address additional demand for transportation and parking until multi-modal performance targets are met

This review provides “a mechanism to evaluate whether the multimodal transportation system is capable of supporting proposed development, as well as consideration of proportional mitigation measures.” (Portland 33.852 Transportation Impact Review). Minneapolis and San Jose have also adopted requirements for transportation demand management plans to be submitted for developments the size of the subject project. Some of the strategies could include shared parking agreements with neighboring uses based on peak-time analysis, improved infrastructure for on-street parking, and financial incentives for multi-modal transportation for residents of the development.

In summary, I would like to see the application include information about the estimated impact on traffic and parking from the proposed development, analysis of the existing and upcoming uses in the area, and the proposal of mitigating solutions that address the gap between moving toward a new approach and achieving a robust transit system and safe walkable neighborhood.
References:
Portland 33.266.410 Transportation and Parking Demand Management
Portland 33.852 Transportation Impact Review
Portland 17.107 Transportation and Parking Demand Management
Minneapolis Title 20 Chapter 555.1300 Travel Demand Management
San Jose, TX Chapter 20.90.900 – Transportation Demand Management
standing in alley, looking northeast

Saturday April 20, 2024 approximately 1:40 pm

standing in alley, looking southwest

Saturday April 20, 2024 approximately 1:40 pm
6th & Peoria intersection, looking southwest  
Saturday April 20, 2024 approximately 1:40 pm

6th & Quaker intersection, looking southwest  
Sunday April 21, 2024 approximately 12:30 pm
Sunday April 21, 2024 approximately 12:30 pm

6th & Quaker intersection, looking south

Sunday April 21, 2024 approximately 12:30 pm

standing on Quaker, looking northwest
Transportation and Parking Demand Management

33.266.410 Transportation and Parking Demand Management

A. Purpose. Transportation and parking demand management (TDM) encompasses a variety of strategies to encourage more efficient use of the existing transportation system, and reduce reliance on the personal automobile. This is achieved by encouraging people through education, outreach, financial incentives, and pricing to choose other modes, share rides, travel outside peak times, and telecommute, among other methods. Effective TDM also incorporates management of parking demand. Transportation and parking demand management strategies help reduce traffic congestion, reduce the amount of money that must be spent to expand transportation system capacity, improve air quality, and ensure road capacity is available for those who need it most.

B. Transportation and parking demand management in the commercial/mixed use and multi-dwelling zones. In the commercial/mixed use and multi-dwelling zones, a TDM plan is required when new development includes a building with more than 10 dwelling units, or an alteration to existing development includes the addition of more than 10 dwelling units within a building. Sites in the Central City plan district are exempt from this requirement. To meet the TDM standard, the applicant must choose one of the following:

1. Go through the Transportation Impact review process set out in chapter 33.852; or
2. Meet the objective standards of Title 17.107 as verified by the Portland Bureau of Transportation.

33.266.420 Transportation Impact Review in the Campus Institutional Zones

Development on a site zoned CI with a College or Medical Center use must conform to an approved Transportation Impact review. Development that is not in conformance with an approved Transportation Impact review requires Transportation Impact review when the development:

A. Increases the net building area on the campus by more than 20,000 square feet; or
B. Increases the number of parking spaces on the campus by more than 4.

(Amended by: Ord. No. 164014, effective 3/27/91; Ord. No. 164899, effective 12/11/91; Ord. No. 165376, effective 5/29/92; Ord. No. 166313, effective 4/9/93; Ord. No. 167054, effective 10/25/93; Ord. No. 167186, effective 12/31/93; Ord. No. 167189, effective 1/14/94; Ord. No. 169324, effective 10/12/95; Ord. No. 169535, effective 1/8/96; Ord. No. 169699, effective 2/7/96; Ord. No. 170704, effective 1/1/97; Ord. No. 171718, effective 11/29/97; Ord. No. 174263, effective 4/15/00; Ord. No. 174980, effective 11/20/00; Ord. Nos. 175341 and 175358, effective 3/16/01; Ord. No. 175837, effective 9/7/01; Ord. No. 175966, effective 10/26/01; Ord. Nos. 175965 and 176333, effective 7/1/02; Ord. No. 177649, effective 7/1/02; Ord. No. 177028, effective 12/14/02; Ord. No. 177422, effective 6/7/03; Ord. No. 177701, effective 11/29/97; Ord. No. 178172, effective 3/5/04; Ord. No. 178509, effective 7/16/04; Ord. No. 179316, effective 7/8/05; Ord. No. 179845, effective 1/20/06; Ord. No. 179980, effective 4/22/06; Ord. No. 181357, effective 11/9/07; Ord. No. 182429, effective 1/16/09; Ord. No. 183598, effective 4/24/10; Ord. No. 184524, effective 7/1/11; Ord. No. 185974, effective 5/10/13; Ord. No. 186639, effective 7/11/14; Ord. No. 187216, effective 7/24/15; Ord. No. 188162, effective 2/1/17; Ord. No. 188259, effective 3/31/17; Ord. No. 188177, effective 5/24/18;
Ord. No. 188958, effective 5/24/18; Ord. No. 189137, effective 8/22/18; Ord. No. 189805, effective 3/1/20; Ord. No. 189784, effective 3/1/20; Ord. No. 190093, effective 8/1/21; Ord. No. 190380, effective 8/1/21; Ord. No. 190687, effective 3/1/22; Ord. No. 190851, effective 6/30/22; Ord. No. 191164, effective 3/31/23; Ord. No. 191310, effective 6/30/23; Ord. No. 191609, effective 3/1/24.)
33.852 Transportation Impact Review

Sections:
33.852.010 Purpose
33.852.100 Procedure
33.852.105 Supplemental Application Requirements
33.852.110 Approval Criteria
33.852.115 Duration of a Transportation Impact Review

33.852.010 Purpose
Transportation Impact Review provides a mechanism to evaluate whether the multimodal transportation system is capable of supporting proposed development, as well as consideration of proportional mitigation measures. The development thresholds that trigger a Transportation Impact Review can be found in other chapters of this Title. Transportation Impact Review may be completed at various levels of detail. Generally, the more specific the proposal, the less review that will be required as future development is built. Transportation Impact Review is intended as a mechanism to identify practicable actions to reduce and mitigate transportation impacts, consistent with allowing those uses generally permitted or allowed in the base zone.

33.852.100 Procedure
Transportation Impact Reviews are processed through a Type II procedure.

33.852.105 Supplemental Application Requirements
In addition to the application requirements of Section 33.730.060, an application for Transportation Impact Review must include the following. In commercial/mixed use zones, if the applicant has chosen Transportation Impact Review rather than implementing the pre-approved plan allowed by 33.266.410, only supplemental application requirement H is required.

A. Description of proposed development. Transportation Impact Review must include proposed development, and may incorporate possible future development anticipated for up to ten years;

B. Delineation of the study area, and rationale for the delineation. At a minimum, the study area must include primary access routes between the site and the nearest regional trafficways and major city traffic streets, regional transitways and major transit priority streets, major city bikeways, and city walkways. Other secondary routes used to access the site within the neighborhood(s) where the site is located must also be included;

C. Description of existing uses and conditions in the study area. If the application is for development in the Cascade Station/Portland International Center Plan District, the following are also required:

   1. The description must include build-out of the Maximum Use Allocations in Table 508-1 in the count of background traffic, regardless of whether construction of those uses has occurred;
2. Table 508-1 assumptions and conclusions must be provided to BDS for tracking purposes;

D. Traffic forecasts and distribution;

E. Primary traffic access routes to and from the study area;

F. Analysis of the proportional responsibility of the proposed development to mitigate forecasted impacts;

G. Recommended mitigation measures including transportation system management and needed transportation improvements;

H. Transportation and parking demand management plan that has all the elements required by Chapter 17.107; and

I. Evaluation of the transportation impacts of the proposed development, including impacts in the study area, on:
   1. Street function, capacity and level of service;
   2. On-street parking;
   3. Access;
   4. Transit operations and movements; and
   5. Pedestrian and bicycle routes and safety.

33.852.110 Approval Criteria for Transportation Impact Reviews
The request for development or development capacity will be approved if the review body finds that the applicant has shown that all of the following criteria are met. In commercial/mixed use zones, if the applicant has chosen Transportation Impact Review rather than implementing the pre-approved plan allowed by 33.266.410, only approval criterion B applies.

A. The transportation system is capable of supporting the recommended development in addition to the existing uses in the area. Evaluation factors include safety, street capacity, level of service, connectivity, transit availability, availability of pedestrian and bicycle networks, access restrictions, neighborhood impacts, impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation. Evaluation factors may be balanced; a finding of failure in one or more factors may be acceptable if the failure is not a result of the proposed development, and any additional impacts on the system from the proposed development are mitigated as required by criterion C;

B. Proposed transportation and parking demand management actions are contributing to the City sufficiently achieving the relevant mode share and residential auto ownership targets established by the Transportation System Plan for the uses and development on the site;

C. Measures proportional to the impacts of the proposed development are proposed to mitigate on- and off-site transportation impacts. Measures may include transportation improvements to on-site circulation, public street dedication and improvement, private street improvements, intersection improvements, signal or other traffic management improvements, additional transportation and parking demand management actions, street
crossing improvements, improvements to the local pedestrian and bicycle networks, and transit improvements; and

D. Transportation improvements adjacent to the development and in the vicinity needed to support the development are available or will be made available when the development is complete or, if the development is phased, will be available as each phase of the development is completed.

33.852.115 Duration of a Transportation Impact Review
An approved Transportation Impact Review remains in effect for up to ten years, or until development allowed by the review has been completed or the review is amended or superseded, whichever comes first.

(Added by: Ord. No. 179076, effective 6/30/05. Amended by: Ord. No. 188177, effective 5/24/18; Ord. No. 188958, effective 5/24/18; Ord. No. 191609, effective 3/1/24.)
Chapter 17.107 Transportation and Parking Demand Management

(Chapter added by Ordinance 188177; amended by Ordinance 188695, effective May 24, 2018.)

17.107.010 Purpose.

(Amended by Ordinance 188957, effective June 23, 2018.)

The purpose of this Chapter is to describe the required elements of a Transportation and Parking Demand Management (TDM) Plan, and the circumstances under which a pre-approved TDM plan may be submitted. Requiring TDM is intended to prevent, reduce, and mitigate the impacts of development on the transportation system, neighborhood livability, safety, and the environment while reducing transportation system costs.

TDM plans provide residents, employees, and visitors with information and incentives to use transportation methods other than single occupancy vehicles in order to achieve the City's transportation goals, including reduced reliance on single occupancy vehicles, and reduced vehicle miles travelled.


(Amended by Ordinance 189651, effective September 6, 2019.)

A TDM Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

A. Description of proposed development, including trip generation estimates and proposed auto and bicycle parking. The description may include development anticipated to occur for a period of up to 10 years;

B. Description of existing land uses, traffic conditions, and multimodal facilities in the area within ¼ mile of the site, including (if applicable) any current employee mode split data from the most recent Employee Commute Options (ECO) report submitted to the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality;

C. Performance Targets:

1. Mode split goals shall be based on the performance targets from Policy 9.49.3 in the Transportation System Plan;

2. An ECO survey submitted in Subsection B. shall serve as the baseline mode split, when available. If an ECO survey is not available, census data may be used, or the applicant may submit an independent survey from a professional traffic engineer;

3. Interim performance targets may be determined as a straight line projection from the base year to 2035;

4. Alternate performance targets may be proposed based on the following factors:

   a. The relative availability of bicycle, transit, bike share, and car share infrastructure and services;

   b. Current TDM strategies that have been implemented by the applicant;

   c. Travel characteristics, including schedules, of employees, residents, and visitors;
d. Best practices and performance of comparable sites in Portland and comparable cities;

D. If a site has a TDM Plan approved through a previous land use review, and the applicant is in compliance with the provisions of that Plan, then the TDM Plan may serve as the basis of any subsequent updates. The submittal for a TDM Plan update should include:

1. Demonstration of compliance with neighborhood engagement obligations;

2. Demonstration of compliance with mode split reporting obligations;

3. Evaluation of mode split trends based relative to the performance target;

E. Strategies likely to achieve the identified mode split and parking management performance targets. Strategies may include but are not limited to:

1. Supply, management, and pricing of on-site employee, resident, and student parking;

2. Dissemination of information about alternatives to single-occupant vehicle commuting;

3. Identification of a site or campus TDM coordinator;

4. Financial incentives offered to employees for carpool, car-sharing, transit, bicycling, and walking;

5. For nonresidential uses, strategies to reduce total trips such as telework and/or compressed work week scheduling or on-site housing;

6. For nonresidential uses, the availability of end-of-trip facilities, such as bicycle lockers, showers, and secured bicycle parking.

F. For colleges and hospitals in the Campus Institutional Zone, a neighborhood engagement plan;

G. Reporting as required by Section 17.107.045, including any Performance Monitoring plans proposed by the applicant that exceed the ECO reporting requirements detailed in Section 17.107.045;

H. Ongoing Participation and Adaptive Management plan, specifying what additional actions not detailed in Subsection 17.107.020 D. may be utilized to achieve the 2035 performance targets specified in Subsection 17.107.020 C.

17.107.030 Transportation and Parking Demand Management Requirements and Procedures.

(Amended by Ordinances 189895 and 190251, effective February 5, 2021.)

A. Requirement for Colleges and Medical Centers. Title 33 requires College and Medical Center uses in the campus institutional zones to conform to an approved Transportation Impact review. The application requirements for the Transportation Impact review require the applicant to provide a Transportation and Parking Demand Management Plan that has all the elements required by this Chapter. Approval of the TDM plan is subject to the criteria described in Chapter 33.852.

B. Requirement for Residential Uses. Title 33 requires development in a commercial/mixed use or multi-dwelling zone that includes more than 10 new dwelling units to have a TDM Plan at the time of development permit issuance. Development subject to this requirement may utilize the pre-approved multimodal incentive described in Section 17.107.035, or develop a custom plan approved through Transportation Impact Review, as described in Chapter 33.852.
17.107.035 Pre-Approved Multimodal Incentives for Development.

(Amended by Ordinances 188957 and 189895, effective March 18, 2020.)

As an alternative to preparing a custom TDM plan subject to Sections 17.107.020 through 17.107.030, and Chapter 33.852, an applicant may agree to provide a multimodal incentive plan, preapproved by the City, including, but not limited to, the following:

A. Distribution of transportation options information approved or provided by the Portland Bureau of Transportation for the first 4 years of building occupancy, offered to residents, employees, and visitors;

B. Multimodal financial incentives equal to the value of a 1-year adult TriMet pass per residential unit, for the first year of building occupancy. This obligation will pay for a menu of incentives that will be offered to residents of the site to increase the use of transit, bicycling, walking, and other alternatives to driving alone. Specific rates for affordable dwelling units and market-rate dwelling units are found in the annual fee schedule;

C. Participation in an annual travel survey of residents and employees for the first 4 years of building occupancy;

D. A written acknowledgment by the applicant of the enforcement provisions in Code Section 17.107.050.

17.107.045 Required Reporting.

Employers on sites subject to an approved TDM Plan shall submit Employee Commute Options surveys to the Portland Bureau of Transportation a minimum of every 2 years after initial approval. On residential properties subject to a pre-approved TDM Plan under Section 17.107.035, the building owner or manager is required to actively participate in an annual City travel survey of residents and employees for the first 4 years of building occupancy.

17.107.050 Enforcement and Penalties.

It shall be a violation of this Chapter for any entity or person to fail to comply with the requirements of this Chapter or to misrepresent any material fact in a document required to be prepared or disclosed by this Chapter. Any building owner, employer, tenant, property manager, or person who fails, omits, neglects, or refuses to comply with the provisions of this Chapter shall be subject to a civil penalty of up to $1,000 for every 7-day period during which the violation continues. If an entity or person is fully implementing all other elements of this Chapter, failing to meet performance targets alone shall not be an enforcement violation. The Bureau of Transportation shall seek voluntary compliance for a period of at least 1 month before resorting to penalties.

17.107.060 Administrative Rule Authority.

The Director of Transportation shall adopt administrative rules necessary to achieve the purpose of this Chapter.

17.107.070 Fees.

The City may charge fees for Transportation and Parking Demand Management goods and services provided, including but not limited to application review, incentives and education, performance monitoring, adaptive management, and compliance and enforcement.
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ARTICLE XIII. - TRAVEL DEMAND MANAGEMENT

555.1300. - Purpose.

The purpose of the travel demand management ordinance is to support the city's transportation policies and to ensure that larger developments and uses with high-traffic demand have positive impacts on safety, equity, mobility, climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, mode split, and air quality.

555.1310. - Buildings and uses subject to a travel demand management plan.

(a) In general. Buildings and uses subject to a travel demand management plan are listed in Table 555-10, Buildings and Uses Subject to a Travel Demand Management Plan, along with the required minimum number of points required for each building or use. The number of points awarded for each travel demand management strategy is listed in Table 555-11, Travel Demand Management Strategies.

(b) Travel demand management plan, minor. Minor travel demand management plans shall include a review for compliance with the minimum number of points required by this article.

(c) Travel demand management plan, major. In addition to review for compliance with the minimum number of points required by this article, a major travel demand management plan shall include a report containing a traffic study prepared consistent with industry standards and certified by a licensed engineer.

(d) Travel demand management plan, discretionary. The planning director, in consultation with the city engineer, may mandate a travel demand management plan that includes a report containing a traffic study prepared consistent with industry standards and certified by a licensed engineer for the establishment of any use, new building, or building expansion not specified in this chapter when it is determined by the planning director that the proposal presents unique transportation challenges due to the nature of the use or location. The required travel demand management strategies shall be determined based on the findings of the report.

Table 555-10 Buildings and Uses Subject to a Travel Demand Management Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Buildings and Uses</th>
<th>Minor, Major, or Discretionary Travel Demand Management Plan Required</th>
<th>Minimum Points Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any building or use containing fifty (50) or more and less than two hundred fifty (250) new or additional dwelling units or rooming units.</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any nonresidential development containing more than twenty-five thousand (25,000) sq. ft. and less than two hundred thousand (200,000) sq. ft. of new or additional gross floor area.</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any building or use containing two hundred fifty (250) or more new or additional dwelling units or rooming units.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any nonresidential development containing two hundred thousand (200,000) sq. ft. or more of new or additional gross floor area.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment or expansion of a reception or meeting hall containing five thousand (5,000) sq. ft. of new or additional gross floor area.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment or expansion of a shopping center containing ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft. of new or additional gross floor area.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The planning director, in consultation with the city engineer, may mandate a travel demand management plan that includes a report containing a traffic study prepared consistent with industry standards and certified by a licensed engineer for the establishment of any use, new building, or building expansion not specified in this chapter when it is determined by the planning director that the proposal presents unique transportation challenges due to the nature of the use or location.

| Discretionary | As determined by the planning director |

(e) *Mixed-use and multiple use development.* Mixed-use development is subject to a minor or major travel demand management plan only when either the residential or nonresidential use is subject to such requirement in Table 555-10, Buildings and Uses Subject to a Travel Demand Management Plan, provided that a discretionary travel demand management plan may be required for any building or use. When a development includes more than one (1) use subject to a minor or major travel demand management plan, the minimum required point total shall be based on only the use with the highest requirement rather than the sum of the point total for all applicable buildings or uses.

(f) *Exceptions.* A written request may be submitted to the planning director requesting an exemption from the requirement to submit a travel demand management plan. The planning director shall consider, but not be limited to, the nature of the use and the number of vehicle trips the site is expected to generate, and whether a substantial percentage of the building's floor area would be dedicated to warehousing, storage, or other uses that reduce the applicability of travel demand management strategies required by this ordinance. Future conversion of the space to a different use or uses may necessitate the need for a travel demand management plan.

555.1320. - Application for travel demand management plan.

Any person having a legal or equitable interest in land which requires submission of a travel demand management plan may file an application for approval of such plan on a form approved by the zoning administrator.

555.1330. - Administrative review.
The planning director, in consultation with the city engineer, shall conduct the administrative review of the travel demand management plan. The planning director shall recommend to the zoning administrator any mitigating measures deemed reasonable and necessary, and shall include such recommendation as a condition of the issuance of any building permit, zoning certificate or other approval required by this zoning ordinance or other applicable law. All findings and decisions of the planning director shall be final, subject to appeal to the city planning commission, as specified in Chapter 525, Administration and Procedures.

555.1340. - Content of travel demand management plans.

Any travel demand management plan shall contain at least the following:

1. A description of the goals of the travel demand management plan and its relationship to applicable city transportation policies and programs including how the development will contribute to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, achieve city mode split goals, reduce use of single-occupancy motor vehicles, and increase walking, bicycling, and transit as primary modes of travel.

2. An acknowledgement of a commitment to provide self-reported audits every two (2) years to the planning director and city engineer that confirms ongoing compliance with required strategies until it is deemed that the development is sufficiently meeting city transportation goals. If any points for travel demand management strategies are derived from non-infrastructure solutions, documentation of ongoing programmatic elements must be included in the audit.

555.1350. - Compliance with requirements of travel demand management strategies.

Points shall be awarded for travel demand strategies listed in Table 555-11, Travel Demand Management Strategies. All applicable standards shall be met in order to qualify for the points for each strategy. The required strategies shall be maintained in good order for the life of the structure or use. A list and description of the approved travel demand strategies for a given site shall be posted in a conspicuous common area of the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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| Transit fare provision | 6 | a. The building owner or management company shall provide unlimited-ride transit passes to residents and employees utilizing a program administered through the regional transit agency.  
b. For single-tenant nonresidential uses, all full-time employees shall be provided unlimited-ride transit passes. For multi-tenant nonresidential uses, not less than seventy-five (75) percent of the full-time employees within the development shall be provided unlimited-ride transit passes.  
c. For residential uses, unlimited-ride transit passes shall be provided to all units within the development at a rate not less than one (1) pass per unit. |
| Zero vehicle parking | 6 | a. No off-street parking spaces for motor vehicles shall be provided for the development.  
b. Accessible spaces, spaces for shared vehicles, and up to three (3) temporary drop-off and pick-up spaces shall be exempt from this requirement. |
| Transit fare subsidy | 3 | a. The building owner or management company shall provide a transit fare subsidy for unlimited-ride transit passes not less than thirty (30) percent of the cost of the transit pass to residents and employees utilizing a program administered through the regional transit agency.  

b. For single-tenant nonresidential uses, all full-time employees shall be offered unlimited-ride transit passes at a reduced rate. For multi-tenant nonresidential uses, not less than seventy-five (75) percent of the full-time employees within the development shall qualify for unlimited-ride transit passes at a reduced rate.  
c. For residential uses, unlimited-ride transit passes shall be made available to all units within the development at a rate not less than one (1) pass per unit. |
| Limited vehicle parking | 3 | a. No more than one-half (0.5) space per residential unit shall be provided when the residential use requires a travel demand management plan.  
b. Off-street parking less than or equal to thirty (30) percent of the maximum parking requirement for the development shall be provided when the nonresidential use requires a travel demand management plan.  
c. A development shall not qualify for points for both the zero vehicle parking strategy and the limited parking strategy. |
| Pedestrian realm improvements | 3 | Improvements shall be implemented in the public right-of-way that support pedestrian activity and exceed minimum requirements, as approved by the planning director in consultation with the city engineer. In addition to any additional improvements determined by the planning director or city engineer, the development shall provide a minimum of two (2) of the following three (3) enhancements: 1) A widened sidewalk that brings a substandard pedestrian space into compliance with the City of Minneapolis Street Design Guide. Sidewalks must be paved with materials that meet or exceed city standards for sidewalk finishes. 2) Street trees and landscaping installed in an enhanced planting bed. 3) Street furniture appropriate for the site’s context, not disrupting the pedestrian throughway. |

| Shower, locker, and long-term bicycle storage | 2 | a. The development shall provide shower and locker facilities, and long-term bicycle parking at a fifty (50) percent greater rate than otherwise required by this zoning ordinance. b. Points for this strategy shall only be awarded for uses that are required by this chapter to provide shower and locker facilities. |

<p>| Shared vehicles | 2 | a. Nonresidential uses shall provide one (1) shared vehicle per one hundred thousand (100,000) sq. ft. of nonresidential space, but not less than one (1) vehicle, when the nonresidential use requires a travel demand management plan. b. Residential uses shall provide a minimum of one (1) shared vehicle per one hundred (100) dwelling units when the nonresidential use requires a travel demand management plan, but not less than one (1) vehicle, when the nonresidential use requires a travel demand management plan. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Unbundling and pricing of parking             | 1    | a. In a residential use subject to a travel demand management plan, parking spaces for residential units shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase price of the housing units.  
|                                               |      | b. In a nonresidential use subject to a travel demand management plan, a fee shall typically be charged for long-term customer and employee parking.  
|                                               |      | c. Points for this strategy shall not be awarded for both this strategy and the Zero Vehicle Parking strategy.                                                                                             |
| Real-time transit information                 | 1    | The development shall post real-time transit information in a public space near or at the entrance to the development.                                                                                         |
| Proposed by the applicant                     | As determined by the planning director | The property owner or representative may propose a travel demand management strategy not detailed in this table such as valet parking, mobility hubs, or other items as appropriate for the use and location. Points awarded shall be determined by the planning director in consultation with the city engineer. |
20.90.900 - Applicability.

A. Applicability. The City shall not issue a Development Permit, Ministerial Permit, Building Permit, or a Certificate of Occupancy that is not in compliance with the requirements of this Part.

B. Exemptions. The following Projects are exempt from the requirements of this Part 9 of Chapter 20.90:

1. Any work on an existing building or structure which does not result in an increase in floor area, except for a project that involves a change of use where the proposed use is defined as a different TDM use category pursuant to Table 20-190 and where the modified square footage qualifies as a Level 1 or Level 2 project pursuant to Table 20-260.

2. Projects in which the new floor area constructed consists of:
   a. Fewer than 16 single-family detached housing units; or
   b. Fewer than 26 units of all other home end uses except for single-family detached housing units; or
   c. 10,000 square feet or less of any combination of commute end uses; or
   d. 100,000 square feet or less of any combination of visit end uses; or
   e. 30,000 square feet or less of any combination of other uses; or
   f. Fewer than 99 guest rooms, or suites of rooms, in a hotel; or
   g. Fewer than 9,000 seats or 250,000 square feet, whichever is greater, in any arena, stadium, or theater; or
   h. fewer than 250 students in any charter or private school.

3. Projects that require a development permit pursuant to Chapter 20.100 or a Ministerial Approval pursuant to Chapter 20.195 for which an application has been deemed complete by the City pursuant to Government Code Section 65943 or Government Code 65941.1(a) (unless exceptions are triggered per Government Code § 65589.5(o)) prior to the effective date of Part 9 of Chapter 20.90, except for where the project is modified subsequent to the determination of completeness where such modifications would change the use categorization per Table 20-260, or if the project applicant elects to use the standards of this Chapter.

4. Projects where a Planned Development Zoning has been effectuated prior to the approval date of this ordinance.

5. Projects that provide 100% restricted affordable units, excluding unrestricted manager units that are;
   a.
Deed restricted by a public entity for a period not less than 55 years for rental units and 45 years for for-sale units to low-income residents (earning 80 percent or less of the Area Median Income) and;

b. Are developed at a minimum density of 35 DU/AC and;

c. Are located in a High Quality Transit Area

(Ord. 30857.)

20.90.905 - Requirement for transportation demand management plan.

Except for projects exempted in 20.90.900.B, all projects shall submit a "Transportation Demand Management Plan", or "TDM Plan" (defined in section 20.90.050.S) at time of initial application for a development permit or ministerial permit. The development permit or ministerial permit shall not be deemed complete until the TDM Plan is submitted. No development permit or ministerial permit shall be issued that does not meet the requirements of this part.

The point value of the TDM Strategies selected for the TDM Plan shall add up to or exceed the Project's required Point Target. Table 20-255 shows the Point Target range by Project Level and TDM use category. The TDM Program Guidelines describe the Point Target calculation and a menu of qualified TDM Strategies with corresponding point values. The points target calculation shall be determined as part of the development permit approval along with a TDM plan.

(Ord. 30857.)

20.90.910 - Standards.

A. Project Requirements. Throughout the lifetime of the Project, the Project will maintain TDM Strategies, selected from the TDM Program Guidelines, sufficient to achieve the required Point Target per Table 20-255. The lifetime of the Project shall mean until such time as the Project is demolished, or such time as the Project is added to or replaced with a new Project that is subject to the requirements of this Part. The Project shall:

1. Applicants shall execute and record a Covenant and Agreement that runs with the land, that an approved TDM Plan and the TDM Strategies contained therein will be maintained throughout the lifetime of the project. A TDM Plan may be modified at the discretion of the TDM Coordinator pursuant to Section 20.90.910.C. No Building Permit shall be issued to a Project without an approved TDM Plan and recorded Covenant and Agreement.

a. Implement the TDM Strategies in the Project’s approved TDM Plan throughout the lifetime of the Project.

b. The owner of a property, or their designee, that contains a project subject to a TDM Plan pursuant to this Section shall submit annually to the TDM Coordinator a TDM Plan Compliance Documentation that includes:
i. Documentation showing maintenance of the TDM Strategies in the Project’s approved TDM Plan.

ii. Upon five consecutive years of a Project submitting timely TDM Plan Compliance Documentation demonstrating compliance with the TDM Program, the annual TDM Plan Compliance Documentation requirement may be reduced in frequency or waived at the discretion of the TDM Coordinator.

c. In addition to the above, for Level 2 Projects, as pursuant to Table 20-250, the property owner shall submit annually to the TDM Coordinator a TDM Monitoring Report that includes:

i. A travel survey as described in the TDM Program Standards.

ii. Parking data as described in the TDM Program Standards.

iii. Upon five consecutive years of a Project submitting timely TDM Monitoring Reports demonstrating compliance with the TDM Program, the annual TDM Monitoring Report requirement may be reduced in frequency or waived at the discretion of the TDM Coordinator.

d. Level 2 projects shall install available technology to collect ongoing on-site trip count and parking data and submit to the TDM Coordinator no less than once a year. The technology shall be approved by the TDM Coordinator to ensure compatibility with City monitoring methods.

B. Requirement to Reduce Trips for Level 2 Projects. All Level 2 projects are subject to trip reductions pursuant to the requirements of the TDM Program Standards. If the project is not meeting these trip reduction requirements, the TDM coordinator shall require modifications to the TDM plan or the project will be subject to enforcement pursuant to 20.90.920.

C. Project Levels and TDM targets. Requirements are scaled to the size and scope of a Project and have corresponding requirements as defined in Subsection 20.90.910.A. There are two Project Levels as defined in Table 20-250. The Level applied to a Project consisting of an addition or change of use is based on the new floor area or the number of residential units contained in the newly constructed floor area or total floor area subjected to the change of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 20-250: PROJECT LEVEL THRESHOLDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home End Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute End Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit End Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 20-255: PROJECT REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Level</th>
<th>Point Target for HEU/VEU/CEU Uses</th>
<th>Point Target for Other Uses</th>
<th>TDM Plan and Annual TDM Plan Compliance Documentation</th>
<th>TDM Monitoring Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Projects</td>
<td>25 Points</td>
<td>5 Points</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Projects</td>
<td>25 Points</td>
<td>5 Points</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Ord. 30857.)

20.90.912 - TDM plan modifications.

A. TDM Plan Modifications. Any modifications to an approved TDM Plan require submission of a revised TDM Plan for approval. A TDM Plan shall comply with the Transportation Demand Management Program Standards version in effect at the time of submission of the modification, unless otherwise specified by state law, and include TDM Strategies that achieve the property's Point Target.

1. Administrative Permit. An administrative permit, subject to Chapter 20.100, part 10 may be issued to modify an approved TDM plan when the modifications to the TDM plan are only to programmatic TDM strategies that were not specifically conditioned in the development permit.

   a. The administrative permit shall be issued only if the changes to the TDM strategies in the TDM plan will meet or exceed the point target for the existing use at time of submittal of the administrative permit.

2. Development Permit or Permit Amendment. If the modification to the approved TDM Plan is to a TDM strategy that was a condition of approval of the original a project, a new development permit or permit amendment must be submitted to modify the TDM Plan.

3. In all cases, the Covenant and Agreement running with the property shall be updated to reflect the modified TDM plan.

(Ord. 30857.)

20.90.915 - Administration.

A. Content of the TDM Standards chapter in the San José Transportation Analysis Handbook. Upon enactment of this Ordinance, the San José Department of Transportation shall establish, maintain and update the TDM Standards, and other necessary components of the TDM Program outlined in this Section. The TDM Program Standards shall be consistent with the purposes of this Part and each other. The TDM Program Standards shall include the following:

1. TDM Program overview

2. TDM point targets by Project Level and parking supply (see Table 20-257);

3. TDM Strategies and their associated point values;

4. TDM compliance and monitoring reporting requirements; and

5. The technical justification for assigned point values for each TDM strategy.

B. Updates to TDM Program Standards. The TDM Program Standards shall be reviewed and updated periodically, as deemed appropriate by the San José Department of Transportation, to:
1. Provide feasible options to applicants to meet program goals and outcomes; and
2. Reflect best practices, emerging technologies, and/or respond to lessons learned from monitoring and evaluation.
3. Any changes to the TDM Program Standards that are inconsistent with the provisions of this Chapter shall require an amendment to this Chapter in order for said changes to be effective.

C. Effect of Updates on Project Requirements. Projects shall meet all requirements of the TDM Program Standards version in effect at the time when submitting their first TDM Plan at the time the development permit or ministerial permit is deemed complete, including but not limited to the designated Point Target and available TDM Strategies. If the Department of Transportation updates the TDM Program Standards subsequent to the date the applicant submitted a TDM Plan, the applicant may elect to have their Project be subject to all requirements of the current version of the TDM Program Standards by submitting a revised TDM Plan for approval.

D. Parking Supply TDM Point Value. The below table outlines the amount of TDM points a project receives based on its location and parking supply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDM Points</th>
<th>TABLE 20-257 - PARKING SUPPLY TDM POINT VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High-Quality Transit Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-End (space per dwelling unit)</td>
<td>Commute-End/Visit-End (per 1,000 square feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0—0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.76—.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.85—.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.94—1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.03—1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.12—1.20</th>
<th>1.81—2.00</th>
<th>1.77—1.89</th>
<th>2.71—3.00</th>
<th>2.09—2.25</th>
<th>3.21—3.50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.21—1.29</td>
<td>2.01—2.20</td>
<td>1.90—2.02</td>
<td>3.01—3.30</td>
<td>2.26—2.42</td>
<td>3.51—3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.30—1.38</td>
<td>2.21—2.40</td>
<td>2.03—2.15</td>
<td>3.31—3.60</td>
<td>2.43—2.57</td>
<td>3.81—4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.39—1.47</td>
<td>2.41—2.60</td>
<td>2.16—2.28</td>
<td>3.61—3.90</td>
<td>2.58—2.74</td>
<td>4.11—4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.48—1.56</td>
<td>2.61—2.80</td>
<td>2.29—2.41</td>
<td>3.91—4.20</td>
<td>2.75—2.91</td>
<td>4.41—4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.57—1.65</td>
<td>2.81—3.00</td>
<td>2.42—2.54</td>
<td>4.21—4.50</td>
<td>2.92—3.08</td>
<td>4.71—5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.66+</td>
<td>3.01+</td>
<td>2.55+</td>
<td>4.51+</td>
<td>3.09+</td>
<td>5.01+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Note: Table 20-257 does not apply to projects with a TDM Use Category of "OTH."

(Ord. 30857.)

20.90.920 - Compliance and enforcement.

A. The TDM Coordinator shall be responsible for enforcing continual compliance with the requirements of the TDM Program, as outlined below.

1. A property owner shall allow City staff access to relevant portions of the property to conduct site visits, inspect physical improvements, collect empirical data, and/or facilitate phone, and/or digital surveys with residents, tenants, employees, and visitors. City staff shall provide advance notice of request for access.

2. No building, grading, demolition, foundation, use of land or change of use permit, nor Certificate of Occupancy, shall be issued for any building or site that contains a Project that is not in compliance with the requirements of the TDM Program.

3. Failure to maintain one or more TDM Strategies is a violation of this Code.

4. For Level 2 projects, failure to submit the TDM Monitoring Report by December 31st following the designated appropriate deadline of one year from the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy is a violation of this Code.

B. Any violation of this Part shall be punishable by an administrative citation in accordance with the procedures set forth in Chapter 1.15 of Title 1 of this Code relating to the issuance of administrative citations, imposing of administrative fines, right to appeal, and the right to an administrative hearing.
C. The amounts of the fines for violations imposed pursuant to this Part shall be set forth in the schedule of fines established by resolution of the City Council.

D. A violation of this Part is also enforceable through all other civil and administrative remedies available to the City.

(Ord. 30857.)

20.90.925 - User-defined TDM strategy.

A. Alternative Compliance. An applicant may apply for a User-Defined TDM Strategy as an alternative to those contained in the menu of TDM Strategies in the TDM Program Standards. This process shall be incorporated into the initial development permit or ministerial permit. The decision-making authority shall be the official or body designated to approve that development entitlement or ministerial permit. In the case where the applicant elects to replace an approved TDM plan with a user defined TDM strategy and no other development or ministerial permit would be required, the Director of Planning or the Director’s designee, in consultation with the TDM Coordinator, shall have initial decision-making authority to approve a User-Defined TDM Strategy, with an appeal to the City of San José Planning Commission in accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 20.100.220, of this Code. An applicant may request such approval by submitting an application for a "Special Use Permit" as set forth in Section 20.100.800 of this Code.

B. Findings. The Director's determination shall include written findings in support of the decision. In order to grant approval of the User-Defined TDM Strategy, the Director must find that:

1. The proposed alternative is consistent with the purpose and intent of the applicable standards in that the User-Defined TDM Strategy is expected to reduce drive-alone trips and/or VMT to or from the project site; and
2. The proposed alternative is equivalent to or exceeds the effectiveness of meeting the intent of the applicable standards in that the amount of drive-alone trips and/or VMT reduced as a result of the strategy is commensurate with other strategies that are assigned to have the same value of points in the TDM Program Guidelines.

C. Conditions. The Director shall impose conditions binding on the applicant to secure substantial compliance with the goals and purposes of this ordinance, including such conditions as necessary to ensure that:

1. The applicant commits in an enforceable agreement that runs with the land to monitor the effectiveness of the User-Defined TDM Strategy to encourage alternatives to drive-alone trips;
2. The applicant shall submit to the TDM coordinator all monitoring data, with monitoring metrics and frequency to be determined at the discretion of the TDM coordinator; and
3. 
The applicant commits to a substitute strategy of commensurate effectiveness (a strategy assigned equal or more points) if the User-Defined TDM Strategy is terminated for any reason.

(Ord. 30857.)
City of Tulsa
Board of Adjustment
planning@cityoftulsa.org

RE: Case Number: BOA-23667

Dear Board Members:

The purpose of this letter is to ask that you deny the requested parking variance.

I am the owner of 1Architecture and the proposed variance will have a negative impact on my ability to conduct business. My architecture firm did the historic renovation of most of the projects on 6th street between Peoria and Quincy and our office is located immediately adjacent to the proposed project. The historic buildings on 6th street were built to the property lines and do not have any parking. We use the on street parking, and until yesterday our landlord rented the lot behind our office that is a part of the proposed project. Yesterday, the developer filing this variance informed our landlord that we will no longer be allowed to use the lot.

The developer on this project is creating a self-imposed hardship – one that can be easily addressed via planning and design. Our existing business has neither of those options. It is unfair to shift the burden from this development onto the businesses that have been operating in the area for years.

Attached is an overlay of the proposed project boundary scaled on top of the development under construction at 11th & Lewis. As a comparison, the lot at 11th & Lewis is slightly larger (4.37 Acres) and is also an Urban infill site. Per the information on the City’s permit site, this development was able to find a “creative design solution” to fit 256 dwelling units by providing a parking structure with 391 stalls.

Please advocate for better, more community driven solutions.

I respectfully request that you deny the proposed variance and ask the applicant to

Sincerely,

Kevin Hale
PRINCIPAL | OWNER
918.764.9996
1319 E 6th St. Tulsa, OK 74120
April 22, 2024

City of Tulsa
Board of Adjustment
planning@cityoftulsa.org

RE: Case Number: BOA-23667

Dear Board Members:

I would like to respectfully request that you deny the requested parking variance to reduce the required parking ratio for apartment/condo uses in the CH District.

My husband and I own several properties directly abutting the proposed development and two across the street – in total 6 commercial tenants and around 14,000 sf of commercial space. We have been owners in the Pearl District since 2007 and actively involved in its evolution. Over the years, we’ve invested our time and money. We have made decisions that have been not only in our best interest, but in the best interest of the neighborhood. We have collaborated and assisted. We have a lot at risk.

Our properties that will be directly negatively impacted should this variance be approved include: 1319 E 6th St, 1321 E 6th St, 1323 E 6th St, 1302 E 6th St, 1310 E 6th St, and 1316 E 6th St.

If you approve the requested variance, the existing commercial residents will be losing access to over 50 parking spaces that we have paid rent on for years in addition to the spaces he is asking for in his variance (I believe it was around 73?). That is over 125 vehicles that he is asking you to put onto already overtaxed street/park parking.

We are already operating under less-than-ideal circumstances in this small commercial enclave regarding parking. Please do not make an already difficult situation worse by adding to our burden. The reduction in public parking that this project as shown would bring about creates a very real and imminent threat to our businesses.

What would this district be worth if our commercial enterprises are forced to go somewhere else – or worse close altogether?

Again, please do not make this already difficult situation worse. Please deny the requested parking variance.

Sincerely,

Rachel Navarro
Live Well Properties LLC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. S. Jason Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td>651 S. Quarter Ave.</td>
<td>5/1/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carle McMahon</td>
<td></td>
<td>510 S. Quincy Ave</td>
<td>5-1-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. E. F. fo eton</td>
<td></td>
<td>1315/1317 E. 4th St</td>
<td>5-2-2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Whitney Chapman</td>
<td></td>
<td>573 S. Peoria Ave</td>
<td>5-2-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Scott Marr</td>
<td></td>
<td>510 S. Rockford Ave</td>
<td>5-2-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. James Speegle</td>
<td></td>
<td>418 S. Peoria Ave</td>
<td>5-2-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Nathan Garrett</td>
<td></td>
<td>624 S. Peoria Ave</td>
<td>5-6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Leo Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>507 S. Peoria Ave</td>
<td>5-6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stephen Scatt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1302 E. 3rd St / 1324 E. 3rd St</td>
<td>5-6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Thomas Regan</td>
<td></td>
<td>416 S. Ulica Ave / 1313-15 E. 3rd Street</td>
<td>5-6-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jeff Clay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1433 E 6th St.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tim Dyer</td>
<td></td>
<td>515 S Peoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6th & Peoria Multi-Family Development
Letter of Petition – BOA-23667

I am writing to the City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment to express my support for the proposed multi-family development located at the southeast corner of East 5th Place and South Peoria Avenue. The proposed development will address housing needs in the area that would be supported by and support local businesses and amenities located in proximity to this site. Residential housing would revitalize the area, attracting new investment, breathing new life into an underutilized part of town. In addition, an existing network of bike lanes, sidewalks, and public transit offer an ideal environment for the addition of residential development.

The property owner has met with neighboring property owners to satisfy and alleviate concerns regarding the proposed development and we are in support of the proposed project before the City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment.

[SIGNATURE SHEET NEXT PAGE]
### Owner and Applicant Information
**Applicant:** Mark D. Crowl  
**Property Owner:** Black Pearl Enterprises, LLC

### Property Location
2304 E. 4th Pl.  
Tract Size: ±.2 acres

### Location within the City of Tulsa
*shown with City Council districts*

### Elected Representatives
**City Council:** District 1, Vanessa Hall-Harper.  
**County Commission:** District 2, Karen Keith.

### Public Notice Required
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance  
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance  
Posted Sign – min. 10 days in advance

### Request Summary
Special exception to permit a duplex in the RS-4 district  
(Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5).

### Zoning
**Zoning District:** RS-4  
**Zoning Overlays:** N/A

### Comprehensive Plan Considerations
**Land Use**  
**Land Use Plan:** Neighborhood  
**Small Area Plans:** Kendall-Whittier  
**Development Era:** Streetcar

**Transportation**  
**Major Street & Highway Plan:** N/A  
**planitulsa Street Type:** N/A  
**Transit:** N/A  
**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** None  
**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** Tulsa GO Plan recommends an on-street bike lane on Lewis Ave.

### Environment
**Flood Area:** N/A  
**Tree Canopy Coverage:** 10-20%  
**Parks & Open Space:** Kendall-Whittier Park is nearby.

---

**Case History:**  
05/14/2024: Item continued to present alternative site designs.
**Staff Analysis**
The applicant is requesting a special exception to permit a duplex in the RS-4 district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5).

**Relevant Case History**
- None.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. **Neighborhoods** are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are within the Kendall-Whittier Small Area Plan.

**Development Era**
The subject property is in an area developed during the Streetcar Era (1910s-30s), prior to the proliferation of automobiles, when streetcars facilitated growth beyond downtown. Land uses range from fully integrated to somewhat separated, on a half-mile grid, with a mix of housing options. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, commercial districts, and well-designed streetscapes.

**Transportation**

**Major Street & Highway Plan:** N/A

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** N/A

**Transit:** N/A

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** None.

**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** There is an on-street bike lane recommended in the Tulsa GO Plan on Lewis Ave.

**Arterial Traffic per Lane:** 2,683 vehicles per lane per day on Lewis Ave.
Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: The subject property is not in a flood area.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 12%. Preserving the limited existing canopy should be encouraged, as well as measures to increase the canopy through landscaping. Street-lining trees in particular should be encouraged to spread the benefit of the tree canopy to the pedestrian realm.

Parks & Open Space: Kendall-Whittier Park is nearby.

Sample Motion
I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to permit a duplex use in a RS-4 District,

• per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description
Lot 8, Block 2, Hillcrest addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map

Subject property from E. 4th. Pl. (Image used from Google Street view)
Hello Neighbor!

You’re receiving this flyer due to your residence being located in the same, immediate neighborhood vicinity as the vacant lot on the corner of 4th Pl. & Gillette Ave. and as part of a neighborhood outreach plan conducted by the current lot owners - Black Pearl Enterprises.

Black Pearl Enterprises is owned entirely by two long time Tulsa natives, Mark and Eric. These local partners have been working with the Tulsa Planning Office in preparation for submitting a Special Exception request to construct a duplex on the aforementioned vacant property, formally addressed as 2304 E. 4th Pl. Tulsa, OK 74104.

Given the development would constitute a change from its current, vacant state, we wanted to notify all residents in the local area of our plans to build this duplex, listen to any feedback local residents may have, and attempt to address concerns in advance of the approval process.

Please see the depictions below for the preliminary site plan we intend to construct. If you have any issue with our duplex plans or would simply like to ask some questions about the property, please reach out to crowlholdings@gmail.com with any comments or concerns.

We look forward to your feedback and to joining this vibrant community!

- Increases overall visual appeal of the neighborhood
- Develops a previously vacant lot, increasing property value
- Supports the healthy growth and development of Kendall Whittier

- Provides quality, affordable, housing option to the neighborhood
- Fits the Vision Statement of the Kendall-Whittier Sector Plan
- Overall design to match “cottage” style architecture of the neighborhood
Neighborhood Outreach Summary

Black Pearl Enterprises, LLC (BPE) has taken the neighborhood outreach and community engagement piece of the Special Exception permitting & application process extremely seriously. On Monday, February 26th, 2024, representatives from BPE went door to door, dropping off informative flyers to all properties in the immediate neighborhood. These flyers were delivered to each residence on both sides of S. Gillette Ave, E. 4th St, E. 4th Pl, E. 5th St, and E. 5th Pl. A Contact email address was provided, where neighbors could reach out with any questions, concerns, or suggestions about the development, but no email correspondence was received, indicating little to no opposition to our duplex project.

Additionally, BPE conducted an “Open House” on 3/2/24, where representatives spent the day passing out flyers, speaking to neighbors, and giving interested locals updates about the project. Locally brewed coffee, soft drinks, muffins, and cookies were provided to those that stopped by. The Open House was a resounding success, and our duplex project was extremely well received by homeowners in the immediate area. Forging personal relationships with the neighborhood is a cornerstone of our development and an aspect of the approval process we will continue to prioritize. A log of the interactions from the Open House can be found below:

- Two homeowners, one from 436 S. Gillette Ave and another from 2307 E. 4th Pl. stopped by to learn about the project, we spoke for about 30 minutes to provide plans and got to know the history of the neighborhood. No concerns were expressed and a general sense of support was provided
- Amberto, a local who’s address is unknown, stopped by and grabbed a muffin and some coffee. We spoke about our plans and he was excited to see an empty lot get developed
- The homeowner from 2303 E. 4th Pl. came by and grabbed a Mountain Dew and cookie. This individual lives directly across the street from our lot and was excited to see the lot getting interest in a way that fits with the neighborhood
- A lovely lady three houses down, who owns the property at 2312 E. 4th Pl. came by the Open House for a Diet Coke and cookie. We spoke for about 30 minutes on the history of the neighborhood, and she appreciated our outreach efforts. A general sense of support for our development was discussed and provided
- Around 1pm, a neighbor came by to ask about our plans for the current trees on the lot. We informed the neighbor that we plan to keep all that we can during the construction process. He has a need for a tree in his front yard, and we informed him that he could take and transplant any tree that he wanted at his convenience
- An individual from 429 S. Gillette Ave came by and expressed strong support for the project, offered to help however he can, and was excited to see the lot improved

Copies of the information flyer and Pictures from the Open House were provided along with our application. BPE looks forward to remaining an engaged member of the Kendall Whittier community for years to come!
### Owner and Applicant Information

**Applicant:** Raul Cisneros  
**Property Owner:** Jose Gomez

### Property Location

2809 E. 81st Pl.  
Tract Size: ±.3 acres

### Location within the City of Tulsa

(Shown with City Council districts)

![City Council Districts Map](image)

### Elected Representatives

**City Council:** District 2, Jeannie Cue.  
**County Commission:** District 3, Kelly Dunkerley.

### Request Summary

Special Exception to permit duplexes in the RS-5 district  
(Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5)

### Zoning

**Zoning District:** RS-5  
**Zoning Overlays:** N/A

### Comprehensive Plan Considerations

#### Land Use

**Land Use Plan:** Neighborhood  
**Small Area Plans:** None  
**Development Era:** Late Automobile

#### Transportation

**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Multimodal Corridor  
**planitulsa Street Type:** Multimodal Corridor  
**Transit:** N/A  
**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** None  
**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** On-street bike corridor is recommended on 81st St by the Tulsa GO Plan.

#### Environment

**Flood Area:** N/A  
**Tree Canopy Coverage:** 0-10%  
**Parks & Open Space:** ORU campus is nearby.
Staff Analysis

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to permit duplexes in the RS-5 district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5). The request is to allow 2 duplexes for a total of 4 units.

Relevant Case History
- Z-7742, Oct 18, 2023, Property was re-zoned from RS-3 to RS-5.

Comprehensive Plan Considerations

Land Use Plan
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>MPD-4</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-5</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans
The subject properties are not in a small area plan.

Development Era
The subject property is in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking, community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: Multimodal Corridor.

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: Multimodal Corridor.

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None.

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: On-street bike corridor is recommended on 81st St by the Tulsa GO Plan.

Arterial Traffic per Lane: 4,612 vehicles per lane per day on E. 81st St.
Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: The subject property is not in a flood area.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 10%. Preserving the limited existing canopy should be encouraged, as well as measures to increase the canopy through landscaping. Street-lining trees in particular should be encouraged to spread the benefit of the tree canopy to the pedestrian realm.

Parks & Open Space: ORU campus is nearby.

Sample Motion
I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to permit a duplex use in a RS-5 District,

• per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description
Lot 2 Block 1, Southwood Terrace Resub Prt ORU Hgts 3rd, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
CITY OF TULSA
CORRECTIONS SUMMARY

BLDR-170633-2024 (2809 E 81ST PL S Unit_B Tulsa, OK 74137)
Markup Summary #1

Note (1)

Subject: Note
Page Label: 4
Author: Roberto
Date: 2/6/2024 2:32:32 PM
Status:
Color: ■
Layer:
Space:
R106.1.1 Information on construction documents. Construction documents shall be of sufficient clarity to indicate the location, nature and extent of the work proposed and show in detail that it will conform to the provisions of this code and relevant laws, ordinances, rules and regulations, as determined by the building official.
Review comment: Wall Section Detail 1/A6 is missing. Please provide this information to enable review.

WSD Comment (5)

Subject: WSD Comment
Page Label: 2
Author: James Henley
Date: 1/18/2024 1:59:04 PM
Status:
Color: ■
Layer:
Space: Site plan shows lot width of 47.5ft. Lot 2 Blk 1 is 95ft wide and the parcel number associated with it has already been issued permits for a duplex at 2811 E 81st Pl. Only one primary structure is allowed per lot. If you have split these lots, provide the approved lot split with the new parcel #. If not, you will need to apply for and provide an approved lot split.

Subject: WSD Comment
Page Label: 2
Author: James Henley
Date: 1/18/2024 2:26:11 PM
Status:
Color: ■
Layer:
Space: Drainage:
This lot has an elevation drop of 12ft from the Southwest corner to the Northeast corner of the lot and has an existing storm inlet in the Northeast corner. How are you flowing drainage uphill to the street and why would you change an existing drainage course that goes directly to an existing storm inlet? Please explain.

Subject: WSD Comment
Page Label: 2
Author: James Henley
Date: 1/18/2024 1:59:19 PM
Status:
Color: ■
Layer:
Space: Is fill being brought in? How much?
Revise with finished floor elevation.
Revise with pre and post elevations for the entire lot.

This constitutes a Plan Review to date in response to the information submitted with and after 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 client. Any code items not reviewed are still in force, and it shall be the responsibility of the owner and design professional(s) to ensure that all code requirements are satisfied.
CITY OF TULSA
CORRECTIONS SUMMARY

Subject: WSD Comment
Page Label: 2
Author: James Henley
Date: 1/18/2024 1:59:21 PM
Status: 
Color: 
Layer: 
Space: 

The curb is uphill from the proposed construction location. How are you preventing drainage from flowing down the drive and into the garage?

Subject: WSD Comment
Page Label: 2
Author: James Henley
Date: 1/18/2024 1:59:28 PM
Status: 
Color: 
Layer: 
Space: 

Revise to show storm inlet at the North property line. Storm inlet must have erosion control as well.

Zoning Review (1)

Subject: Zoning Review
Page Label: 2
Author: DWhiteman
Date: 2/5/2024 2:46:33 PM
Status: 
Color: 
Layer: 
Space: 

It appears that this property is in the process of being rezoned. The zoning review cannot be approved until that process is complete. After rezoning, you will then need to apply for a lot split. Finally, if both the rezoning and lot split are approved, please submit approval paperwork for both as revised plans. The county clerk’s recording stamp must be on the lot split documentation. The zoning review will resume at that point. If this is rezoned RS, a special exception will be required to place a duplex on an RS zoned lot.

This constitutes a Plan Review to date in response to the information submitted with and after 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 client. Any code items not reviewed are still in force, and it shall be the responsibility of the owner and design professional(s) to ensure that all code requirements are satisfied.
Proposed Lot split duplex to place on each proposed tract

REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR'S EXHIBIT

FOR: RCI DESIGNS
INVOICE NO: 20383

PARENT TRACTS (AS PROVIDED):
LOT TWO (2), BLOCK ONE (1), SOUTHWOOD TERRACE, A RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCK ONE (1), ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS 3RD ADDITION, A SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NE/4) OF SECTION SEVENTEEN (17), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

TRACT A:
THE EAST HALF OF LOT TWO (2), BLOCK ONE (1), SOUTHWOOD TERRACE, A RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCK ONE (1), ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS 3RD ADDITION, A SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NE/4) OF SECTION SEVENTEEN (17), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

TRACT B:
LOT TWO (2), BLOCK ONE (1), SOUTHWOOD TERRACE, A RESUBDIVISION OF BLOCK ONE (1), ORAL ROBERTS UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS 3RD ADDITION, A SUBDIVISION OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF THE NORTH HALF (N/2) OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NE/4) OF SECTION SEVENTEEN (17), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

THAT THIS IS NOT A LAND OR EXISTING SURVEY PLAT, AND THAT THIS EXHIBIT IS NOT TO BE RELIABLE UPON FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FENCE, BUILDING OR OTHER FUTURE IMPROVEMENT LINES. LINES IF ANY, ARE FOR REFERENCE ONLY, ACTUAL LOCATIONS REQUIRE A BOUNDARY SURVEY. NO EFFORT HAS BEEN MADE TO SEARCH THE RECORDS OF THE COUNTY CLERKS OR OTHER GOVERNMENT OFFICE. ANY EXISTENCE OR RIGHTS OF WAY SHOWN OR NOTED IS PER SUBMISSION PLAT OR AS SPECIFICALLY PROVIDED BY THE CLIENT TO THE UNDERSIGNED.
Staff Report
Special Exception

Hearing Date: May 14, 2024
Prepared by: Austin Chapman
achapman@cityoftulsa.org
918-596-7597

Owner and Applicant Information
Applicant: Marth Gibson
Property Owner: Viper on Construction

Property Location
2427 E. 27th St. N.
Tract Size: 7,000 square feet

Location within the City of Tulsa
(shown with City Council districts)

Elected Representatives
City Council: District 1, Vanessa Hall Harper
County Commission: District 1, Stan Salee

Public Notice Required
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
Posted Sign – min. 10 days in advance

Request Summary
Special Exception to permit a Manufactured Housing Unit in the RS-3 zoning district (Sec. 5.020, Table 5-2.5); Special Exception to extend the 1-year limit for a Manufactured Housing Unit (Sec. 40.210-A)

Zoning
Zoning District: RS-3
Zoning Overlays: None.

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use
Land Use Plan: Neighborhood
Small Area Plans: None
Development Era: Early Automobile

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: Unclassified
planitulsa Street Type: None.
Transit: Regular Route
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None.
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None.

Environment
Flood Area: None.
Tree Canopy Coverage: 0-10%
Parks & Open Space: N/A
**Staff Analysis**
The applicant is proposing to rehabilitate a 1993 Manufactured Housing unit to be placed on the subject property. The applicant is requesting the Board extend the 1 year time limit for a manufactured housing unit to be allowed permanently.

**Relevant Case History**
- None.

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are "Mostly Residential Uses" which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low-intensity uses that support residents' daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off of an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access off of a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Detached House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are not included in a small area plan.

**Development Era**
The subject property is located in an area developed during the early Automobile Era. As automobile use began to supplant the use of streetcars in cities across the country, the pattern of urban development changed. From the time of the Great Depression, through World War 2, and prior to the development of the Interstate Highway System, Tulsa’s land use pattern became more centered around the mile-by-mile grid of major streets that follows the boundaries of the township and range system. During this time period, Tulsa saw some of the fastest growth that has occurred in the city’s history, consistent with population growth across the United States. Detached house neighborhoods with a variety of architectural styles proliferated through the area, and a relatively low level of redevelopment has occurred over time as compared to the Downtown Era and the Streetcar Era.

**Transportation**

**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Not classified.

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** None.

**Transit:** Regular Service routes on N. Lewis.

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** None.

**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** None.

**Arterial Traffic per Lane:**
Arterial Traffic - North (E 36th St N - 2,477 Vehicles per Lane)
Arterial Traffic - East (N Harvard Ave - 1,712 Vehicles per Lane)
Arterial Traffic - South (E Apache St - 2,138 Vehicles per Lane)
Arterial Traffic - West (N Lewis Ave - 1,836 Vehicles per Lane)

Environmental Considerations

Flood Area: The subject property are not in a flood area.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 10%. The area would benefit from additional trees, which also capture and treat runoff before it enters the river.

Parks & Open Space: None.

Site Photos

Subject property in BOA-23692 (Image used from Google Street View)
Sample Motion
I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to permit a Manufactured Housing Unit in the RS-3 zoning district (Sec. 5.020, Table 5-2.5); Special Exception to extend the 1-year limit for a Manufactured Housing Unit (Sec. 40.210-A)

- per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description
Lot 10 Block 5, The Ben C Franklin Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Subject Tract

BOA-23692

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: 2021
STATE OF OKLAHOMA

VEHICLE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
55670820179100

YEAR
1993

MAKE
PRTKMP

TITLE NO.
810000406507

DATE 1ST SOLD
6/1/2015

DATE ISSUED

ODOMETER
Exempt

TYPE OF TITLE
Duplicate

DATE INS.

LOSS OR SALVAGE

NAME AND ADDRESS OF VEHICLE OWNER
DANIELS & DANIELS CONSTRUCTION, INC
3501 W KENOSHA ST
BROKEN ARROW OK 74012-8948

THIS VEHICLE IS SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING LIEN(S):

It is hereby certified that according to the records of the Oklahoma Tax Commission, the person named herein is the owner of the vehicle described above which is subject to a lien(s) as shown; however, the vehicle may be subject to other liens or security interests.

CONTROL NO.
41302043
(This is not a title number)

ASSIGNMENT OF TITLE BY REGISTERED OWNER

I/we hereby assign and warrants ownership of the vehicle described on this certificate to the following, subject only to the liens or encumbrances, if any, properly noted on this certificate.

Purchaser(s) Name (Type or Print):
Salvador Velasquez

Purchaser(s) Complete Address:
4700 Rain Ave. Muskogee, OK

Actual Purchase Price of Vehicle:
$1,000

I certify to the best of my knowledge that the ODOMETER READING reflected on the vehicle’s odometer and listed below is the ACTUAL MILEAGE of the vehicle UNLESS one of the accompanying statements is checked:

[ ] 1. The odometer has exceeded its mechanical limits.
[ ] 2. The odometer reading is NOT the actual mileage. Warning — Odometer Discrepancy

Signature of Seller(s):
[Signature]

Printed Name of Seller(s):
[Printed Name]

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 7 Day of FEBRUARY 2019

Notary Public:
[Seal]

Commission Expiration: 12/14/2019

Signature of Buyer(s):
[Signature]

Printed Name of Buyer(s):
[Printed Name]

KATHLEEN A. SCHROEDER
Notary Public State of Oklahoma
Commission No. 15021725
Commission Expires December 15, 2019
The commercial trailer or mobile home

Vehicle identification number: 55670820179100
Year 1993

Exterior description
Metallic trailer mobile home 12 ft x 60 ft
Central air conditioner

Interior descriptions
Two bedrooms 12ft x 12ft
One completed bathroom 8ft x 5ft with shower, toilet, sink
Drain pipe in the missing kitchen
Electrical cables all trailer

Was a commercial trailer mobile hose

We buy for remodeling and put the kitchen and new bathroom and doors and replaced any window needed change the floors, new carpet y bedrooms.
Subject: Zoning Review  
Page Label: 1  
Author: DWhiteman  
Date: 3/27/2024 1:21:29 PM  
Color:  

Section 5.020-G Use Regulations - Residential Building Types. Residential uses allowed in R districts must be located in residential buildings. Descriptions of the residential building types and references to applicable regulations are found in Section 35.010. The following residential building types are allowed in R districts. 

REVIEW COMMENT: Manufactured Housing Units are only allowed on an RS-3 zoned lot by Special Exception. Apply to the Board of Adjustment for a special exception to allow a Manufactured Housing Unit on an RS-3 zoned lot. Contact the Tulsa Planning Office at 918-584-7526 for Board of Adjustment schedules procedures.
Residential Drive Radius

The proposed driveway approach does not meet the minimum radius standard of 5 feet. Please provide plans indicating the proposed driveway radius will meet the minimum standard as prescribed within the COT Standard Drawings (Standard No. 701-704). COT Standards can be found here: https://www.cityoftulsa.org/government/departments/engineering-services/specifications-checklists-and-details/standard-details-8-x-11/

Revise site plan to show location of AC equipment pad.

35.010-H Manufactured Housing Unit. A manufactured housing unit is a principal residential building that complies with the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. §5401, et seq.). Manufactured housing units are subject to the same regulations that apply to detached houses, except as modified by supplemental regulations of Section 40.210.

REVIEW COMMENT: Provide documentation indicating the date of manufacture for this manufactured housing unit.

This constitutes a Plan Review to date in response to the information submitted with and after 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 client. Any code items not reviewed are still in force, and it shall be the responsibility of the owner and design professional(s) to ensure that all code requirements are satisfied.
CORRECTIONS SUMMARY

BLDR-175259-2024 (2427 E 27TH ST N Tulsa Tulsa, OK 74110)
Markup Summary #1

Note (5)

Subject: Note
Page Label: 1
Author: James Henley
Date: 3/14/2024 3:37:19 PM
Color: 
Submitted two different site plans with different measurements.
Submit ONE site plan for review. Do not submit multiple plans with different measurements/proposed building locations. We have no idea which one to review or which one you're proposing for construction.

Subject: Note
Page Label: 1
Author: James Henley
Date: 3/14/2024 3:38:18 PM
Color: 
Erosion Control:
All developments shall be designed, constructed, and completed in a manner which minimizes the exposure of bare earth to precipitation.
Revise site plan to show an Erosion Control Plan containing detailed location of all silt fence and other erosion and sedimentation control methods to be used during construction per City of Tulsa Standard 126. COT Standards may be found here: https://www.cityoftulsa.org/government/departments/public-works/engineering-services/specifications-checklists-and-details/standard-details-22-x-34/

Subject: Note
Page Label: 1
Author: James Henley
Date: 3/14/2024 3:38:25 PM
Color: 
Drainage:
Revise site plan with a drainage plan that clearly shows how overland drainage will be conveyed to the street or public storm system. Show how the proposed structure affects overland drainage. Use arrows to indicate flow direction.

This constitutes a Plan Review to date in response to the information submitted with and after 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 client. Any code items not reviewed are still in force, and it shall be the responsibility of the owner and design professional(s) to ensure that all code requirements are satisfied.
5/7/2024

City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment
175 E. 2nd Street
Suite 480
Tulsa, OK 74103

Re: Case Number BOA-23692

Dear Board Members,

I am writing to express my deep displeasure regarding the potential special exception to permit a manufactured housing unit in an RS-three zoning district next door to my property located at 2417 E. 27th Street North.

As a property owner in this neighborhood, I am concerned about the impact that this decision will have on the aesthetic appeal and property values of the community. Manufactured housing units are not in line with the character of the neighborhood, which is comprised primarily of single-family homes. Allowing this exception sets a dangerous precedent and could potentially lead to a further degradation of the neighborhood.

Furthermore, I am worried about the potential safety hazards that a manufactured housing unit could pose. These units are often of lower quality and may not meet the same building standards as traditional homes. Allowing such a unit to be placed next to my property raises concerns about fire risks, structural integrity, and overall safety.

I urge the City of Tulsa to deny the special exception. It is essential to uphold zoning regulations that are in place to protect the integrity of our neighborhood and ensure that it remains a desirable place to live for all residents.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns. I look forward to hearing from you regarding this matter.

Yours Truly,

[Signature]

Nathan Chapman
Owner, Charles Haskell LLC
Staff Report
Special Exception BOA-23695

Hearing Date: May 28, 2024
Prepared by: Sean Wallace
swallace@cityoftulsa.org
918-596-7585

Owner and Applicant Information
Applicant: Sandra Caballero
Property Owner: Jaime Luevanos & Sandra Cabellero

Property Location
15009 E. 39th Pl.
Tract Size: ±.2 acres

Location within the City of Tulsa
(shown with City Council districts)

Elected Representatives
City Council: District 6, Christian Bengel
County Commission: District 1, Stan Sallee

Public Notice Required
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
Posted Sign – min. 10 days in advance

Request Summary
Special Exception to allow a Type 2 Home Occupation in an
RS-3 District to permit a Nail Salon (Sec. 45.100).

Zoning
Zoning District: RS-3
Zoning Overlays: None

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use
Land Use Plan: Neighborhood
Small Area Plans: None
Development Era: Late Automobile

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A
planitulsa Street Type: N/A
Transit: N/A
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Environment
Flood Area: N/A
Tree Canopy Coverage: 30-50%
Parks & Open Space: There is natural/undeveloped land
nearby.
Staff Analysis
The applicant is requesting a special exception to open a nail salon in the residence.

Relevant Case History
• None

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use Plan
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents' daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-4</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans
The subject property is not within a small area plan.

Development Era
The subject property is in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking,
community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Arterial Traffic per Lane: 3,811 vehicles per lane per day on E. 41st St.

**Environmental Considerations**

Flood Area: The subject property is not in a flood zone.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 48%. Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

Parks & Open Space: There is a lot of natural/undeveloped land nearby.

**Sample Motion**

I move to **approve or deny** a Special Exception to permit a Type 2 Home Occupation in an RS-3 District for a Nail Salon (Sec. 45.100),

- per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description**

Lot 2 Block 2, Battle Creek Park Phase II, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

**Exhibits**

Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: 2021

Subject Tract

BOA-23695
Note (1)

Sec. 45.100-G Where Allowed  2. Type 2 Home Occupations
Type 2 home occupations may be approved as an accessory use to a principal use in the household living use category through the special exception procedures of Section 70.120. Type 2 home occupations are subject to the general regulations of 45.100-H and the supplemental regulations of 45.100-J.
Review Comments: Provide a Special Exception reviewed and approved by the Board of Adjus: rent.
Contact the Tulsa Planning Office to make an appointment to get on the meeting schedule.
918-596-7526.
Dear neighbor:

My name is Sandra Caballero and I am your neighbor. My house number is 15009 here on 39th Pl. I am in the process of acquiring my own business as a nail technician which will be held at my residence. I am respectfully requesting that you can confirm that you have no issues with me operating my business from my home. I can assure you that I'll be taking care of clients on appointment bases, therefore, there should be no issues with noise in the area or they would not be taking up any parking spots on the streets either.

Thank you for your understanding and support.

Respectfully,
Sandra Caballero.

Karyanie Diaz - Karyanie1659 #3958
Sandy Longbrake #3959

Ruby Lopez #15015
Walters Tianjong #15021
Staff Report
Variance BOA-23696
Hearing Date: May 28, 2024
Prepared by: Sean Wallace
swallace@cityoftulsa.org
918-596-7585

Owner and Applicant Information
Applicant: David Valderrama, Valderrama Homes LLC
Property Owner: John and Rebecca Abraham Trust

Property Location
1602 N. Denver Ave.
Tract Size: ± .20 acres

Location within the City of Tulsa
(shown with City Council districts)

Request Summary
Variance to reduce the 20-foot setback for a street facing garage door on a corner lot (Sec. 80.020-B).

Zoning
Zoning District: RS-3
Zoning Overlays: HNO

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use
Land Use Plan: Neighborhood
Small Area Plans: None
Development Era: Early Automobile

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A
planitulsa Street Type: N/A
Transit: N/A
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks on N Denver
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Environment
Flood Area: N/A
Tree Canopy Coverage: 10-20%
Parks & Open Space: John Starks Park is one block to the east.

Elected Representatives
City Council: District 1, Vanessa Hall-Harper
County Commission: District 1, Stan Sallee

Public Notice Required
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
Staff Analysis
The applicant is requesting a Variance to reduce the 20-foot setback for a street facing garage door on a corner lot (Sec. 80.020-B). The lot is nonconforming due to lot width. The Board previously approved reducing the setback to 9.5 feet; but the applicant is now requesting it be reduced to 7 feet.

Relevant Case History
- BOA-23657, March 26, 2024, the Board approved a variance to reduce the 20-foot setback for a street facing garage door on a corner lot (Sec. 80.020-B).

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use Plan
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3 &amp; HNO</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3 &amp; HNO</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3 &amp; HNO</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-3 &amp; HNO</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans
The subject property is not within a small area plan.
Development Era
The subject property is in an area developed during the Early Automobile Era (1930s-50s), which retained a high degree of the connectivity from neighborhood streets to the arterial network, with mostly commercial, office, industrial, and other active uses along major streets and a mix of housing options and neighborhood-based uses like schools, churches, and libraries in the interior sections. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, commercial revitalization, compatibility of scale for neighborhood development, and transitions between commercial corridors and residential areas.

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: N/A

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks on N Denver.

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Arterial Traffic per Lane: N/A

Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: The subject property is not in a flood area.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 10-20%. Preserving the limited existing canopy should be encouraged, as well as measures to increase the canopy through landscaping. Street-lining trees in particular should be encouraged to spread the benefit of the tree canopy to the pedestrian realm.

Parks & Open Space: N/A John Starks Park is one block to the east.
**Sample Motion**

I move to **approve or deny** a Variance to reduce the 20-foot setback for a street facing garage door on a corner lot (Sec. 80.020-B).

- per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ of the agenda packet.
- subject to the following conditions (including time limitation, if any): ________________________________.

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.

**Property Description**

LT 12 BLK 4, THE MORLEY ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

**Exhibits**

Case map  
Aerial (small scale)  
Aerial (large scale)  
Photos  
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Land Use Plan Categories

- Arkansas River Corridor
- Downtown
- Employment
- Local Center
- Multiple Use
- Neighborhood
- Park and Open Space
- Regional Center
All penetrations will be spray-foamed with fire grade foam where fire blocking is necessary and to control air tightness. Fasteners per local code for all framed areas.

All rafters will be fastened to 2x12 plates around the perimeter of the ceiling joints with structural lags rather than hurricane ties, as well as all ceiling joints.

Sill plates will have foam barrier between plate and foundation. Additionally, exterior sill plates will be caulked with Quadt Max where the bottom of the plate meets the slab. Caulk will fill the exterior gap throughout.

2x12 headers above garage doors and the entry door. 6, 15" structural lags will be driven through the garage door columns and into the garage door headers, on each end of the headers.

1/2" anchors will fasten the sill plates to the foundation at least every four linear feet.

Simpson 14" Garage strap tie hold downs, two on each side of every garage door. Because the south wall, where the garage doors will be, will have little structure, we will build up those wall columns, and web set those hold downs when pouring the slab, and fasten them to the columns when framing.

Sherwin Williams Duratow paint will be used for exterior and interior. All areas will first be primed with Zinsser Bulls Eye primer. One color of paint for both interior and exterior surfaces.

Covered Patio Roof Attachment:
Location: North end of the garage
Size: 12' x 24' with a 10" overhang
Roof Type: 6/12 gable

Structural Details:
Posts: 6x8x8 rough sawn cedar on the North corners, 6x6x8 everywhere else
Beams: 6x3.5x3.5 rough sawn cedar
Post Fails: Minimum 24" diameter, 30" deep, five total, with #4 rebar
Rebar Design: Four vertical sticks forming a square with a 90-degree bend extending 5" out and a 135-degree hook, tied with three horizontal rows
Rebar Placement: 3" from bottom and wall of hole, bends into patio slab (see detail 4 on A06)

Concrete Slab:
Dimensions: 12' 4" x 24' 8" (extends 4" past posts)
Thickness: 5"
Placement: Extends 12' 4" from the north garage wall, centered with the garage

Finishing Details:
Fascia & Soffit: Matching garage
Sheathing: 1/2" Zip System
Shingles: Matching garage, with synthetic underlayment
Lighting: Six 6" dimmable can lights in pine tongue and groove

Hardware:
Rafter-to-Beam Attachment: Simpson A282Z 2" x 1 3/8 Angle
Patio Roof-to-Wall Attachment: 3/8" x 6" Spax structural lags
(Studs in the gable will be doubled up to provide extra grip for the Spax lags in addition to the extra structural support for the roof)
Post Mounts: 8" wedge anchors

Additional Requirements:
Silt Fence: Around garage and covered patio area
Silt Slope: Not less than 5" from North property line

Property Measurements:
From center of Queens to front of garage (brick location): 36.5 feet
From west side of house to aaroea brick: 6.5 feet

Garage Floor Plan
3/8" = 1'
Asphalt Shingles

1/2" Zip System - seams taped with synthetic underlayment

2x6 Rafter @ 16" OC - Spax Lags fasten every rafter to the 2x10s - 6:12 Pitch

16" Rim-Joist

2x6 Sub-Fascia

2x4 soffit ledger

1x8 Cedar Fascia

2x4 Soffit Bearer @ 16" OC

Hardie Soffit with vent (NO VENTS ON EAST SIDE FACING THE EXISTING STRUCTURE - per Fire Code)

2x6 Top Plates

Hardie Plank Cladding

7/16" Zip System Sheathing - seams taped

R-3 1/2" Foam Board Insulation - seams taped

4" 1-1/8" 2x6 Stud Wall @ 16" OC with Quad Max Caulking in exterior gaps throughout

2x6 Pressure Treated Sill Plate with Sill Seal Foam and Quad Max Caulking throughout

Fire Blocking between every rafter

2x10 Plate around perimeter of attic

16" Blue Line I-Joist with R-30 Mineral Wool Batt insulation @ 16" OC

5/8" Type X Drywall on ceiling

5/8" Type X Drywall on all exterior walls

R-23 Mineral Wool Batt insulation

Hot Shot Bug Repellant to be poured in every stud bay

1/2" Concrete Wedge Anchor & 48° OC

#4 Rebar Grid @ 24" OC

5" Concrete Slab with fiber reinforcement and 15-mil vapor barrier

#5 Rebar Sheer Reinforcement @ 24" OC

#5 Rebar Open Loop Stirrup @ 60" OC

Four (4) #5 Rebar to run throughout footing

min 18" x 18" 3,500 PSI Concrete Footing with fiber reinforcement

Main Wall Detail

Scale: 1" = 1'
Post Pad Perspective

*not to scale

- #4 Rebar Grid @ 24" OC
- 5" Concrete Slab with fiber reinforcement and 15-mil vapor barrier
- Four (4) #4 Rebar Shear Reinforcement - min 3" from edge of concrete
- Three (3) #4 Rebar Open Loop Stirrup
- min 24" x 30" 3,800 PSI Concrete Post Pad with fiber reinforcement

Asphalt Shingles
1/2" Zip System - seams taped with synthetic underlayment
2x6 Rafter @ 16" OC with SST A232 Angle - 6:12 Pitch
1x8 Cedar Fascia
2x6 Sub-Fascia
2x4 soffit ledger
2x4 Soffit Bearer @ 16" OC
Hardie Soffit - no vent
6" Rough Sawn Cedar post
Post Base per local code
8" Wedge Anchor

4" Patio Detail
Scale 1" = 3'-0"
### Owner and Applicant Information

**Applicant:** T L Carter  
**Property Owner:** Kyle & Kay Dye

### Property Location

6415 E. Apache St. N.  
**Tract Size:** ±.5 acres

### Location within the City of Tulsa

(shown with City Council districts)

### Request Summary

Special Exception to permit a Personal Vehicle Sales & Rentals use in the CS Zoning District (Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2).

### Zoning

**Zoning District:** CS  
**Zoning Overlays:** None

### Comprehensive Plan Considerations

#### Land Use

**Land Use Plan:** Employment  
**Small Area Plans:** None  
**Development Era:** Late Automobile

#### Transportation

**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Secondary Arterial and Multimodal Corridor  
**planitulsa Street Type:** Multimodal Street  
**Transit:** Regular Route 460 or 320  
**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** Sidewalks  
**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** A bike lane is recommended in the Tulsa GO Plan on N. Sheridan Rd.

#### Environment

**Flood Area:** N/A  
**Tree Canopy Coverage:** 30-50%  
**Parks & Open Space:** N/A

---

**Elected Representatives**

City Council: District 3, Crista Patrick  
County Commission: District 1, Stan Sallee

**Public Notice Required**

Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance  
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance  
Posted Sign – min. 10 days in advance
Staff Analysis
The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to permit a Personal Vehicle Sales & Rentals use in the CS Zoning District (Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2).

Relevant Case History
- BOA-15687, April 1991, the Board approved a special exception to permit a car rental business.

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use Plan
The subject property is designated as Employment. **Employment** is intended to accommodate offices, warehousing and storage, manufacturing and assembly, and industrial processes. The Industrial Site Suitability map corresponds to the Employment land use designation and indicates where uses that are potentially incompatible with sensitive land uses are best suited to locate. This directs industrial uses to particular areas of the city while discouraging industrial in close proximity to Neighborhood areas.

Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>School bus sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Vacant parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>School bus sales office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans
The subject property is not within a small area plan.

Development Era
The subject property is in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking,
community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

**Transportation**

**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Secondary Arterial and Multimodal Corridor

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** Sheridan Rd is a Multimodal Street

**Transit:** Regular route 460 or 320

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** Sidewalks

**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** A bike lane is recommended on N. Sheridan Rd.

**Arterial Traffic per Lane:** 1,728 vehicles per lane per day on E Apache St - 2,973 vehicles per lane per day on N Sheridan Rd.

**Environmental Considerations**

**Flood Area:** The subject property is not in a flood area.

**Tree Canopy Coverage:** Tree canopy in the area is 47%. Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

**Parks & Open Space:** None

**Sample Motion**

I move to *approve or deny* a Special Exception to permit a Personal Vehicle Sales & Rentals use in the CS Zoning District (Sec. 15.020, Table 15-2).

- per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description**

LT 12 LESS BEG NEC TH S140.1 W630 N140.1 E430 S115.1 E180 N115.1 E20 POB BLK 4, Mohawk Acres, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

**Exhibits**

Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
(Subject property)
Land Use Plan Categories

- Arkansas River Corridor
- Multiple Use
- Downtown
- Neighborhood
- Employment
- Park and Open Space
- Local Center
- Regional Center
PLAT of SURVEY

CERTIFICATE

I, Enoch Cox of Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, and a Professional Surveyor, do hereby certify that I have made a survey of the following described property, to-wit:
Lot 12, less beginning at the NE corner, thence South 140.1'; thence West 630'; thence North 140.1'; thence East 430'; thence South 115.1'; thence East 180'; thence North 115.1'; thence East 20' to the point of beginning, Block 4, MOHAWK ACRES ADDITION to Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

We further certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct plat of same, shows the location of buildings, the dimensions of the property and distances to streets, and there are no encroachments thereon.

WITNESS my hand and seal this 20th day of April, 1986

[Signature]
Registered Land Surveyor
## Staff Report
### Special Exception BOA-23698

**Hearing Date:** May 28, 2024  
**Prepared by:** Sean Wallace  
swallace@cityoftulsa.org  
918-596-7585

### Owner and Applicant Information
- **Applicant:** Robert Bell  
- **Property Owner:** Labadie Construction Co. LLC

### Property Location
- **3855 S. Birmingham Pl. E.**  
- **Tract Size:** ±.6 acres

### Location within the City of Tulsa
*(shown with City Council districts)*

### Request Summary
- **Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A).**

### Zoning
- **Zoning District:** RS-1  
- **Zoning Overlays:** N/A

### Comprehensive Plan Considerations
- **Land Use**  
  **Land Use Plan:** Neighborhood  
  **Small Area Plans:** None  
  **Development Era:** Early Automobile

- **Transportation**  
  **Major Street & Highway Plan:** N/A  
  **planitulsa Street Type:** N/A  
  **Transit:** Regular Route on 41st St.  
  **Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** None  
  **Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** A signed route is recommended on Delaware Ave in the Tulsa Go Plan.

### Environment
- **Flood Area:** N/A  
- **Tree Canopy Coverage:** 30-50%  
- **Parks & Open Space:** N/A

### Elected Representatives
- **City Council:** District 9, Jayme Fowler  
- **County Commission:** District 3, Kelly Dunkerley

### Public Notice Required
- **Newspaper Notice** – min. 10 days in advance  
- **Mailed Notice** to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
**Staff Analysis**

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height from 4 feet to 6 feet inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A).

**Relevant Case History**
- None

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. **Neighborhoods** are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**

The subject properties are not within a small area plan.

**Development Era**

The subject property is in an area developed during the Early Automobile Era (1930s-50s), which retained a high degree of the connectivity from neighborhood streets to the arterial network, with mostly commercial, office, industrial, and other active uses along major streets and a mix of housing options and neighborhood-based uses like schools, churches, and libraries in the interior sections. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, commercial revitalization, compatibility of scale for neighborhood development, and transitions between commercial corridors and residential areas.
Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: Regular route on 41st St.

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: A signed route is recommended on Delaware Ave in the Tulsa Go Plan.

Arterial Traffic per Lane: 2,930 vehicles per lane per day on S. 41st St.

Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: The subject property is not in a flood area.

Tree Canopy Coverage: Tree canopy in the area is 33%. Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

Parks & Open Space: N/A

Sample Motion
I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A),
• per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description
E244.35 W269.35 S100 N647.70 E/2 W/2 SE SW SEC 20 19 13 .56AC, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
(Subject property)
BOA-23698

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: 2021

Subject Tract

9.6
BOA-23698

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Aerial Photo Date: 2021
3855 S. Birmingham Place
Tulsa OK 74105
Special Exception
6 Foot High Fence
Front Yard

Criteria:

1. The special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code.
2. The special exception will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

Findings:

1. The rear property lines of the two properties south of the subject tract are along South Birmingham Place.
2. These adjacent properties to the south are each developed with a 6ft high masonry wall with an access to South Birmingham Place.
3. The property at the intersection of 38th Street and Birmingham Place is developed with a 6ft high wrought iron fence with rock pillars along South Birmingham Place, its side yard that continues along 38th Street which would be considered its front yard.
4. The properties along South Birmingham Place on the East side of the road are Estate Size Lots developed with larger houses with Birmingham Place utilized as rear, side and front yards.
5. The intent of the Zoning Code is to protect the Streetscape of the neighborhood and to minimize the impacts of privacy fences 12 feet from a public road.
6. Section 45.080 Tulsa Zoning Code Specifies-A Fences and walls within required building setbacks may not exceed 8 feet in height, except that in required street setbacks fences and walls may not exceed 4 feet in height. However, in R zoned districts, fences up to 8 feet in height are permitted in side street setbacks of detached houses or duplexes located on corner lots and in street setbacks abutting the rear lot line of houses or duplexes located on double frontage lots. The board of adjustment is authorized to modify these fence and wall regulations in accordance with the special exception procedures of Section 70.120.

Summary

The Board of Adjustment is allowed to modify the fence and wall regulations in accordance with the Special Exception procedures.

The properties along the east side of South Birmingham Place have been developed so that there is a mix of rear, side and front yards. This creates a condition that the code provides no consistency in the development characteristics of the Street Scape. Currently three properties on this block of South Birmingham Place are developed with 6 foot high fencing on South Birmingham Place.

The proposed fence of rock pillars and wrought iron fencing will not only stay within the concept of the Estate housing feel for the neighborhood but provides a more open streetscape that is evident and is consistent with the property located at the intersection of 38th and Birmingham.
Place, condition that is in more harmony with the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code.

The wrought iron fencing associated with the boundary lines along South Birmingham Place protects the character of the streetscape for those properties that are not designed with rear walls that are developed along the right of way. The approval of the 6 foot high wrought iron fencing does provide a consistency to the street scape that promotes the character of the neighborhood and therefore help with combating a condition that could be injurious to the area.

Subject Property and Adjacent Tract

Second Property to the South
Intersection of 38th Street and South Birmingham Place

Fence Example
City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment,

We are writing to OPPOSE the exception to increase the “permitted fence height inside the street setback” in Case BOA-23698. (Sec.45.080-A). The property requesting the exemption is 3855 S Birmingham Pl. This exception would change the overall character of the neighborhood and would significantly alter the views and curb appeal of the neighboring properties, potentially affecting the property values and enjoyment the neighbors have in their own front yards. In addition, this is a new build and I do not understand why they are asking for a variance after their home is already built and not before. Our neighborhood largely has front yards that are open and connect with one another and this requested change is significant and unwanted by many of the surrounding neighbors.

Thank you for your consideration to DENY the special exemption.

Sincerely,
Andrew and Jennifer Donnelly
2705 E 39th Place

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not reply, forward, click links, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. Please report using the Phish Alert button in the Outlook Desktop Client if this message contains potentially unsafe content.
Staff Report
Special Exception BOA-23699

Hearing Date: May 28, 2024
Prepared by: Sean Wallace
swallace@cityoftulsa.org
918-596-7585

Owner and Applicant Information
Applicant: Robert Bell
Property Owner: Eden Village of Tulsa, Inc.

Property Location
1251 S. 61st Ave. W.
Tract Size: ±16.8 acres

Location within the City of Tulsa
(shown with City Council districts)

Request Summary
Special exception to reduce the required parking for a cottage house development (Sec. 55.050-K).

Zoning
Zoning District: RM-2
Zoning Overlays: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use
Land Use Plan: Neighborhood
Small Area Plans: Charles Page
Development Era: Streetcar

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: Gilcrease Expressway - Freeway
planitulsa Street Type: N/A
Transit: N/A
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Gilcrease Expy Trail
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: N/A

Environment
Flood Area: FEMA 500-year floodplain
Tree Canopy Coverage: 0-10%
Parks & Open Space: Terwilliger Park is nearby.

Elected Representatives
City Council: District 4, Laura Bellis.
County Commission: District 2, Karen Keith.

Public Notice Required
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
**Staff Analysis**

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to reduce the required parking for a cottage house development (Sec. 55.050-K). The required spaces would be 126 (2 for every detached house), and the applicant is requesting it be reduced to 76.

**55.050-K Alternative Compliance**

The motor vehicle parking ratios of this chapter are not intended to prevent development and redevelopment or to make development and redevelopment economically impractical. In order to allow for flexibility in addressing the actual expected parking demand of specific uses, alternative compliance parking ratios may be approved through the special exception procedures of Section 70.140 only if:

1. The board of adjustment determines that the other allowed parking reduction alternatives of Section 55.050 are infeasible or do not apply; and

2. The board of adjustment determines that the reduced parking ratios proposed are not likely to cause material adverse impacts on traffic circulation and safety or on the general welfare of property owners and residents in the surrounding area.

**Relevant Case History**

- None

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**

The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RM-2</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential/Terwilliger Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RM-2</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Gilcrease Expy/Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Arkansas River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RM-2</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**

The subject property is within the Charles Page Boulevard Plan.

**Development Era**

The subject property is in an area developed during the Streetcar Era (1910s-30s), prior to the proliferation of automobiles, when streetcars facilitated growth beyond downtown. Land uses range from fully integrated to
somewhat separated, on a half-mile grid, with a mix of housing options. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, commercial districts, and well-designed streetscapes.

**Transportation**

*Major Street & Highway Plan:* Gilcrease Expressway - Freeway

*Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:* N/A

*Transit:* N/A

*Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:* Gilcrease Expy Multi-Use Trail

*Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:* N/A

*Arterial Traffic per Lane:* N/A

**Environmental Considerations**

*Flood Area:* The subject property is within the FEMA 500-year floodplain.

*Tree Canopy Coverage:* Tree canopy in the area is less than 10%. Preserving the limited existing canopy should be encouraged, as well as measures to increase the canopy through landscaping. Street-lining trees in particular should be encouraged to spread the benefit of the tree canopy to the pedestrian realm.

*Parks & Open Space:* Terwilliger Park is nearby.

**Sample Motion**

I move to *approve or deny* a Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for Cottage House Development in the RM-2 District (Sec. 55.050-K);

- per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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, that the other allowed parking alternative of Section 55.050 are infeasible or do not apply and the reduced parking ratios proposed are not likely to cause material adverse impacts on traffic circulation and safety or on the general welfare of property owners and residents in the surrounding area.

**Property Description**

BEG 427.01S NWC SE NW TH E101.97 N146.31 E215.12 S211.59 E498 S825.67 W820 TO SWC SE NW TH N899.08 POB SEC 8 19 12 16.813ACS, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

**Exhibits**

Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Aerial Photo Date: 2021
GENERAL SITE NOTES:
1. ALL WORK AND MATERIALS SHALL COMPLY WITH ALL MUNICIPAL REGULATIONS AND CODES, WHICH VARY MORE STRINGENTLY.
2. ALL MATERIALS SHALL COMPLY WITH OSHA STANDARDS.
3. CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL APPLICATIONS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, ALL UTILITIES, STREET/ROADWAY, DRIVE, TRAFFIC SIGNS & POLES, ETC. AS REQUIRED. ALL DRAWINGS SHALL BE ACCURATE BASED ON CONTRACTOR'S CONFIRMATION OF THE INFORMATION SHOWN AND SHALL BE SUPPORTED BY ALL OSHA SPREADS SHOWN IN BASE DRAWING.
4. REFER TO FUTURE LANDSCAPE PLANS FOR GRASS, TREES, AND PLANTED MATERIALS.
5. ALL DIMENSIONS AND COORDINATES ARE FROM BACK OF CURB UNLESS SHOWN OTHERWISE.
6. POOL = 1'-0" UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED.
7. DRAINAGE AND SITE CLEARING DONE PREVIOUSLY BY OTHERS.

PARKING SUMMARY
REQUERED PARKING:
20 SPACE FOR DWELLING UNIT: 20' - 1.25 = 25

PROVIDED PARKING:
STANDARD: 60
ACCESSIBLE: 2
VAN ACCESSIBLE: 1
TOTAL PROVIDED PARKING: 66

RESIDENTIAL UNITS BY SEPARATE PERMIT, FOR REFERENCE ONLY

EDEN VILLAGE
1251 S. 61ST W. AVE TULSA, OK 74127

CIVIL-SERVER\Projects\2340656 Eden Village of Tulsa\Dwg\PRODUCTION\2340656 SITE PLAN.dwg PLOT:5/3/2024 1:01:24 PM ORIG SIZE:22"X34"
Criteria:

1. The special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code.
2. The special exception will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

Findings Eden Village:

1. Eden Village was originally submitted as a multi-family development with Tri-plex’s units.
2. The Development was to have 63 homes and a community center.
3. The building permit for the community center was submitted and approved with a design for 76 parking spaces. 13 spaces for the community center and 1 space for each home equals 76 parking spaces.
4. It was the intent of the development to ask for relief of the 76-space requirement before the Occupancy Permit would be requested for the Community Center.
5. Since the approval of the tri-plex design an interpretation change by the city allowed the development to design to its original intent to have individual units utilizing a Cottage Development concept.
6. This Cottage Development change has been submitted with the infrastructure plans and has been reviewed and approved as the current plan for the development. (See Attached Site Plan-66 spaces provided)
7. Under the Cottage Development the parking standards would change to 2 spaces for each dwelling unit and no spaces for the community center because it would be considered accessory to the development. This would bring the total number of spaces per Zoning Code to 126 spaces.
8. Request for waiver of letter of deficiency requirement has been submitted with this request. The deficiency did not exist with the original submittal. The new deficiency is related to the change in parking requirements associated with the style of housing development created. This application will attempt to have recognized the limitations of the type of use versus the development characteristics of the Cottage Style Development as specified in the Zoning Code.

Facts: Eden Village:

1. A very important part of the proposed development is that it is a 501.C3 which funding is from various sources with specifications to provide a specific service in a specific way. The funding sources range from individuals, Churches, Charitable Foundations and even Governmental Entities. The specifics of the development addressed below were also a part of the monies received to create the use. Though changing the use or the specification of the development may not be easily achievable the ownership will stipulate to a condition that if the use proposed changes to a more standard Cottage Development that the development will be subject to a
platting process and be required to meet the development standards as outlined in the Tulsa Zoning Code for the use being requested at that time.

2. The City of Tulsa Zoning Code does not provide specific Use Standards designed for the characteristics of Chronically Homeless Residential Development.

3. The development has a 5000 square foot Community Center that is designed to meet the needs of the residents. It will be used by employees of the development, nursing, counseling and various services.

4. As an accessory use to a residential development the parking requirement is zero, The Zoning Code specifies that a Community Center should have 2.7 spaces per 1000 square feet for a total of 13.5 spaces.

5. The development is planned to have 63 one-bedroom tiny homes. The homes are restricted in the Eden Village literature to one occupant only. No vehicles owned by the residents of Eden Village will be allowed within the housing area beyond the parking lot of the Community Center.

6. It was a critical component of the location of Eden Village to have access to Public Transit because the residents do not have means for alternate transportation.

Summary

Eden Village is not designed to rehabilitate a citizen into our standard community that zoning codes are designed to protect. It is designed to provide a segment of the homeless population with a place that is designed to meet their needs and to provide them with the opportunity to have a place to call home, so they will not have to sleep on the street. Research indicated that various larger cities have been trying to control their citizen base’s vehicle ownership by establishing less parking requirements. Some findings from these studies have been placed at the end of this application, however they were determined not pertinent to the criteria sought other than the reduction of parking for Low Income areas is being established in other Cities. Here we have the reverse of this, in that we have citizens that do not have or want the burdens of vehicle ownership and this situation would justify a reduction of the parking requirements.

1. What the findings indicate is that the needs of these types of communities are established by the circumstances of the residents. Historically, it has been determined that less than 20% of the residents of Eden Village will have vehicle ownership.

2. In determining the parking requirements for Eden Village, it is necessary to evaluate the activities associated with the Community Center. The support services provided at the Community Center are established with times that do not overlap. Recognizing the employees and services, the established 13.5 spaces appear to be appropriate for the use.

3. There is a visitor component to the development related to the community center and the residents. There was not a lot of information available related to the historic numbers of visitors. In recognition of establishing excess spaces for resident parking a 10-space requirement for visitors was deemed appropriate.

4. It has been established that less than 20% of the residents of Eden Village will own Automobiles and the parking standards associated with the residential units should be reduced. The development proposes a .6 parking standard per unit which still provides an additional 25 parking spaces above the expected need.

5. The Special Exception will create a parking standard of 13.5 + 10 + 37.8 for a total parking requirement of 61.3 spaces.

6. It is understood that we could come to basically the same requirement based on the restriction of one individual per dwelling and establish the parking standard as 1 space per unit and continue with the community center as an accessory use. However, this does not provide for realistic evaluation of future like uses.
Attached is the Legal Description of the property and the site plan for the Eden Village development with the proposed parking plan.

It should be noted that the development is willing to evaluate the actual use of the parking spaces over time. This information would be extremely valuable in analyzing future developments and could be subjected to a condition to add additional spaces if necessary.

Research of Parking Studies

Several Larger Cities around the country have done extensive studies related to the need to provide a reduce parking standard for low income or affordable housing. The intent of these studies varies from community to community, but it was clear that the reduction of automobiles in an area was influenced by the reduction of parking spaces. Some of the findings of these studies is provided for information.

a. A very large number of cities have eliminated minimum requirements for a very small portion of their communities. Of the 200 examined codes, approximately 20% have abolished or reduced parking mandates citywide. The remainder have eliminated parking requirements in specific areas such as a central business district, main street, or historic district. In fact, several codes limited parking reforms to two to four blocks within a downtown or commercial district, as seen below. Eliminating minimum parking requirements is progress no matter which way you cut it, but limiting it to such an insignificant area also limits the positive impacts of these policies. Cities with such boundaries should consider expanding them to mirror the pace of their population, density, and development growth.

b. Most cities, towns, and counties establish in their zoning code a minimum number of off-street parking spaces that must be created for each unit in a new residential development, such as 0.5 parking spaces per bedroom. The purpose of parking requirements is to ensure that new residents have a dedicated place for their vehicles, and avoid negative spillover effects on public parking in the surrounding area. However, there are many circumstances where a one-size-fits-all parking requirement may result in an excess supply of parking spaces, including for residents of affordable housing, who tend to have fewer vehicles per household, and in higher-density neighborhoods where many transportation needs can be met by public transit. Parking requirements can make housing more expensive to produce, as fulfilling this requirement can be costly, particularly when land prices are very high or where expensive underground parking or parking structures are needed to accommodate the required number of spaces. By reducing parking requirements for qualifying affordable developments, cities, towns, and counties can help to ensure the amount of parking provided aligns with actual needs, freeing up resources that can be used to lower home prices and rents, as well as space for additional units and/or amenities.

c. Cities, towns, and counties considering reductions in parking requirements for qualifying affordable (Low Income) developments should structure their zoning codes in response to local conditions and community goals. In this section we review a number of the factors that should be addressed in developing and implementing reduced parking requirements for qualifying developments.
# Board of Adjustment

## Staff Report BOA-23700

**Hearing Date:** May 28, 2024  
**Prepared by:** Dylan Siers  
**dsiers@cityoftulsa.org**  
**918-596-7584**

### Owner and Applicant Information

**Applicant:** Justin DeBruin, Wallace Design Collective  
**Property Owner:** Monte Cassino / Congregation of the Benedictine Sisters of the Sacred Hearts

### Property Location

2206 S. Lewis Ave. E.  
**Tract Size:** ±13.4 acres

### Location within the City of Tulsa

*(shown with City Council districts)*

![City Council Districts Map]

### Request Summary

**Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A)**

### Zoning

**Zoning District:** RS-3  
**Zoning Overlays:** N/A

### Comprehensive Plan Considerations

#### Land Use

**Land Use Plan:** Regional Center  
**Small Area Plans:** None  
**Development Era:** Streetcar

#### Transportation

**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Urban Arterial 21st & Lewis  
**planitulsa Street Type:** N/A  
**Transit:** Bus Routes  
**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** Side Walks  
**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** A signed route is recommended on S. Yorktown Ave. in the Tulsa Go Plan.

#### Environment

**Flood Area:** City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain  
**Tree Canopy Coverage:** 20-30%  
**Parks & Open Space:** N/A

### Elected Representatives

**City Council:** District 4, Laura Bellis  
**County Commission:** District 1, Stan Sallee

### Public Notice Required

**Newspaper Notice** – min. 10 days in advance  
**Mailed Notice** to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
Staff Analysis

The applicant is requesting a Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A). The applicant is proposing a 6’ tall fence within the street setback.

Relevant Case History

- None

Comprehensive Plan Considerations

Land Use Plan

The subject property is designated as Regional Center. Regional Centers are defined by existing regional trip generators, in contrast to Local Centers. These centers should be the most connected land use pockets outside of downtown for public transit access and high-capacity arterial streets. New regional trip generators should be permitted in the area with special consideration given to transportation access and circulation. Regional trip generators include universities, malls, large medical campuses, casinos, big-box shopping centers, and very large churches.

Surrounding Properties:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>OM, CS</td>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Office, Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-2</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Regional Center</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Area Plans

The subject properties are not within a small area plan.

Development Era

The subject property is in an area developed during the Streetcar Era (1910s-30s), prior to the proliferation of automobiles, when streetcars facilitated growth beyond downtown. Land uses range from fully integrated to somewhat separated, on a half-mile grid, with a mix of housing options. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, commercial districts, and well-designed streetscapes.

Transportation

Major Street & Highway Plan: Urban Arterial 21st & Lewis Ave.
Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: Bus Routes

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: A signed route is recommended on S Yorktown Ave in the Tulsa Go Plan.

Arterial Traffic per Lane: North (E 21st St S - 3,807 Vehicles per Lane) & East (S Lewis Ave - 3,878 Vehicles per Lane)

Environmental Considerations

Flood Area: City of Tulsa Regulatory Floodplain

Tree Canopy Coverage: 20-30%. Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

Parks & Open Space: N/A

Sample Motion

I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height inside the street setback (Sec. 45.080-A),

- per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description

Lots 1 to 11 Inc Blk 4 & Lots 1 to 9 Block 5 & Part of Vac Zunis Ave & 22nd St Boman, Brentwood Hgts, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma,

AND

BEG 630S & 40W NEX NE TH W11130 TO EL ST TH NELY139.6 NLY CV LF 45.63 TO SWC BLK 1 THE YORKTOWN TH E485.26 N82.39 ELY 80.94 NEW75.79 NE94.9 NE47.73 N182.28 TO SL ST TH E APROX 302.33 SELY CV RT APROX 75.82 TO WL ST TH S APROX 503.33 POB SEC 18 19 13 Acres, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma
Subject property from S Lewis Ave. (Image used from Google Street view)

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Applicant Exhibits
BOA-23700

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.

Aerial Photo Date: 2021

Subject Tract

11.6

Feet
BOA-23700

Subject Tract

0 87.5 175 350 Feet

E 86TH PL S
RS-3
E 22ND PL S
E 22ND ST S
E 20TH ST S
S YORKTOWN AVE
S ZUNIS AVE
S ZUNIS AVE
S LEWIS AVE
E 21ST ST S
HP

Note: Graphic overlays may not precisely align with physical features on the ground.
Aerial Photo Date: 2021

11.7
Land Use Plan Categories

- Arkansas River Corridor
- Multiple Use
- Downtown
- Neighborhood
- Employment
- Park and Open Space
- Local Center
- Regional Center

S LEWIS AVE
E 21ST ST S
HP

SUBJECT TRACT

BOA-23700
19-14 04
SOUTH VEHICULAR GATE

NOTES:
1. GATE, HARDSCAPE, AND KEY PAD TO ALL CONFORM TO LOCAL, STATE AND FEDERAL GUIDELINES AND REGULATIONS. CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
2. FENCE, COLUMN AND GATES ARE CONCEPTUAL IN NATURE. CONTRACTOR TO SUBMIT SHOP DRAWINGS TO LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR FINAL APPROVAL PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.
FENCE AND COLUMN DETAIL

11.10

NOTES:
1. Columns not to exceed 6" grade change between each column wall to be added where grade exceeds 1 in 20.
2. Fence to be 6' black powder coated steel fence with double top rail. Ameristar Montage or approved equal.

DOUBLE GATE

11.10
**Owner and Applicant Information**

Applicant: Cody Holbrook  
Property Owner: 2H Contracting LLC

**Property Location**

2807 E. 3rd St.  
Tract Size: ±.15 acres

**Location within the City of Tulsa**  
(Shown with City Council districts)

**Request Summary**

Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an RS-3 District (45.031-D); Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A, 45.031-D.6)

**Zoning**

Zoning District: RS-3  
Zoning Overlays: N/A

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use**

Land Use Plan: Neighborhood  
Small Area Plans: Kendall-Whittier  
Development Era: Streetcar

**Transportation**

Major Street & Highway Plan: Urban Arterial & Multi-Modal Corridor (Delaware Ave.)  
planitulsa Street Type: N/A  
Transit: Bus Route on 3rd  
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sharrow along E 3rd St in the Tulsa Go Plan and Sidewalks  
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: Signed Route on Delaware Ave

**Environment**

Flood Area: N/A  
Tree Canopy Coverage: 10-20%  
Parks & Open Space: N/A

---

**Elected Representatives**

City Council: District 4, Laura Bellis  
County Commission: District 1, Stan Sallee."
Staff Analysis

The applicant is attempting to obtain a Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an RS-3 District (45.031-D); Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A, 45.031-D.6) The square footage of the accessory building is 1090 square feet.
Relevant Case History
- None

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. **Neighborhoods** are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are within the Kendall-Whittier small area plan.

**Development Era**
The subject property is in an area developed during the Streetcar Era (1910s-30s), prior to the proliferation of automobiles, when streetcars facilitated growth beyond downtown. Land uses range from fully integrated to somewhat separated, on a half-mile grid, with a mix of housing options. Priorities in these areas include walkability, bikeability, access to public transit, historic preservation, housing type variety, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, commercial districts, and well-designed streetscapes.

**Transportation**
**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Urban Arterial & Multi-Modal Corridor (Delaware Ave.)

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** N/A

**Transit:** Bus Route on 3rd

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** Sharrow along E 3rd St in the Tulsa Go Plan and Sidewalks

**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** Signed Route on Delaware Ave.

**Arterial Traffic per Lane:** South (E 3rd St S - 1,985 Vehicles per Lane)

**Environmental Considerations**
**Flood Area:** N/A

**Tree Canopy Coverage:** 10-20% Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.
Sample Motion

I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an RS-3 District (45.031-D); Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A, 45.031-D.6) per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ of the agenda packet.

- subject to the following conditions (including time limitation, if any): ________________________________.

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.

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 Description

E 1/2 of Lt 6 Blk 5, Pleasant View Addn, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Exhibits

Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Applicant Exhibits
2807 E Third Street

Photographs of New Structure “Unit B” in its current status

West side of structure
South West Corner of Structure
East side of structure
North West side of structure
Interior View of kitchen/living/pantry/bathroom
Interior view of east bedrooms/living room
Interior view of north bedroom
Interior view of laundry room
Owner and Applicant Information
Applicant: Richard Rokeby
Property Owner: Richard Rokeby

Property Location
5722 E. 5th Pl.
Tract Size: ±.74 acres

Location within the City of Tulsa
(shown with City Council districts)

Elected Representatives
City Council: District 3, Crista Patrick.
County Commission: District 2, Karen Keith.

Public Notice Required
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance

Request Summary
Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A);
Variance to allow an accessory building to exceed 10 feet in height to the top of the top plate in the rear setback (Section 90.090-C)

Zoning
Zoning District: RS-3
Zoning Overlays: N/A

Comprehensive Plan Considerations
Land Use
Land Use Plan: Neighborhood
Small Area Plans: None
Development Era: Early Automobile

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: Hudson Ave (Residential Collector)
planitulsa Street Type: N/A
Transit: N/A
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: N/A
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: None

Environment
Flood Area: N/A
Tree Canopy Coverage: 10-20%
Parks & Open Space: N/A
Staff Analysis
The Applicant is proposing a Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A); Variance to allow an accessory building to exceed 10 feet in height to the top of the top plate in the rear setback (Section 90.090-C) The proposed accessory building is 1,200 sq ft

Section 45.030 - Accessory Buildings and Carports in R Districts

45.030-A Accessory Building Size

1. RE and RS-1 Districts
   In RE and RS-1 districts, the total aggregate floor area of all detached accessory buildings, including accessory dwelling units, and accessory buildings not erected as an integral part of the principal residential building may not exceed 750 square feet or 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure, whichever is greater. [1]

2. RS-2, RS-3, RS-4, RS-5 and RM Districts
   In RS-2, RS-3, RS-4, RS-5, or RM zoned lots used for detached houses or duplexes, the total aggregate floor area of all detached accessory buildings, including accessory dwelling units, and accessory buildings not erected as an integral part of the principal residential building may not exceed 500 square feet or 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure, whichever is greater. [1]

   [1] For detached accessory buildings, including accessory dwelling units, located within rear setbacks see 90.090-C.

2. Detached Accessory Buildings, including Accessory Dwelling Units, in RE, RS, RD Districts and RM Zoned Lots Used for Detached Houses or Duplexes.
   a. Detached accessory buildings, including Accessory Dwelling Units, may be located in rear setbacks provided that:
      (1) The building does not exceed one story or 18 feet in height and is not more than 10 feet in height to the top of the top plate; and

Relevant Case History
- None

Statement of Hardship
There is a pre-existing 30X 40 ft pad on the property. Because the rear property line is at a slight angle, a portion of the sw rear of the pad is 17 ft 4 inches from the back fence. The pad at the SE portion is 21 ft 1 inc A tree directly north of the pad is the sole remaining intact tree on the property, following the fathers day storm of 2023. Being that
this proposed building is replacing a building destroyed by a falling tree, the homeowner is very cautious about trees close to buildings. Moving the proposed building to accommodate the 20 ft rule would place it closer to the tree.

While the proposed square footage of the building is beyond the rule, this is a very large lot which would leave more than ample room surrounding it. The homeowner has a substantial collection of tools and parts to shelter in addition to lawn mowing and gardening equipment. The building is intended to be used for storage and a general hobby hut. Behind the property is a 2 story separate garage. To my knowledge, that property owner has not had any problems with neighbors. It’s in full view of the homeowners kitchen window but has never been an issue. In addition, there are 5 other fairly large site-built accessory buildings within 2 blocks of the homeowner.”

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use Plan**
The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. Neighborhoods are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Existing Zoning/Overlay</th>
<th>Existing Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>RS-3</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Small Area Plans**
The subject properties are not within a small area plan.

**Development Era**
The subject property is in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking, community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

**Transportation**
**Major Street & Highway Plan:** Hudson Ave (Residential Collector)

**Comprehensive Plan Street Designation:** N/A

**Transit:** N/A

**Existing Bike/Ped Facilities:** None
**Planned Bike/Ped Facilities:** N/A

**Arterial Traffic per Lane:** N/A

**Environmental Considerations**

**Flood Area:** N/A

**Tree Canopy Coverage:** 10-20%. Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

**Parks & Open Space:** N/A
Sample Motion
I move to approve or deny a Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-B); Variance to allow an accessory building to exceed to exceed 10 feet in height to the top of the top plate in the rear setback (Section 90.090-C) per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ of the agenda packet.

• subject to the following conditions (including time limitation, if any): ____________________________________________.

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.

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 Description
E100 LESS E15 BLK 46, Glenhaven, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma
Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Applicant Exhibits
RICHARD F ROKEBY
5722 E 5TH PLACE, TULSA, OK 74112
(TULSA COUNTY, OK)
30' X 40' X 12'

SCOPEx OF PLANS:
1. TO PROVIDE STRUCTURAL DESIGN FOR THE PRE-FAB METAL BUILDING PER THE SPECIFIED DESIGN LOADS, AND APPLICABLE BUILDING CODES. ANY DISCREPANCIES IN DESIGN LOADS SHALL BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTN. OF THE ENGINEER OF RECORD.

2. DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY ARCHITECTURAL, SITE, ZONING, HVAC, ELEC. MECH DESIGN OR REQUIREMENTS. THESE ITEMS MUST BE ADDRESSED BY THEIR RESPECTIVE PROFESSIONALS IN CHARGE.

GENERAL STRUCTURAL DESIGN NOTES
1. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH IBC 2016, ASPC 7-16, OSMA, AISI 360, AISI 3100, AWS D1.3 CODES AND ALL OTHER APPLICABLE LOCAL CITY OR COUNTY REQUIREMENTS.

2. ALL WELDS ARE TO BE SHOP WELDS. FIELD WELDING IS NOT PERMITTED. WELDING ELECTRODES PER AWS CODE, E70XX UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE ON PLANS.

3. ALL STRUCTURAL LIGHT GAUGE TUBING SHALL BE ASTM A500 GRADE C (Fy = 50 KSI, Fu = 62 KSI) OR EQUAL. ALL CHANNELS SHALL BE A693 (HSLA) GRADE 50 STEEL (Fy = 50 KSI, Fu = 61 KSI) OR EQUAL.

4. ALL STRUCTURAL FIELD CONNECTIONS SHALL BE #" 1/4 x 3/4 SOD PER ESR-2198 U.N.O. REFER TO DESIGN NOTES ON SHEET 2 FOR SHEATHING FASTENER TYPE.

5. GYPSUM BOARD OR DRYWALL FINISH OR ANY BRITTLE BASE MATERIAL IS NOT CONSIDERED OR ACCOUNTED FOR ON THE DESIGN CRITERIA OF THIS STRUCTURE, U.N.O.

STRUCTURAL DESIGN CRITERIA
PREVAILING CODE: OBC 2015
OCCUPANCY / USE GROUP: S (STORAGE)
CONSTRUCTION TYPE: V B (ANY MATL - IBC 402.5)
RISK CATEGORY: I
BUILDING FOOTAGE: 1200 SQ FT

1. DEAD LOAD (D) COLLATERAL LOAD 2.0 PSF
2. ROOF LIVE LOAD (LR) LR = 24 PSF
3. SNOW LOAD (S)
   GROUND SNOW LOAD Pg = 35 PSF
   IMPORTANCE FACTOR IS = 0.80
   THERMAL FACTOR TF = 1.2
   EXPOSURE FACTOR Ce = 1.0
   ROOF SLOPE FACTOR Cs = 1.0
   FLAT ROOF SNOW LOAD Pi = 24 PSF
   SLOPED ROOF SNOW LOAD Pi = 24 PSF

4. WIND LOAD (V)
   DESIGN WIND SPEED V = 140 MPH
   EXPOSURE C

5. SEISMIC LOAD (E)
   Ss / S1 = 0.129/0.072
   SDS / SDI = 0.158/0.116
   DESIGN CATEGORY B
   SITE CLASS D (DEFAULT)
   IMPORTANCE FACTOR IF = 1.00

ASD LOAD COMBINATIONS:
1. D + (LR OR S)
2. D + (0.4W OR 0.7E)
3. D + 0.75 (0.6W OR 0.7E) + 0.75 (LR OR S)
4. 0.6D + (0.4W OR 0.7E)

STRUCTURAL DRAWING INDEX
1. COVER SHEET
2. ELEVATIONS
3A. FOUNDATION PLAN & NOTES
3B. FOUNDATION DETAILS & NOTES
4. COLUMN LAYOUT PLAN & DETAILS
5. FRAME SECTION & DETAILS
6A. SIDE WALL FRAMING
6B. SIDE WALL DETAILS
7A. END WALL FRAMING
7B. END WALL DETAILS

Ahmad M. Wehbi
I have reviewed this document
TOLEDO, OH
SIGNED: MAR 18 2024
EXPRES: 12/31/2025
34435

SPECIAL INSPECTIONS
NO SPECIAL INSPECTIONS ARE REQUIRED FOR THIS STRUCTURE AS IT MEETS THE EXCEPTIONS OF SECTION 1704 PER OBC 2016, UNLESS EXPLICITLY REQUIRED BY THE BUILDING OFFICIAL.

13.11
**DESIGN NOTES**

1. The intention of elevations provided on the sheet is to indicate structural component, dimensions, and building orientation only.

2. Architectural design requirements are not covered in this plan set. These design requirements shall be addressed in a separate architectural set by responsible licensed professionals in charge, as needed.

3. All exterior sheathing shall be:
   - Class A rated 29GA, 3/16" ED RT - GALT, or
   - Fanned steel (5-60 ksi cold), or

4. All exterior wall sheathing shall be:
   - Class A rated 29GA, 3/16" ED RT - GALT, or
   - Fanned steel (5-60 ksi cold), or

5. Sheathing connections shall be #12-14 x ½" SDS welded or through bolt every 24".

**LEGEND**

- **WN** WINDOWS (RET. WINDOW MWG)
- **WD** WALK-THRU DOORS (RET. DOOR MWG)

**NOTE 1:** Any door or window design information is not covered in this plan set and shall be addressed by others.

**NOTE 2:** LOC of walk-in doors or windows can be determined on site as long as they fall between bays (between floor frames).
FOUNDATION PLAN

SCALE: 3/4" = 1'  

FOUNDATION NOTES:

1. Control joints shall be placed so as to limit max. slab spans to 20' in each direction.
2. Conic anchors shall be located as shown on the foundation plan with a minimum of (1) anchor per post.
3. Min. footing depth needed to resist building loads is indicated on foundation details. However, a greater footing depth may be required to meet the local frost line depth per code.
4. Depth of footings shall extend into undisturbed soil or compacted engineering fill.
5. Assumed soil bearing capacity is to be a min. of 1500 PSF.
6. Conic strength to be a min. of 3000 PSI @ 28 days for moderate weathering potential. Special inspection of concrete is not required as structural design of foundations is based on a min strength of 3500 PSI @ 28 days.

CONCRETE ANCHORAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>1/2&quot; Ø X 7&quot; LG, POWER-STUD*</th>
<th>S/D EXPANSION ANCHOR (PER ER 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANCHORAGE NOTES:
1. ANCHOR INSTALLATION REQUIREMENTS (REF ANCHORAGE DETAIL):
   A. L - ANCHOR LENGTH: 7.00' OCS
   B. D - ANCHOR EDGE DISTANCE: MIN. 4.00' OR U.N.O.
   C. H - ANCHOR HOE DEPTH: MIN. 4.50' OCS
   D. - CONCRETE EMBEDMENT DEPTH: MIN. 3.754'
   2. SPACING BETWEEN (2) ANCHORS: MIN. 5.00' OR U.N.O.
   3. ANCHORS TO BE INSTALLED PER MANUFACTURER'S REG. PER SPECIFIED EIR.

REINFORCEMENT NOTES:
1. REINFORCING STEEL: DEFORMED BARS CONFORMING TO ASTM A615, GRADE 40, WITH A MINIMUM FIELD OF 40 ksi FOR ALL BARS UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED ON DRAWINGS.
2. WELDED WIRE FABRIC: ASTM A163 USING BRIGHT STEEL WIRE MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF ASTM A62, GAUGES AND DIMENSIONS AS NOTED ON THE DRAWINGS PROVIDED IN FLAT SHEETS OR ROLLS.

"OPTIONAL CURB" NOTES:
1. THE USE OF CURB IS OPTIONAL. HOWEVER, WHEN SELECTED, A CURB SHALL BE PROVIDED BENEATH ALL WALLS (PERIMETER AND INTERIOR) OF STRUCTURE.
2. CURB OPENINGS MUST BE LARGER THAN DOOR OPENINGS TO ALLOW DOOR TRACKS TO REACH THE SLAB. REFER EXAMPLES BELOW. NOTE: IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF CONC. CONTRACTOR TO COORDINATE AND VERIFY CLEAR DAM. NEEDED FOR DOOR TRACKS FROM DOOR MSG. / BUILDING MSG. PRIOR TO POUR.

FOUNDATIONS DETAILS
SCALE: 3/4" = 1'
COLUMN LAYOUT PLAN

NOTE:
SEE SHEET 3A / 3B FOR ANCHOR TYPE
SEE SHEET 5 FOR FRAME SECTION AND DETAILS

BASE RAIL
ANCHOR DETAIL
SCALE: 1/8" : 1

DOOR / COLUMN POST
ANCHOR DETAIL
SCALE: 1/8" : 1

DOOR POST
END WALL POST
ANCHOR DETAIL
SCALE: 1/8" : 1

TYP POST
ANCHOR DETAIL
SCALE: 1/8" : 1

CORNER COLUMN POST
ANCHOR DETAIL
SCALE: 1/8" : 1
MEMBER PROPERTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MATERIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORNER POST</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROOF MEMBER</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE RAIL</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. 3 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIRTS</td>
<td>4&quot; X 14GA HAT CHANNEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEADER</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOOR POST</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDOW POST</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END WALL POSTS</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAGONAL BRACES</td>
<td>2&quot; SQ. X 12GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCR2, BRACE</td>
<td>2 1/4&quot; SQ. X 14GA TUBE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ROOF MEMBER DETAIL

2. CORNER DETAIL

3. WINDOW/DOOR DETAIL

4. WINDOW/DOOR DETAIL
**Owner and Applicant Information**
Applicant: Tommy Harris
Property Owner: Pickleberry Properties

**Property Location**
4553 N. Hartford Ave. E.
Tract Size: ±0.22 acres

**Location within the City of Tulsa**
(Shown with City Council districts)

**Elected Representatives**
City Council: District 1, Vanessa Hall-Harper
County Commission: District 1, Stan Sallee

**Request Summary**
Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district
(Section 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5)

**Zoning**
Zoning District: RS-3
Zoning Overlays: N/A

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

**Land Use**
Land Use Plan: Neighborhood
Small Area Plans: None
Development Era: Early Automobile

**Transportation**
Major Street & Highway Plan: 46th St N - Secondary Arterial;
Hartford Ave - Residential Collector
PlanItulsa Street Type: N/A
Transit: Bus Route
Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks
Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: Signed Route on Hartford

**Environment**
Flood Area: N/A
Tree Canopy Coverage: 10-20%
Parks & Open Space: N/A

**Public Notice Required**
Newspaper Notice – min. 10 days in advance
Mailed Notice to 300’ radius – min. 10 days in advance
Posted Sign – min. 10 days in advance
**Staff Analysis**

The applicant is proposing a Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5)

### Table 5-2.5: R District Building Type Regulations for Household Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE CATEGORY</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>RT</th>
<th>RM-</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>RMH</th>
<th>Supplemental Regulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>Household Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single household</td>
<td>Detached house</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>2-unit townhouse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Section 40.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufactured housing unit</td>
<td>Manufactured housing subdivision</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile home</td>
<td>Mobile home park</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use building</td>
<td>Vertical mixed-use building</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two households on single lot</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more households on single lot</td>
<td>Cottage house development</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/Condo</td>
<td>Mobile home park</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-use building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Case History**
- None

**Comprehensive Plan Considerations**

### Land Use Plan

The subject property is designated as Neighborhood. **Neighborhoods** are mostly residential uses, which includes detached, missing middle, and multi-dwelling unit housing types. Churches, schools, and other low intensity uses that support residents’ daily needs are often acceptable, particularly for properties abutting Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center land use areas. Multi-dwelling unit housing that takes access off an arterial is considered Multiple Use, Local Center, or Regional Center. If a multi-dwelling unit housing property takes access from a lower-order street separated from the arterial, then it would be considered Neighborhood.

**Surrounding Properties:**
Small Area Plans
The subject properties are not within a small area plan.

Development Era
The subject property is in an area developed during the Late Automobile Era (1950s-present), which has grown since the mainstreaming of automobile-centric lifestyles, with a high degree of separation between residential and nonresidential uses, and low levels of street connectivity. In these areas, transportation is nearly exclusively concentrated on the mile-by-mile arterial grid, and major streets are often both transportation corridors and destination corridors, which can lead to traffic congestion. Nonresidential uses are predominantly located at the intersections of major arterial streets. Priorities in these areas include commercial revitalization, placemaking, community gathering opportunities, conservation of natural areas, a high degree of privacy, one-stop shopping, and commuting routes.

Transportation
Major Street & Highway Plan: 46th St N - Secondary Arterial; Hartford Ave - Residential Collector

Comprehensive Plan Street Designation: N/A

Transit: Bus Route

Existing Bike/Ped Facilities: Sidewalks

Planned Bike/Ped Facilities: Signed Route on Hartford

Arterial Traffic per Lane: N/A

Environmental Considerations
Flood Area: N/A

Tree Canopy Coverage: Significant effort should be given to the preservation of mature stands of trees. Tree canopy removal should be minimized, and replacement of trees that need removing should be encouraged.

Parks & Open Space: N/A
Sample Motion
I move to approve or deny a Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5) per the conceptual plan(s) shown on page(s) _____ 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 Description
Lots 46, Block 4, Suburban Acres Amd, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Exhibits
Case map
Aerial (small scale)
Aerial (large scale)
Tulsa Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map
Applicant Exhibits
**CONTRACTOR DIRECTIVES**

1. **All work shall conform to the International Residential Code of Regulations for the site.**
2. Prior to bidding, the general contractors shall visit and inspect the site and familiarize themselves with the existing conditions affecting the work. The general contractor shall not make any bid or proposal based on any assumptions regarding location, extent, nature, or amount of work to be performed under this contract if the contractor's failure to inspect the site.
3. The general contractor and subcontractors are responsible for locating any existing utility lines, prior to the beginning of any excavation. Existing utilities shown on the drawings are approximate locations as best determined from existing survey, but should not be construed to represent all existing utilities.
4. Field verify means the contractor is required to field verify the existing conditions and deficiencies prior to construction or preparation of submittal shop drawings and integration of field survey information into the construction.
5. The organization of the drawings and specifications shall include the following:
   - Subcontracts or establishing the extent of work to be performed by trade.
6. In the event of a conflict between drawings or between a drawing and specification, the drawing or specification item includes the order of priority, larger number of which shall be accepted. The contractor shall be notified of any and all discripencies in dimensions and sizes, and prior to construction, agree to the proper drawings or specifications prior to proceeding with the incorrect information.
7. All items of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing details and locators may not necessarily appear on the architectural drawings. The drawings provided are not intended with the appropriate subcontracts or construction design shall be responsible for any changes due to the permanent fixtures.
8. The general contractor shall be responsible for verifying all windows and doors rough openings prior to any framing of openings.
9. Changes to the city-approved drawings and specifications shall be made by an addendum or a change order. Addendum or change orders must be approved by the designer and the city holding drawings.
10. The existing grade is a field survey of existing conditions provided by change. The elevating measurements are only approximate and not over accurate. Contractor shall field verify all existing conditions and coordinate all necessary adjustments with owner.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| CS | COVER SHEET |
| SP | SITE PLAN |
| A1 | FLOOR PLAN - FIRST FLOOR |
| A3 | ELEVATIONS |
| A4 | ROOF PLAN |
| A5 | WALL SECTIONS / EAVE DETAILS |
| E1 | LIGHTING PLAN - FIRST FLOOR |