## CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES of Meeting No. 566
Thursday, July 5, 1990, 1:00 p.m. City Commlssion Room, Plaza Level

Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT
Bolzle
Bradley
Chappelle
Fuller
White,
Chalrman
members absent

The notice and agenda of sald meeting were posted in the Office of the City Audltor on Tuesday, July 3, 1990, at 8:45 a.m., as well as in the Receptlon Area of the INCOG offices.

After declarlng a quorum present, Chalrman Whlte called the meetling to order at 1:00 p.m.

## MIMATES:

On MOTION of BRADLEY, the Board voted 3-1-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, White, "aye"; no "nays"; Chappelle, "abstalning; Fuller, "absent") to APPROVE the Minutes of June 21, 1990.

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

## Case No. 15449

Action Requested:
Varlance of the front yard setback requirement measured from the centerline of East 26 th Place from 50 ' to $43^{\prime \prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$, and varlance of the slde yard setback requirement from 5' to ${ }^{11}$ to permit a carport Section 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTINL DISTRICTS Use Unlt 6, located 6781 East 26th Place.

## Presentation:

The appllcant, Stan Draayer, requested by letter (Exhlblt A-1) that Case No. 15449 be heard at a later date, due to a contlnulng health problem.

## Protestants:

The property owner at 6775 East 26 th Place pointed out that this is the second request for continuance, and that he will be out of town for the next scheduled Board of Adjustment meeting. After discussion, he was agreeable to contlnuling the case to August 2, 1990.

Case No. 15449 (contInued)

## Board Actlon:

On MOTION of BOLZE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradey, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to CONTINUE Case No. 15449 to August 2, 1990, as requested by the appllcant.

## Case No. 15463

## Action Reguested:

Varlance of the maximum bullding helght limitation from 351 to 391 to permit construction of a unlversity student center - Section 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 5, located 432 and 434 South Florence.

## Presentation:

The applicant, James Nledermeyer, 1810 Mid-Continent Tower, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that a portion of the application concerning the student center was approved at the prevlous Board meeting; however, it was discovered that the peak of the chapel wlll exceed the bullding helght limltatlon, whlch also requires a varlance. He Informed that the peak of the chapel wII! be $4^{\prime}$ taller than the maximum 35' height ilmitation. Mr. Niedermeyer polnted out that the chapel is located near the center of the property, and away from the residences to the north. A floor plan and elevatlons (Exhlbit B-1) were submitted.

## Couments and Questions:

Ms. Bradley asked If the protestant that appeared at the prevlous meeting has been notlfled of the varlance request, and Mr. Gardner informed that the application has been properly advertised, and all surroundling property owners have recelved notlce of this hearlng.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of BOLZE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to APPROVE a Varlance of the maximum bullding helght IImitation from 35' to 39' to permit construction of a university student center - Section 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 5; per plot plan and bullding elevations submitted.

After approval of the appllcatlon, it was dlscovered that a protestant in the audlence had been overlooked.

On MOTION of BOLZE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to RESCIND the motion for approval of Case No. 15463.

## Protestants:

Jack Sylvester, owner of property at 3016 East 4th Place, stated that his property is 22 from the proposed building and Inquired as to the helght of the prlvacy fence on the north. He stated that his house has two storles.

Case No. 15463 (continued)
Ms. White replled that a $6^{\prime}$ screening fence will be installed on the north property line, and polnted out that a 351 apartment bullding would be allowed by right at this location.

Mr. Jackere noted that the chapel is located toward the center of the property, and away from the north property line.

Mr. Niedermeyer Informed that the height of the bullding along the north side of the property is much less than 35'.

Mr. Gardner polnted out that activitles on the ground would be screened by the ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ screenling fence, but lt would not be practical to screen the second story of a two-story bullding.

## Board Act Ion:

On MOTION of BOLZLE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentlons"; Fuller, "absent") to APPROVE a Varlance of the maximum buliding height Ilmitation from 351 to 391 to permit construction of a unlversity student center - Section 403. BUK ND AREA REQUIREENTS IN RESIDENTIN DISTRICTS - Use Unlt 5; per plot plan and bullding elevations submitted; flinding that the chapel is located to the Interlor of the tract and the 41 addition to the height will not adversely affect the residences to the north; and finding that there are existing bulldings in the general area that are taller than the proposed chapel; on the following descrlbed property:

Lots 2, 3 and 4, Block 4, College Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

## MINOR VARIANCES AND EXCEPTIONS

Case No. 15472

## Actlon Requested:

Minor Varlance of the minlmum setback requirement measured from the centerline of Peorla from 50' to 36' to permit replacement of an existing sign - Section 1221.C. 6 General Use Conditlons for Business Signs - Use Unlt 21, located 3646 South Peorla.

## Presentation:

The appllcant, Terry J. Howard, 6550 East Independence, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who submitted a sign plan (Exhlblt C-2) and photograph (Exhlbit C-1), requested permission to replace a Texaco sign at the above stated location. He explalned that the company has designed a new sign to be placed in the middle of the existing pole, which will not extend as close to the street as the old one.

Protestants: None.

Case No. 15472 (continued)

## Board Action:

On MOTION of OMPPELLE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradey, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to APPROVE a Minor Varlance of the minimum setback requirement measured from the centerilne of Peorla from 50' to 36' to permit replacement of an existing sign - Section 1221.C.6 General Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unlt 21; per sign plan submitted; finding that the replacement sign will be located in the center of the existing pole and WIIl not extend as close to the street as the previous one; and finding there are numerous sign structures in the area that are closer to the street than the one proposed at this location; on the following described property:

East $90^{\prime}$ of the south $45^{\prime}$ of Lot 6 , and the east $90^{\prime}$ of Lot 7, Block 6, Peorla Gardens Addition, CIty of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15474
Minor Varlance of the rear yard setback requirement from 25' to 20' to permit constructlon of an attached garage - Section 403 BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 6, located 5146 East 107th Place South.

## Presentation:

The applicant, Jon Vroonan, 6138 South Loulsville, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that he has sold a house on the property in question, contingent upon Board of Adjustment approval of the minor varlance. He submitted a plot plan (Exhlbit D-1) and a prellminary plat (Exhlbit D-2), and explalned that the garage will be constructed on the side of the corner lot to prevent removal of several trees.

Protestants: None.
Board Action:
On MOTION of BRADEY, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradiey, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to APPROVE a Minor Varlance of the rear yard setback requirement from $25^{\prime}$ to $20^{\prime}$ to permit construction of an attached garage - Section 403 BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 6; per plot plan submitted; finding a hardship demonstrated by the corner lot location, with required major setbacks from two streets; on the following descrlbed property;

Lot 7, Block 4, Southern Oaks Estates Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15475

## Action Reguested:

MInor Varlance of the required 31 setback from an interior lot IIne to 2.4 ' to permit an exlsting detached garage - Sectlon 401.B.1.C Accessory Use Conditlons - Use UnIt 6, located 1203 East 25th Street.

## Presentation:

The applicant, James A. Brackett, 1203 East 25th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted photographs (Exhlbit E-3) and a plot plan (Exhlblt E-1) for an existlng garage. He explalned that the lot ls Irregular In shape and an error was made during construction, which resulted in one corner of the garage extending Into the required setback on the east. Letters of support (Exhlblt E-2) were submitted.

Protestants: None.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of CUPPELLE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradiey, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to NPRROVE a Minor Varlance of the required 31 setback from an Interior lot IIne to 2.41 to permit an exlsting detached garage - Section 401.B.1.C Accessory Use Conditions - Use Unit 6; per plot plan submitted; finding that the lot is Irregular In shape, and granting of the minor varlance request wlll not be detrimental to the nelghborhood; on the following described property:

Part of Lot 11, Block 2, Sunset Terrace, an addltion to the Clty of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof, belng more particularly described as follows, to-wlt:

Beginning at the northwesterly corner of Sald Lot 11; thence south $42^{\circ} 52^{\prime 3} 36 \prime$ east along the northerly line of sald Lot 11, a distance of $102.36^{\prime}$; thence south $67^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 20^{\prime \prime}$ west a distance of 27.63'; thence south $2^{\circ} 37^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ east a distance of $5.2^{\prime}$; thence south $18^{\circ} 33^{\prime \prime} \mathbf{O H " l}^{\prime \prime}$ west a distance of 90.59'; thence south $20^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime}$ west parallel to and $17.97^{\prime}$ west of the east line of sald Lot 11, a distance of 16.01 to a point on the southwesterly line of sald Lot 11 , sald polnt belng 17.97 ! northwesterly of the southeasterly corner of sald Lot i1; thence north westerly along the southwesterly llne of sald Lot 11 on a curve to the right having a radius of 235.38', a distance of $135.0^{\prime}$ to the southwesterly corner of sald Lot 11; thence northeasterly along the westerly IIne of sald Lot 11 on a curve to the left having a radlus of $1,540.76^{\prime}$, a dlstance of 134.95' to the Polnt of Beglnning.

## NEW APPLICATIONS

## Case No. 15467

## Action Requested:

Varlance of the required number of parking spaces to be provided per efflciency or one bedroom multlfamlly unit from 1.5 to .75 spaces per unit - Section 1208. MILTIFAMILY DNELLING AND SIMILAR USES Use Unit 8, located SW/c Oklahoma Street and Hartford Avenue.

## Presentation:

The applicant, First BaptIst Church of North Tulsa, 1414 North Greenwood, Tulsa, Oklahoma, requested that Case No. 15467 be withdrawn, as they are not in need of the rellef requested.

## Board ActIon:

On MOTION of CHRPFELLE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradey, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentlons"; Fuller, "absent") to WITHDRAM Case No. 15467, as the applicant Is no longer in need of the rellef requested.

## Case No. 15470

## ActIon Reguested:

Special Exception to permit a moblle home in an AG zoned district Section 301 PRINCIPAL USES PERNITTED IN THE AGRICUI-TURE DISTRICT Use Unit 9, located 655 South 156th East Avenue.

## Presentation:

The applicant, Ron Wilson, 635 South 156th East Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that temporary approval for a moblle home at this location was previously approved by the Board, and asked that the moblle be allowed to remaln permanently.

Protestants: None.

## Board ActIon:

On MOTION of OUFFELE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to NPRROVE a Speclal Exception to permit a moblle hone in an AG zoned district - Section 301. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITIED IN THE AGRICALTURE DISTRICT - Use Unit 9; finding that the moblle home has been located at the present address for a perlod of three years and has proved to be compatible with the nelghborhood; on the following described property:

Beginning at the $N E / C$ of the W/2 of SE/4; thence south 390', west 439.92', north $390^{\prime}$, east $440^{\prime}$ to the Point of Beginnling, less the west $25^{\prime}$ and the north $30^{\prime}$ of the east 415 ' for street, Section 3, T-19-N, R-14-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, 3.429士 acres.

## ActIon Reguested:

Varlance to increase the maximum allowable display surface area of a business sign from 114 sq ft to 126.5 sq ft - Section $1221 . \mathrm{D} .2$ CS District Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unit 21, located 12563 East 21 st Street.

## Presentation:

The applicant, Glenn Cunningham, C. R. Signs, PO Box 580395, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a photograph (Exhibit $\mathrm{F}-1$ ) and sign plan (Exhlblt f-2) for the the sign In question. He stated that the intent of the awning was to Improve the appearance of the bullding and the surrounding area. Mr. Cunningham explalned that an error in computation was made and the drawings were sent to the Clty, who also falled to detect the error and issued a permit for the sign. He stated that the sign was constructed, per plan, and the sign Inspector in the field discovered that the sign was in violatlon of the Code. He informed that the lettering "Cash Corner" at the bottom of the sign causes the sign to exceed the allowable display surface area. The appllcant polnted out that the total slgnage (exlsting pole sign and canopy sign) do not exceed the allowable amount for the property. Mr. Cunningham stated that the lot contalns 150' of street frontage and is owned by one individual, with two buslnesses belng operated on the property. He asked the Board to allow the words "Cash Corner" to remain at the bottom of the sign.

## Cawnents and Questlons:

In response to Mr. Bolzle, the applicant stated that the owners are not attemptling to exceed the total amount of permitted slgnage for the property.

Ms. Bradley asked Mr. Jackere how an error made by the Sign Inspector should affect the Board's consideration, and he replied that the Board is free to consider all facts Involved in the case. Mr. Jackere further noted that it is not clear at thls polnt who actually made the mlstake; however, the Board should make thelr judgment based on the facts presented and the ordlnance.

Tony Long, 3130 South SherIdan, Tulsa, Oklahoma, operator of the business, stated that he is not attempting to push the llmits of the law, but ls trying to improve the appearance of the bullding. He polnted out that signage is not proposed for the sldes of the bullding.

Mr. Jackere inquired as to the length of the lease on the bullding, and Mr. Long stated that he now has a three-year lease, with two three-year optlons and optlon to purchase.

Mr. Jackere advised that, If inclined to approve the applicatlon, the Board should impose a condition that the next owner of the business would be required to comply with the Code in regard to slgnage.

Case No. 15473 (contlnued)
Ms. White noted that a letter (Exhlbit F-3) from Wilfred Sanditen polnted out that the legal description on the Hearlng Notice Includes parcels of land that are not owned by the appllcant.

Mr. Bolzle stated that It appears that the additlonal amount of slgnage requested would be approxlmately $3^{\prime \prime}$ across the entire front of the sign.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of BOLZE, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Fuller, "absent") to NPRROVE a Varlance to Increase the maximum allowable display surface area of a business sign (wall sign) from 114 sq ft to 126.5 sq ft - Section 1221 .D.2 CS DIstrict Use Conditions for Business Slgns - Use Unit 2i; per sign plan and photograph submitted; and subject to the approval belng limlted to the the canopy sign in question only; finding that the Increase In slgnage wlll only amount to a strip 3 " In helght across the width of the sign, and the total amount of display surface area for slgns on the property will not exceed the permitted amount; on the followlng described property:

East 1' Block 1, Shannon Park Plaza and part of Lot 1, Stacey Lynn Third Annex, Beginning at the SW/c Lot 1 , thence north 190', east 150', south 190', west 150 ' to the Polnt of Beginnling Block 1, less and except the west 75' thereof, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15476

## ActIon Reguested:

Speclal Exceptlon to permit a chlldren's day care center in an OL zoned district - Section 601 PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS - Use Unit 5, located 1812 East 15th Street.

Coments and Questions:
Ms. White Informed that she and Mr. Bolzle wlll abstaln from hearing Case No. 15476.

## Presentation:

The applicant, Chrlstine Whlte, 1412 South Knoxvllle, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a site plan (Exhlbit H-1) for a proposed day care center. She informed that the center will operate Monday through Friday between the hours of 6:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m., and will be licensed to care for 21 chlldren. The applicant, stated that the property wlll be fenced and wlll have two required parklng spaces.

## Conments and Questlons:

Ms. Bradley asked If the house wlll be altered in any way, and the appllcant replled that one door wlll be added on the porch, but no other exterlor alteratlons are planned.

Case No. 15476 (continued)
The applicant stated that the original plan has been silghtly altered, and she noted and Inltlallzed the changes.

In response to Ms. Bradley, the applicant stated that there are offices and medical facllitles In the area. Ms. Bradley remarked that there is an adult day care center in the area.

Protestants: None.

## Boord ActIon:

On MOTION of CHWPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bradley, Chappelle, Fuller, "aye"; no "nays"; Bolzle, White "abstalning"; none "absent") to $\operatorname{APPROVE}$ a Special Exception to permit a chlldren's day care center In an OL zoned district - Section 601 PRINCIPAL USES PERMITED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS - Use Unlt 5; per plot plan submitted; subject to days and hours of operatlon belng Monday through Friday, 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.; finding that there are other day care centers in the vicinity, and the granting of the speclal exception request will not be detrimental to the surrounding area: on the following described property:

North 120' of Lot 11, Block 1, Terrace Park AddItlon, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

## Case No. 15477

## ActIon Requested:

Speclal Exception to allow the exlsting Will Rogers High School bulldings, parking and related facillties and relocation of their baseball fleld to the southwest corner of South Pittsburg Avenue and East 4th Place, and football fleld and track to the new stormwater detention facllity - SectIon 401 PRINCIPAL USES PERMITIED IN RESIDENTIN DISTRICTS - Use UnIt 5, located 3909 East 5th Place.

## Presentation:

The appllcant, Robert Yadon, 3227 East 31, Sulte 200, Tulsa, Oklahoma, architect for the project, submitted an aerlal photograph (Exhlblt G-1) deplcting the slte for a new baseball facillty at Rogers High School. He Informed that a portion of the school property will be used for stormwater detention, and the proposed location is the only avallable space large enough for the project. Mr. Yadon explalned that there is a need for $10^{\prime \prime}$ fenclng In front of the bull pen and dugout, with a 21 belng necessary behind home plate to prevent foul balls from falling in the residentlal area across the street. He Informed that the proposed bulldings are 55' from the centerline of Pittsburg and 4th Place. The applicant stated that the slope of the land causes home plate to be 5' lower than the top of the curb at the intersection of 4th Place and Pittsburg. in regard to parklng, Mr. Yadon requested a varlance of the required 408 spaces to 358, and pointed out that school would not be in session when the baseball field is in use.

Case No. 15477 (continued)
Bobby Jones, director of bullding and planning for Tulsa Public Schools, stated that the forecasted attendance for wlll Rogers High School for the 90/91 school year ls 1422 students, or approximately 70 less than last year's enrol Iment.

Ms. Bradley Inquired as to the average number of people that attend the baseball games at Will Rogers, and Mr. Jones replled that there are usually approximately 100 spectators.

Mr. Jones remarked that students park along the street even if there are sufflclent parking spaces avallable in the parking lot.

## Protestants:

Aaron Phelps, 521 South New Haven; Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that several events are conducted at the school during the evening hours, and those attending always park on the street. He remarked that the parking area is littered with debris and is not lighted, which encourages street parking. He polnted out that the back doors to the school are locked, which further dlscourages parking in the lot. Mr. Phelps stated that he has vlewed other schools in the City and has not found street parking a problem. He stated that the new facility is designed to accommodate a large number of spectators, and is opposed to the application.

Ms. Aaron Phelps, 521 South New Haven, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that parking In the area and trash In the nelghborhood contlnue to plague the residents that live near the school.

Marren Atvell, 467 South Pittsburg, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that he is not opposed to the ball park, but is concerned with the trash that is left in the nelghborhood by the school patrons.

Ms. Bradley asked if the proposed construction wlll bring added nelghborhood problems, and he replled that trash has always been a problem around the school.

Mr. Jones Informed that the school princlpal is to schedule all clean-up operatlons and monltor parking on the school grounds.

Mlke MItchell, 414 South PIttsburg, Tulsa, Oklahoma, volced a concern that foul balls wlll hlt hls home, as he llves directly behlnd home plate.

Mr. Chappelle asked If home plate could be placed nearer the school, as there will be more foul balls than home runs, and Mr. Jones stated that a shlft of the fleld would be Impossible, due to the slope of the land.

Mr. Fuller Inltlated discussion as to the customary helght of other fences around the Clty, and It was determlned that a 21' fence behind home plate is the customary height for other balls flelds.

Case No. 15477 (contlnued)
Mr. Bolzle asked if there wlll be access to the ball fleld along the east and north fence llnes, and Mr. Jones stated that there is a malntenance gate on the north.

Mr. Bolzle remarked that the distance between the parking lot and the entrances seem to discourage parking in the parking lot. He stated that he could not support the application as presented.

It was the consensus of the Board that parkIng is encouraged along the street by the locatlon of the entrance gates.

There was discussion as to the reason for beginnlng construction before the nelghbors were notifled of the proposed construction.

After discussion, the Board determined that they could not support the application as presented, and agreed that a contInuance to allow the school offlcials to confer with the neighbors would be in order. They requested that Mr. Cox, the school princlpal, be present at the next meeting to answer questions concerning the proposed facllity.

## Board ActIon:

On MOTION of BOLZLE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentlons"; none "absent") to CONTINUE Case No. 15477 to July 19, 1990.

## OTHER BUSINESS

Case No. 15467

## ActIon Requested:

Refund of filling fees in the amount of $\$ 192.00$.

## Presentation:

The applicant, FIrst BaptIst Church of North Tulsa, requested that flling fees in the amount of $\$ 192.00$ be refunded, as they are no longer in need of the rellef requested.

## Board Actlon:

On MOTION of CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradley, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to APPROVE a Refund of fees in the amount of $\$ 192.00$; finding that the appllcant was not in need of the rellef requested.

Case No. 15469
Action Reguested:
The appllcant, Herman Watson, requested by letter (Exhlblt K-1) that Case No. 15469 be wlthdrawn and all fees refunded.

## Board ActIon:

On MOTION of CHFPELLE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Bradiey, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to WITMORAM Case No. 15469 and REFUND application fees in the amount of $\$ 175.00$.

There being no further business, the meetling was adjourned at 2:34 p.m.


