

**Tulsa Civic Center
CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES of Meeting No. 605
Tuesday, March 10, 1992, 1:00 p.m.
City Council Room, Plaza Level
Tulsa Civic Center**

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Bolzle, Chairman Chappelle Fuller White	Doverspike	Gardner Jones Moore	Jackere, Legal Department Hubbard, Protective, Insp.

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Friday, March 6, 1992, at 1:50 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Bolzle called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

MINUTES:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes** of February 11, 1992.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Case No. 15938

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit Retail Tire Sales and Installation (Use Unit 17) - **Section 701. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 17.

Variance of the required 100' setback from the centerline of East 41st Street South to 85' to permit the construction of a new building (Use Unit 17) - **Section 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 17, located SE/c East 41st Street and Broken Arrow Expressway.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Joe Covey**, 2805 Northwest 24th Street, New Castle, Oklahoma, stated that he is representing Hibdon Tire Centers, currently operating in Oklahoma City. Mr. Covey submitted a plot plan (Exhibit A-1) for a new tire store in Tulsa, and explained that the building line on the plat was established in 1966, and the plans were drawn according to that setback requirement. He stated that the building will be located in the far west 230' of

Case No. 15938 (continued)

the property, and the setback variance will only be needed for that portion. The applicant requested, however, that Use Unit 17 uses be permitted on the entire tract. A photograph (Exhibit A-2) was submitted.

Comments and Questions:

In response to Mr. Fuller, the applicant stated that there is a medical building located to the east, and an existing building on the subject property, which was previously used as a convenience store.

Mr. Bolzle asked if the building could be moved to the east in order to comply with the setback requirement, and Mr. Covey stated that the property will be split into four tracts in the future. He pointed out that the building has been designed for the irregular shaped lot, and the west end of the property could not be used if the building is moved to the east.

Mr. Gardner explained that the applicant has approximately 600' of frontage, and is proposing to use the west 230' for the tire store. He pointed out that the property west of the creek could support two businesses if the building is constructed on the western portion. Mr. Gardner stated that both business tracts will exceed the required 150' street frontage.

In response to Mr. Bolzle, the applicant informed that the building will be constructed of brick, with four overhead doors. He added that there will be no outside storage of material, and all work will be completed inside the building.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit Use Unit 17 uses on the entire tract - **Section 701. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 17; and to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of the required 100' setback from the centerline of East 41st Street South to 85' only on the west 230' of the subject property to permit the construction of a new tire sales building (Use Unit 17) - **Section 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 17; per plot plan; subject to no outside storage, work or display of merchandise or materials (which excludes outdoor display of automobiles, boats, camping RVs, mobile homes, etc., and overnight campgrounds);

Case No. 15938 (continued)

finding the tire store to be compatible with the surrounding area and in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code; on the following described property:

A tract of land, containing 9.8432 acres, that is part of Lot 1 of Block 7 of "Alexander Trust Addition Amended", an addition in the City of Tulsa, Oklahoma, said tract of land being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: "Beginning at a point" that is the Northwest corner of said Lot 1; Thence due East along the Northerly Line of Lot 1 for 1074.79' to a point that is 195.51' West of the Northeast corner of said Lot 1; Thence due South for 112.41' to a point of curve; Thence Southeasterly along a curve to the left with a central angle of 45 Degrees 00'-00" and a radius of 120.71' for 94.81' to a point of tangency; Thence S 45 Degrees 00' 00" East along tangency for 106.63' to a point of curve; Thence Southeasterly and Easterly along a curve to the left with a central angle of 44 Degrees 57' 51" and a radius of 120.82' for 94.82'; Thence S 00 Degrees 07'58" East for 18.00'; Thence S 88 Degrees 10' 37" East for 0.12' to a point on the Easterly line of Lot 1; Thence S 00 Degrees 07' 58" East and along the Easterly line of Lot 1 for 319.30' to the Southeast corner of said Lot 1; Thence N 67 Degrees 01' 01" West and along the Southerly line of Lot 1 for 1381.45' to the Southwest corner of Lot 1; Thence due North along the Westerly line of Lot 1 for 106.45' to the Point of Beginning of said tract of land; City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15941

Action Requested:

Special Exception to operate a lounge in an IL zoned district - **Section 901. - PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 12, located 3018 East Pine Street.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Sixto DeLeon**, 4338 East 4th Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by **Mark Reents**, 5416 South Yale, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who informed that his client is proposing to operate a lounge at the above stated location. He informed that there is sufficient parking for the business, and the hours of operation will comply with state and local regulations. Mr. Reents stated that the lounge will serve only 3.2 beer, and will not have live entertainment.

Case No. 15941 (continued)

Protestants:

Jess Brown, 1437 North Evanston Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a petition of opposition (Exhibit B-3) signed by residents of the area, and explained that the business in question will be near a school and within 135' of an elementary school crossing. He stated that the operator of the business next door to the proposed lounge is also opposed to the application. Photographs (Exhibit B-1) of the area and one letter of protest (Exhibit B-2) were submitted.

Mr. Fuller asked if there are other bars in the area, and Mr. Brown replied that there is one near Peoria and Utica, and one east of Yale and Pine.

Alta Spruzolla, 1520 North College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she owns a house approximately 100' from the proposed lounge, and pointed out that other homes are within 20' of the subject property. She stated that the lounge would probably be in operation until 2:00 a.m., and would not be compatible with the residential neighborhood.

Cynthia Daniels, 1504 North Florence, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she rents a house across the street from the proposed lounge, and pointed out that the quiet nature of the neighborhood attracted her to this area. Ms. Daniels stated that she is also concerned that litter could accumulate as a result of this type of business.

Lois Bryant, an attendant at the laundromat next door to the proposed lounge, stated that the use would pose a danger for the children that wait outside while their parents are inside the laundry.

Mr. Bolzle asked if the laundromat and the tenants in the Braum's building share the same parking lot, and Ms. Bryant answered in the affirmative.

Lisa Huckins, 1462 North Evanston Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she is concerned with the safety of her two daughters. She pointed out that it would no longer be safe for them to walk in the neighborhood if the bar is approved.

B. J. Mayo, 1452 North College, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that a bar would create a lot of noise, and would not be compatible with the residential area.

Sandy Plaster stated that she works in the nearby school, and requested that the children not be burdened with this type of use in the neighborhood.

Case No. 15941 (continued)

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Reents stated that he could meet with the protestants and possibly clarify the application. He pointed out that screening could be added and the hours of operation could be changed to make the use more compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Bolzle stated that, although fencing and hours of operation could be a concern, his major concern is the proximity of the building to the residences to the west and across the street to the north.

Ms. White remarked that she is in agreement with Mr. Bolzle, and added that the Board considers all available facts when making a determination.

Mr. Fuller stated that it he is not supportive of the operation of a bar at this location.

Mr. Bolzle honored Mr. Reents requested that he be permitted to make additional comments regarding the protests. He continued by pointing out that the screening can be installed and hours of operation can be adjusted to meets the needs of the residential area. He reiterated that there will be no live entertainment. Mr. Reents stated that Ms. Daniels did not have a right to protest the application since she is a renter and may move at any time.

Mr. Jackere pointed out to Mr. Reents that his client will be a renter, and the same rights should be afforded the renter across the street.

Mr. Reents further noted that the laundromat closes at 8:00 p.m. and the lounge will not have a negative impact on that business. He stated that time restraints can be placed on the business that will alleviate the school crossing concerns.

Additional Comments:

Mr. Chappelle explained that, in the past, the Board has suggested negotiations between the applicant and protestants; however, in this case it appears that it would be impossible to remove all of the neighborhood objections. He stated that the Board does not require this type of meeting unless it appears that it will be beneficial to all parties.

Case No. 15941 (continued)

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doverspike, "absent") to **DENY** a **Special Exception** to operate a lounge in an IL zoned district - **Section 901. - PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 12; finding that the intended use is not compatible with the area, and approval of the special exception request would be injurious to the neighborhood for the reasons stated above; on the following described property:

Part of west 161.24' of the north 166' of Haw Industrial Subdivision, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Case No. 15956

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit off-street parking in an RM-2 zoned district - **Section 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 10, located south of southeast corner East 7th Street and South Troost.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Dewey Hammons**, 4724 South Florence, Tulsa, Oklahoma, explained that he is proposing to buy a vacant lot near his business to be used for parking and storage. He informed that a 40' by 40' storage building will be constructed on a portion of the lot. Mr. Hammons stated that some of his employees are currently parking on the street and the lot would alleviate the existing parking problem.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Jackere asked the applicant if he is proposing to store supplies in the building, and Mr. Hammons informed that he operates a machine shop and will store supplies used in his business.

Mr. Jackere advised that the 40' by 40' warehouse is not permitted at this location.

Mr. Hammons stated that it is not imperative that he build a building on the lot, and requested that the Board approve the lot for parking only.

Case No. 15956 (continued)

Mr. Gardner informed that the property to the south is zoned for light office, and a parking lot would be an appropriate use for the lot in question. He pointed out that parking will not be permitted on approximately 25' of the western portion of the property because of the street setback.

Bolzle advised the applicant that a solid screening fence is required along the north boundary line.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit off-street parking in an RM-2 zoned district - **Section 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 10; subject to all setback and screening requirements being met; finding that office use is located to the south of the property, and a parking lot would be compatible with the surrounding area; on the following described property:

Lot 9, Block 1, Nichols Resub of Parkdale Addition and south 18' of Lot 1, Block 1, Parkdale Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15957

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a heliport in an IL zoned district - **Section 1202 - PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 2, located 1040 East Oklahoma Street.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Air Evac**, 3014 North 74th East Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by **Kevin Coutant**, 320 South Boston, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who informed that **Susan Herron**, chief executive officer, will explain the operation. Ms. Herron stated that Air Evac provides critical care transport service for the Tulsa area, and is owned by Hillcrest and Saint John Hospitals.

Mr. Countant stated that the tract is zoned IL and is contiguous to the Cherokee Expressway to the south. He submitted a plot plan (Exhibit C-1) and informed that the landing pad will be located on the east side of the tract. He informed that the vacated street on the east is included in this application.

Case No. 15957 (continued)

Comments and Questions:

Ms. White inquired as to the number of flights per day and the days and hours of operation, and Ms. Herron stated that the business is a 24-hour a day operation. She informed that 893 flights were made in 1991.

Mr. Bolzle asked if flight paths have been established by the Federal Aviation Authority (FAA), and Ms. Herron stated that they have not be established, but approximately 80% of all departures will be to the south over the expressway, and flights will approach the landing area from the southeast.

Mr. Bolzle asked if Air Evac would benefit by locating near EMSA, and she stated that there is no official relationship between the two, but they could share some educational opportunities.

In response to Mr. Bolzle, Ms. Herron stated that the property will be used for offices, helicopter storage and maintenance.

Mr. Chappelle inquired as to the number of helicopters that will be using the heliport, and Ms. Herron replied that the business has one helicopter that is currently stored at the Tulsa International Airport.

Protestants:

Augusta Mann, 1502 North Norfolk, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she lives one block from the proposed heliport, and informed that she has not been able to sleep at night since EMSA moved to the area approximately five years ago. She pointed out that there are three churches in the area, as well as a YMCA. Ms. Mann stated that the additional noise generated by the heliport would only add to the existing noise problem in the area.

Emanuel Palmer, branch director of the YMCA, stated that there are young children on the YMCA property and he is interested in maintaining a safe environment for them. He informed that their vacant property will be developed into an outdoor recreation area.

Betty O'Neal, district planning chairperson for the area, stated that the residential area to the north would be negatively impacted by the installation of a heliport at the proposed location.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Coutant informed that Air Evac has completed over 5000 accident-free missions since beginning operation. He pointed out that the expressway is noisy and the heliport is an appropriate use for the industrial area.

Case No 15957 (continued)

Mr. Bolzle pointed out that there are numerous parcels available in the industrial park, and asked why the property in question was selected for the heliport.

Ms. Herron stated that this site was the only one that backed up to the expressway, which could be used as a forced landing area in case of an emergency landing on departure. She stated that they have never had a forced landing, but it is a natural landing site in the case of an emergency.

Mr. Chappelle asked Ms. Herron why the business is moving from the airport, and she stated that the business could own their building instead of leasing space, and would be outside the controlled airspace.

In response to Mr. Bolzle, Ms. Herron stated that she does not anticipate the purchase of additional aircraft in 1992.

Mr. Fuller stated that he could support the application.

Mr. Chappelle stated that he is concerned with the approach to the helipad and the potential growth of the operation. He pointed out that all types of health care businesses will experience future growth.

Mr. Bolzle voiced a concern with the proximity of the use to the residential area and the YMCA. He pointed out that the existing EMSA facility is a 24-hour operation and another such operation would overburden the neighborhood.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 1-2-0 (Fuller, "aye"; Bolzle, Chappelle "nay"; no "abstentions"; Doverspike, White, "absent") to **APPROVE*** a **Special Exception** to permit a heliport in an IL zoned district - **Section 1202 - PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 2.**

*The application was denied for lack of three affirmative votes.

Lots 1 - 8, Block 4, Liberty Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15960

Action Requested:

Variance of the required 45' setback from the centerline of South Jamestown Avenue to permit a carport - **Section 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6, located 3504 East Easton.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Rockney Bates**, 3504 East Easton, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted photographs (Exhibit D-1) of other carports in the area, and stated that he is proposing to construct a carport on his property. He explained that a school parking lot is across the street to the west, and the property across the street to the north has a carport already in place.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Hubbard stated that the plans submitted to her office did not contain sufficient information to determine how much relief is needed, and she requested that a detail site plan be provided.

Mr. Jackere asked the applicant if his carport has already been constructed, and he replied that the poles have been installed.

Mr. Bolzle pointed out that a solid structure could be built by right within 5' of the side yard setback line.

After Board discussion, it was their consensus that the application should be continued to the next scheduled meeting to allow the applicant to submit a more complete plan for the proposed construction.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; White, Doverspike, "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 15960 to March 24, 1992.

Case No. 15961

Action Requested:

Variance of the required 12' setback from an abutting residential zoned district to 6'11" to permit an addition to an existing building - **Section 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 17, 4926 East 21st Street South.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Russ Hackler**, 4926 East 21st Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by Charles White, 101 West 81st Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who submitted a plot plan (Exhibit E-1) for the proposed addition. He informed that the new construction will align with the existing building.

Comments and Questions:

In response to Mr. Bolzle, Mr. White stated that the addition will be used for storage purposes.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; White, Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of the required 12' setback from an abutting residential zoned district to 6'11" to permit an addition to an existing building - **Section 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 17; per plan submitted; finding that the new addition will align with the existing building, and approval of the request will not be detrimental to the area; on the following described property:

Lots 3 and 4, Block 1, Gracemont 1st Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15962

Action Requested:

Variance of the minimum 150' frontage to 108' to permit a lot split - **Section 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 11, located 6650 South Lewis Avenue.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Carl Liekam**, 6650 South Lewis Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by Steve Schuller, 525 South Main, Suite 1111, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who informed that the building on the property has been used for office purposes for many years, and is not suitable for commercial use. He explained that the lot split has been requested in order to separate ownership of the shopping center and the office building. He stated that there will be no additional construction on the site.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Bolzle pointed out that future commercial use of the building could result in a parking problem for the area.

Mr. Schuller informed that the property will have one 30' access point on the line between the two properties.

In response to Mr. Bolzle, Mr. Jackere advised that the Board can limit the use of the building to office use only.

Mr. Gardner stated that, if the Board is concerned with future use of the property, the use can be limited to office only and any future changes would require Board approval.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; White, Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of the minimum 150' frontage to 108' to permit a lot split - **Section 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 11; subject to TMAPC approval; and subject to building on the property being restricted to office use only; finding that the existing use is compatible with the surrounding area (also meets lot frontage requirements for an office use), and in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code; on the following described property:

Case No. 15962 (continued)

Beginning 1984.20' north of the SE/c of Section 6, T-18-N, R-13-E, thence north 108', thence west 250', thence south 108', thence east 250' to the point of beginning, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15964

Action Requested:

Variance of the 672 sq ft of signage to a total of 834 sq ft to add additional signs - **Section 1221.D. CS District Use Conditions for Signs** - Use Unit 13, located 1130 South Garnett Road

Presentation:

The applicant, **Barry Moydell**, 1221 Charles Page Boulevard, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a sign plan (Exhibit F-3) for the proposed signage. He stated that the only existing sign on the building is the awning (Exhibit F-2), and the owner is requesting that he be permitted to paint "Super Video" on the wall and install a level row of small flags along the front of the roof. Mr. Moydell stated that the purpose of the flags is to give the irregular roofline a level appearance. A letter (Exhibit F-1) from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation was submitted.

Comments and Questions:

In response to Mr. Fuller, Mr. Moydell stated that the illuminated sign is 6' tall and 100' wide, the video sign is 3' tall and 40' wide and the flags are computed at 2 sq ft per flag. He added that Camelot Inn has had flags on their spires for many years.

Mr. Gardner stated that, even if the new ordinance was applied, it appears that all wall signage has been used on the south half of the building. He pointed out that the 224' building is permitted to have 672 sq ft of wall signage.

Mr. Jones stated that Staff calculated signage for the building by including the flags on the roof as signs.

Mr. Gardner pointed out that the Board must determine if the flags on the roof constitute signage. He added that maximum signage of 672 sq ft, not including the flags on the roof, would be permitted under the new ordinance that is under consideration.

Mr. Bolzle stated that, under the existing ordinance 794 sq ft of signage would be the amount requested, without the flags on the roof.

Case No. 15964 (continued)

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; White, Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of the 672 sq ft of signage to a total of 794 sq ft to add additional signs - **Section 1221.D. CS District Use Conditions for Signs** - Use Unit 13; per plot plan; subject to the elimination of the roof flags (signs); finding that the proposed signage, without the flags, would not be detrimental to the area, or violate the spirit, purposes or intent of the Code; on the following described property:

E/2, NE/4, Section 7, T-19-N, R-14-E, City of Tulsa
Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 15966 Minutes amended 4/28/92

Action Requested:

Variance of a previously approved plot plan to permit a drive-through automatic teller machine and a remote teller; and a variance of the permitted hours of operation (Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m.- 8:00 a.m., and 9:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m.), located NW/c East 36th Street and South Yale Avenue.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Roy Johnsen**, 201 West 5th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that he is representing State Bank. He explained that the automatic teller currently located inside the bank will be relocated outside the building (Exhibit G-1) for customer convenience. Mr. Johnsen stated that there are two traffic lanes on the north side of the building, and a third lane will be installed to accommodate the new machine. He pointed out that the residential property to the north is protected by a 15' green area and a screening fence (Exhibit G-2). The applicant added that another grassy area and a second screening fence is beyond the fence that was installed by the bank. He stated that the storage areas for the houses to the north are nearest the teller machines, with the actual living areas somewhat separated from that location. Mr. Johnsen stated that, although the machines will be available 24 hours, it has been determined that few transactions take place during the nighttime hours. He requested that the hours of operation be permitted 24 hours a day Monday through Friday, and from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday.

Case No. 15966 (continued)

Comments and Questions:

In response to Mr. Fuller, the applicant stated that the previously approved plot plan depicted two lanes to the north, and a third line is now being requested. He pointed out that a revision of the plan was approved in 1991 to permit the addition of a vault inside the bank.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **FULLER**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Fuller, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; White, Doverspike, "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of a previously approved plot plan to permit a drive-through automatic teller machine and a remote teller, with hours of operation being 24 hours each day, Monday through Friday, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday (hours of operation for the bank being from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon on Saturday); per amended plot plan; finding that the additional service lane will not be detrimental to the area; on the following described property:

S/2, S/2, SE/4, NE/4, Section 21, T-19-N, R-13-E,
City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Date Approved

March 24, 1992


Chairman

