## CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES of Meeting No. 858
Tuesday, March 11, 2003, 1:00 p.m.
Francis F. Campbell City Council Room
Plaza Level of City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

| MEMBERS | MEMBERS | STAFF | OTHERS |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PRESENT | ABSENT | PRESENT | PRESENT |
| Dunham, Vice Chair | Perkins | Beach | Boulden, Legal |
| Cooper |  | Butler | Cox, Neighborhood |
| Turnbo |  | Inspections |  |
| White, Chair |  |  |  |

The notice and agenda of said meeting was posted in the City Clerk's office, City Hall, on Thursday, March 6, 2003, at 11:34 a.m., as well as at the Office of INCOG, 201 W. $5^{\text {th }}$ St., Suite 600.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair, White called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.
*.*.*.*.*.*.*.......".

Mr. Jim Beach read the rules and procedures for the Board of Adjustment Public Hearing.

## Case No. 19531

## Action Requested:

Appeal of the decision of the Neighborhood Inspector as to alleged violations; Or in the alternative: a Special Exception to permit a home occupation interior design business. SECTION 402. ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS Use Unit 6, located 3515 S. Lewis.

## Presentation:

Mr. Beach informed the Board that an interested party asked for a one month continuance. Mr. Roy Johnsen mailed a letter stating that he has no objection to the request.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak, and none with a complaint of the continuance.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 3-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins, Cooper "absent") to CONTINUE Case No. 19531 to the meeting on April 8, 2003, on the following described property:

Part of Lots 8 and 9, Beg. NE/c Lot 9 thence S 227.00' W 453.50' N 47.00' NE 21.32' SE 91.06’ NEly 164.08' NE 91.49' N 95' E 150.00’ POB, Block 4, Oakview Estates Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

## Case No. 19539

## Action Requested:

Special Exception to amend previously approved plans to allow installation of security fencing. SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 5, located S \& W of E. $6^{\text {th }}$ St. \& S. Delaware Ave.

## Presentation:

Mr. Beach informed the Board that the notice was not correct because the legal description submitted was in error. It has been given new notice for March 25, 2003. This case was stricken from the agenda.


Mr. White offered to allow time for the applicant for BOA 19529 to speak with interested party that had questions or opposition to this case.


## MINUTES

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 3-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins, Cooper "absent") to APPROVE the Minutes of February 25, 2003 (No. 857).

## NEW APPLICATIONS

## Case No. 19526

## Action Requested:

Variance to allow an accessory building in the front yard (carport, not attached and existing). SECTION 210.B. YARDS, Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards Use Unit 6; and a Variance of required setback from centerline of street from 55' to

36'4". SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, located 5725 E. $23^{\text {rd }}$ St.

## Presentation:

Donald Cooney, 5725 E. $23^{\text {rd }}$ St., stated he was not aware of the zoning code regarding carports. He informed the Board that the neighbors have no complaints.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 3-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins, Cooper "absent") to APPROVE a Variance to allow an accessory building in the front yard (carport, not attached and existing); and a Variance of required setback from centerline of street from 55' to 36'4", with condition that the carport remain open-sided, and finding there are a number of existing carports in the immediate area, on the following described property:

Lot 30, Block 6, Mary Frances Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

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


## Case No. 19527

Action Requested:
Variance of 45 square feet requirement to 107.5 square feet for a pole sign. SECTION 602.B.4.c. and e. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions - Use Unit 11, located 3709 E. $31^{\text {st }}$ St.

## Presentation:

James Adair, 7508 E. $77^{\text {th }}$ St., stated he represented Tulsa Teachers' Credit Union. He introduced Christie Reed with TTCU. He stated the zoning is OL. There is an existing 18' sign. They would like to replace the drive-through sign with a new logo, and different color cabinet. A site plan was provided (Exhibits A1 a and $\mathrm{A}-1 \mathrm{~b}$ ).

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Beach mentioned the history of a BOA application, approved for an increase of the display surface area from 64 square feet to 72 square feet of sign in 1981, Case No. 11485, and to allow two signs on the same property. Mr. Dunham asked if he was asking for the setback to be changed. Mr. Adair replied that the setback is currently 50 ' and they want to move it back to 51 '. The existing sign is 18 ' in height, and OL allows 20', and they plan to use the maximum height of $20^{\prime}$. They also plan to use a new sign pole.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 3-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins, Cooper "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of 45 square feet requirement to 107.5 square feet for a pole sign, per plan, on the following described property:

Lots 9 and 10, Block 4, Loma Linda, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.

## Case No. 19529

## Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a private park in an RS-3 district. SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 5, located 3221 E. $34^{\text {th }}$ St. N.

## Presentation:

Brent Green, the applicant, stated he was withdrawing his application, after discussions with adjoining property owners.

## Board Action:

No Board action was required, regarding the property described as follows:
S/2 W/2 W/2 NE NE NE, Section 20, T-20-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.

## Case No. 19530

## Action Requested:

Variance to increase permitted wall sign square footage on the southeast and northeast walls of Southcrest Hospital in PUD 559-A. SECTION 1103.B.2.a. USES PERMITTED IN A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, Accessory Uses Use Unit 5, located 10101 E. $91^{\text {st }}$ St.

## Tom Cooper arrived at 1:17 p.m.

## Presentation:

Brian Ward, the applicant came to present his case.
Ms. Turnbo announced she would recuse herself in Case No. 19530.
Mr. Cooper announced he would abstain from Case No. 19530.

Mr. White informed the public there was not a quorum and they would not be able to vote on Case No. 19530.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to CONTINUE Case No. 19530 to the meeting on March 25, 2003.

A tract of land that is part of Lot 1, Block 1, Southcrest Medical Campus, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, said tract of land being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Beg. at a point that is the SW/c of said Lot 1 ; thence $\mathrm{N} 01^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ W along the Wly line of Lot 1 for $503.02^{\prime}$ to a point of curve; thence continuing along said Wly line on a curve to the left with a central angle of $32^{\circ} 59^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ and radius of $260.00^{\prime}$ for $149.67^{\prime}$ to a point of reverse curve; thence NWly Nly and NEly along the Wly line of Lot 1 on a curve to the right with a central angle of $74^{\circ} 02^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ and radius of $30.00^{\prime}$ for $38.77^{\prime}$ to a point of reverse curve; thence NEly and Nly along the Wly line of Lot 1 on a curve to the left with a central angle of $41^{\circ} 03^{\prime} 42^{\prime \prime}$ and a radius of $160.00^{\prime}$ for $114.67^{\prime}$ to a point of tangency; thence $\mathrm{N} 01^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime}$ W along said tangency and along the Wly line of Lot 1 for $740.15^{\prime}$ to the NW/c of Lot 1 ; thence $\mathrm{N} 89^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$ E along the Nly line of Lot 1 for $315.00^{\prime}$; thence $\mathrm{S} 01^{\circ} 19^{\prime} 39^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ and parallel with the Wly line of Lot 1 for 403.91'; thence N 88 $40^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ for $38.84^{\prime}$; thence $\mathrm{S} 35^{\circ} 09^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ for $303.30^{\prime}$; thence $\mathrm{N} 88^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ for $32.51^{\prime}$; thence $\mathrm{S} 35^{\circ} 09^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E}$ for $73.99^{\prime}$; thence N $54^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ E for $141.00^{\prime}$; thence S $35^{\circ} 09^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$ E for 294.63'; thence $S 63^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 25^{\prime \prime}$ E for 74.94 ' to a point on the Ely line of said Lot 1 ; thence $S 26^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ E for $0.00^{\prime}$ to a point of curve; thence SWly along the Ely line of Lot 1 on a curve to the right with a central angle of $13^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ and a radius of $274.50^{\prime}$ for $63.08^{\prime}$ to a point of tangency; thence S $39^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 49^{\prime \prime}$ W along said tangency and along the SEly line of said Lot 1 for 630.16 ' to a point of curve; thence SWly and Wly along the Sly line of said Lot 1 on a curve to the right, with a central angle of $49^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 32^{\prime \prime}$ and a radius of $275.50^{\prime}$ for $237.02^{\prime}$ to a point of tangency; thence $S 88^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 21^{\prime \prime}$ W along said tangency and along the Sly line of Lot 1 for 306.19 to the POB of said tract of land.
*.*.*....................

## Case No. 19532

## Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a manufactured dwelling in an AG zoned district. SECTION 301. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICT - Use Unit 9, located 1215 N. $33^{\text {rd }}$ W. Ave.

## Presentation:

David Neff, 2924 S. Detroit, proposes to place a manufactured home on the property for a period of four years while he builds a stick built home. It has wood siding with a composition roof.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham asked for photographs of the home, but Mr. Neff did not have any to show. Mr. Neff stated the property is 20 acres and he showed the approximate location he selected for the home on the site plan. He added that it is at least 700' from the nearest dwelling. He talked with all of his neighbors and they were in support except for one interested party, but he was in agreement to the temporary condition.

## Interested Parties:

George Thomas, stated he represented his parents who own and live on the property at $1206 \mathrm{~N} .27^{\text {th }} \mathrm{W}$. Ave. They are not in total opposition, but they desire the manufactured home to be placed out of their view from their patio. They expect to sell their home in the near future and feel this would decrease an important selling point. They requested the condition of a four-year time limitation should the Board approve the application.

## Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Neff stated he would be willing to place the manufactured home out of their view to the best of his ability. He admitted the site plan is not to scale but he planned to do what he could to satisfy them.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Special Exception to allow a manufactured dwelling in an AG zoned district. SECTION 30, per plan, with condition this approval not to exceed a period of four years, on the following described property:

NE/4 NW/4 NE/4 and the N 200.00' of the NW/4 NW/4 NE/4 of Section 33, T-20N, R-12-E, of the IBM, City of Tulsa, Osage County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.".*.*.*.*.*.*.*.

## Case No. 19528

## Action Requested:

Special Exception under Section 701 to permit Use Unit 23, Bakery Products only, within the existing CH and CG districts and the requested additional CG district (Exhibit D). SECTION 701. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 23; a Variance of the Major Street Plan setback required under Section 215 reducing the urban arterial setback on the west side of the centerline of Delaware from 35' to 22'. SECTION 215. STRUCTURE SETBACK FROM ABUTTING STREETS; a Variance of the building setback required by Section 703 in the CG zoning district on the west side of the centerline of Delaware from 85' (35' urban arterial right-of-way width plus 50') to 22' for approximately 75' (Exhibit E). SECTION 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE

COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS; a Variance of the requirements of Section 1301.D to permit a part of the required off-street parking for the offices and plant facilities within Tract A to be located within Tracts B and C (Exhibits G-H). SECTION 1301.D. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS; and a Variance deleting the screening requirement of Section 1302.A for the existing off-street parking in Tract B in a RM2 district along the north boundary and the north 20' of the west boundary (Exhibit G). SECTION 1302.A. SETBACKS; a Variance of the off-street parking setback from the centerline of $10^{\text {th }}$ Street required by Section 1302.B from 50 ' to $35^{\prime}$ to permit existing off-street parking in Tract B to be located along the north boundary (Exhibit G). SECTION 1302.B. SETBACKS; a Variance deleting the screening requirement of Section 1032.A to permit off-street parking on the west side of Tract C in a CH district on the east side of Delaware (Exhibit H). SECTION 1302.A. SETBACKS; and a Variance of the off-street parking setback from the centerline of Delaware required by Section 1302.B from 50' to 35 ' to permit off-street parking in Tract C along the east side of Delaware (Exhibit H). SECTION 1302.B. SETBACKS, located 2745 E. $11^{\text {th }}$ St

## Presentation:

Charles E. Norman, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower, stated he represented the Bama Pie Company. He submitted applicant's packet and photographs (Exhibit B-2 and B-3) to the Board. The purpose of the application is to permit Bama to add an additional product line and expand the facility on the north side as indicated in the exhibits submitted. Mr. Norman mentioned they presented plans to Maria Barnes, Chairperson of the Kendall-Whittier Neighborhood and Scott Swearingen, the President of the Renaissance Neighborhood. They did not express any concerns regarding this project. Mr. Norman informed the Board that the existing east building wall of the main building encroaches on the Delaware right-of-way by three feet. This has existed for 45 to 50 years. They have contacted City of Tulsa Public Works and Traffic Engineering and they stated they have no intention of trying to acquire part of the building in order to widen and improve Delaware Ave. The City of Tulsa has recommended three feet of the right-of-way to permit the building to remain. He added this has gone through the process and should go before the City Council Thursday of this week. He explained the concept plans have been approved by Traffic Engineering and Public Works as a part of the vacation of the three feet. They would prefer to use cameras for security and not have solid screening fences. A site plan was provided (Exhibit B-1a-d).

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Special Exception under Section 701 to permit Use Unit 23, Bakery Products only, within the existing CH and CG districts and the requested additional CG district (Exhibit D); a Variance of the Major Street Plan setback required under Section 215 reducing the urban arterial setback on the west side of the centerline of Delaware from 35' to 22'; a Variance of the building setback required by Section 703 in the CG zoning district on the west side of the centerline of Delaware from 85' (35'
urban arterial right-of-way width plus 50 ') to $22^{\prime}$ for approximately $75^{\prime}$ (Exhibit E); a Variance of the requirements of Section 1301.D to permit a part of the required offstreet parking for the offices and plant facilities within Tract A to be located within Tracts B and C (Exhibits G-H); a Variance deleting the screening requirement of Section 1302.A for the existing off-street parking in Tract B in a RM-2 district along the north boundary and the north 20' of the west boundary (Exhibit G); a Variance of the off-street parking setback from the centerline of $10^{\text {th }}$ Street required by Section 1302.B from 50 ' to 35 ' to permit existing off-street parking in Tract B to be located along the north boundary (Exhibit G); a Variance deleting the screening requirement of Section 1032.A to permit off-street parking on the west side of Tract C in a CH district on the east side of Delaware (Exhibit H); and a Variance of the off-street parking setback from the centerline of Delaware required by Section 1302.B from 50' to 35' to permit off-street parking in Tract C along the east side of Delaware (Exhibit H), per plan, with condition for a tie-agreement between Tracts A, B, and C.

An interested party was overlooked and Mr. White welcomed her to speak to the Board.

## Interested Parties:

Mary Burkholder, 1128 S. Delaware Pl., expressed concern that this project was going to take up five feet of her property. When she found this was not true, she had no objections.

The Board Action stands approved as above, finding this is a continuation of previous plans, and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, and finding it would be beneficial to the neighborhood, regarding the following described property:

Tract A: Lot 1, Block 1, Bama Pie, and the E 40.00' of Lot 2 and the W 50' of Lot 3 and the S 75' of Lot 12, Block 13, Highlands Addition, and a part of vacated $10^{\text {th }}$ St. adjacent to the Nly line of said Lot 1, Bama Pie, being more particularly described as follows, to-wit: Beg. at a point that is the most Ely NE/c of said Lot 1, Bama Pie; thence S $89^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 27^{\prime \prime}$ W along said Nly line of Lot 1 for 20.00'; thence $\mathrm{N} 00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ E and parallel with a Nly extension of the Ely line of Lot 1 for 10.00'; thence $N 89^{\circ} 40^{\prime 2} 27^{\prime \prime}$ E and parallel with the Nly line of Lot 1 for $20.00^{\prime}$ to a point on said Nly extension; thence S $00^{\circ} 00^{\prime} 06^{\prime \prime}$ W along the Nly extension for $10.00^{\prime}$ to the POB of said tract of land; Tract B: Lots 6 and 7 and the E/2 of Lot 8, Block 12, Highlands Addition; Tract C: Lots $15-21$ inclusive, Block 3, Signal Addition, all in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

Case No. 19535
Action Requested:

Variance of the required rear yard from $25^{\prime}$ to 14 '0" for an addition to a nonconforming structure. SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 6; a Variance of the required 5,000 square feet livability space to 2,875 square feet (existing 2,940 square feet - lot is 5,148 square feet). SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; and a Variance to expand a non-conforming structure. SECTION 1405. STRUCTURAL NONCONFORMITIES, located 2433 S. Troost.

## Presentation:

Michael Schmitz, 1601 S. Detroit, stated he is the architect representing Robert and Kimberly Norman. They propose to add a master bath and closet space on the second level above the family room. The home was built was built in 1927. They also want to add a mudroom on the first level. It is an irregularly shaped lot and the existing livability space is well under the maximum of 5,000 square feet. The owner spoke with neighbors and found no opposition. A site plan was provided (Exhibit D-1).

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Beach pointed out that the livability space would be within the requirements and the variance of livability space is not needed.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of the required rear yard from 25 ' to 14 '0" for an addition to a non-conforming structure; and a Variance to expand a non-conforming structure, per plan, noting the variance for livability space is not required, finding this is a non-conforming lot and structure, and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

Lot 8, Block 8, Terwilliger Heights, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.

## Case No. 19536

Action Requested:
Variance to allow a sign in the planned right-of-way 35 ' from the centerline of East $31^{\text {st }}$ Street. SECTION 1104.D. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS, Building Height, Setbacks and Yards - Use Unit 11, located 3708 E. $31^{\text {st }}$ St.

## Presentation:

James Adair, 7508 E. $77^{\text {th }}$, stated he represented Tulsa Teacher's Credit Union. This application is regarding the main office building with a credit union on the lower floor. There is an existing sign they wish to replace. The trunks of the trees interfere with the view of the sign.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Variance to allow a sign in the planned right-of-way 35 ' from the centerline of East $31^{\text {st }}$ Street, per plan, subject to a removal contract, finding the hardship to be that if the sign were moved any further south it would be blocked by the existing trees, and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

E/2 Lot 4 and Lot 3, Albert Pike Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*......................

## Case No. 19537

## Action Requested:

Variance of $25^{\prime}$ rear yard to $20^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ on corner for new construction in an RS-2 district. SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS - Use Unit 6, located 9444 S. Jamestown Ave.

## Presentation:

Robert Montgomery, 4018 E. $87^{\text {th }}$ St., He purchased the subject property for a new home. They have house plans that fit the lot with the exception of the northeast corner. He stated the hardship is the shape of the lot. A site plan was provided (Exhibit F-1).

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent" to APPROVE a Variance of 25 ' rear yard to $20^{\prime \prime} 8$ " on corner for new construction in an RS-2 district, per plan, finding the unusual shape of the lot, and the variance is for only one corner of the house, and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

Lot 22, Block 1, Tanglewood Estates, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.........................

## Case No. 19538

## Action Requested:

Variance of sign setback requirement of 60' to $54.6^{\prime}$, which is in planned right-ofway. SECTION 1221.C.6. and 1221.C.15. USE UNIT 21. BUSINESS SIGNS AND OUTDOOR ADVERTISING, General Use Conditions for Business Signs; and a Variance of 25' height limit to 30'. SECTION 1221.D. USE UNIT 21. BUSINESS SIGNS AND OUTDOOR ADVERTISING, CS District Use Conditions for Business Signs, located 6004 S. Memorial.

## Presentation:

James Adair, 7508 E. $77^{\text {th }}$ St., stated he represented Copper Mountain Shopping Center. He added that the center has been there for many years and the sign was installed legally at 50'. The sign is now non-conforming because the property line is 60' rather than the previous 50'. They have located the utilities and the easement. Mr. Adair explained that now they are challenged to build the parking lot and still have exposure for traffic on Memorial. The parking lot is divided by a ten foot easement to an apartment complex. They propose to put up three signs instead of the two allowed currently.

## Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham noted that relief was not requested for square footage requirement.

## Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present who wished to speak.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 4-0-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, Cooper "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Variance of sign setback requirement of 60 ' to $54.6^{\prime}$, which is in planned right-of-way; and a Variance of 25 ' height limit to 30 ', subject to a removal contract; and to CONTINUE to the meeting of March 25,2003 , on the following described property:

Lot 13, Block 3, The Falls, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.*.

## Case No. 19540

## Presentation:

Lou Reynolds, 2727 E. $21^{\text {st }}$ St., stated he represented the applicant on this project. They propose to build a car wash with eight bays, and brick exterior. They plan to follow the screening requirements, and use lighting that is shielded away from the neighborhoods. The utility easement was removed and there will be a substantial ditch, which will provide a natural barrier. The applicant discussed the application with the neighbors to resolve issues.

## Interested Parties:

Gary Pinc, 16435 E. $1^{\text {st }}$ St., stated he is not in opposition. He explained their desire to use the driveway and gate in the back yard to access the cul-de-sac. Mr. White responded that this would involve crossing property that is not involved in this application. Mr. Beach added there would be a lot of problems trying to achieve that. Mr. White informed Mr. Pinc that the Board could not help him with his request at this time.

Gary West, 16403 E. $1^{\text {st }}$ St., expressed concern regarding noise and suggested a sound barrier for the car wash. He provided letters and a petition (Exhibits G-1 and G-2) from neighbors that could not attend. They are concerned about noise and fumes.

Daniel Franks, 16201 E. $1^{\text {st }}$ St., stated he was concerned about the water drainage that flows to his property.

Johnnie Charles, 16429 E. $1^{\text {st }}$ St., was concerned that access to the cul-de-sac would cause a traffic problem. Mr. Beach informed him the car wash would not have any access to the cul-de-sac.

## Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Reynolds pointed out that two of the car wash bays are automatic and they do not have the noisy dryer blowers. There is adequate distance from houses, and a solid screening fence will be constructed. Mr. Cooper stated concern about the noise of the vacuums. Mr. Reynolds responded that he was informed the vacuums do not generate that much noise, and they will be 300' to 400' away from the rear property line, plus the distance to the homes. Mr. Cooper asked if there were hours of operation. Mr. Reynolds replied it would be a 24 hour per day operation.

## Board Action:

On MOTION of Dunham, the Board voted 3-1-0 (White, Dunham, Turnbo, "aye"; Cooper "nay"; no "abstentions"; Perkins "absent") to APPROVE a Special Exception to permit a car wash in a CS district, with conditions for car wash and vacuum island only on west end of plan, no truck wash, brick exterior, no dryer blowers, a solid screening fence to be constructed on the south boundary line, all lighting be directed away from the neighborhood to the south and east of the property, finding it will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code, and will
not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare, regarding the following described property:

Lot 4, and 5, Block 1, Quik Trip Commercial Center, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.
*..................".

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Date approved: $\qquad$

Chair

