



## City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment

### Minutes of Meeting No. 1359

**Tuesday, April 22, 2025, 1:00 p.m.**

Tulsa City Council Chamber, 175 E. 2nd St., Tulsa, OK 74103

The notice and the amended agenda of said meeting were posted in the City Clerk's office on April 17, 2025, at 9:38 a.m.

**Members Present:** Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Audrey Blank, Nathan Foster, Erin Roark, Caleb Rocha

#### **Speaker Key:**

(+) indicates a speaker generally supportive of an item;

(-) indicates a speaker generally opposed to an item; and

(=) indicates a speaker generally neutral or who has questions about an item.

Motions and actions require an affirmative vote of three members. When there is less than a full Board, the Board may consider a request to continue agenda items to a later meeting date.

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

### **Approval of Minutes**

---

#### **Minutes from Meeting 1358, April 8, 2025**

Motion: Approval of Minutes.

Motion By: Barrientos

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

### **Unfinished Business**

---

**BOA-23869**

Location: 1120 East Woodward Boulevard South

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Tom Neal

**Action(s) Requested**

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-2 district (Section 45.031-D); Special Exception to increase the permitted floor area for an accessory dwelling unit (Section 45.031-D.6); Variance to increase the maximum allowed 18-foot plate height in the rear setback for an accessory dwelling unit (Section 90.090-C.2).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Tom Neal, 2507 E. 11th Pl., stated that his client is unable to repurpose the existing ADU, leading to the decision to demolish it and build a new structure within the same footprint. He expressed a desire to raise the plate height to better accommodate modern vehicles.

**Speakers**

None

**Board Comments**

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 2.11-2.15 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the need to fit modern vehicles and that the original building was built before the modern zoning code.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

*The Board finds that the special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the zoning code and that it will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.*

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Property Description**

LT 2 BLK 10, SUNSET PARK AMD, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

**BOA-23870**

Location: 321 East Reconciliation Way North

City Council District: 1

Applicant: Lou Reynolds, Eller & Detrich, P.C.

**Action(s) Requested**

Variance to permit a structure in the right-of-way (Section 90.090-A).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Nathalie Cornett, 2727 E. 21st St., stated that her client, MidFirst Bank, plans to install a walk-up ATM in the public right-of-way. She explained that the proposed location was chosen in accordance with MidFirst's policy, which prohibits the placement of ATMs in certain areas, including isolated, poorly lit locations and behind buildings. She stated that the policy aims to ensure that ATMs are easily accessible and safe for both customers and equipment. She highlighted that the challenge arises from the building being constructed up to the property line, leaving the construction of an ATM in the right-of-way the only feasible option.

**Speakers**

None

**Board Comments**

Ms. Radney stated that the proposed ATM will be placed in the least disruptive area. Mr. Barrientos noted that the renderings provided a clearer understanding of the ATM's intended location. He stated that the proposed location is the most suitable placement.

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 3.13-3.14 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the location of the building, the location of the utilities, and safety concerns on the site.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Property Description**

PRT LT 1 BEG SECR LT 1 TH SW85 NW50 NE84.91 SE50 POB & PRT LT 2 & PRT VAC ALLEY BEG NEC LT 2 TH SE100 SW150 NW95 NE64.99 NW5 NE85 POB & LT 3 & E10 VAC ALLEY ADJ ON W BLK 25, TULSA-ORIGINAL TOWN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

## New Applications

---

### **BOA-23877**

Location: 10010 South Riverside Parkway

City Council District: 2

Applicant: Claude Neon Federal Signs

### **Action(s) Requested**

Variance to allow a freestanding sign that is not a monument-style sign and is not consistent with the architectural character of the buildings on the site in the RDO-2 district (Section 20.050-D.5); Variance to increase the 6-foot maximum height and 50-square-foot maximum sign area for freestanding and monument signs in the RDO-2 district (Section 20.050-D.5); Variance to allow two dynamic display signs on one lot in the CS and RDO-2 districts (Section 20.050-D.5; Section 60.080-E); Variance to allow dynamic display signs to exceed the maximum display area of 48 square feet in the CS district (Section 60.080-E); Variance to permit a dynamic display sign within 50 feet of the driving surface of a signalized intersection (Section 60.100-D).

### **Presentation by Applicant**

Will Stanford, 1225 N. Lansing Ave., stated that all the Kum & Go locations have been rebranded as Maverick, and they are seeking approval to upgrade the existing signage to digital technology. He noted that the dynamic display would indicate fuel prices, and additionally, a change in price every eight seconds to reflect credit card discounts. He stated that the hardship is the shape of the lot, and the presence of a multi-tenant establishment, which would necessitate a larger sign.

### **Speakers**

(-) Steve Easley, 9640 S. 67th E. Ave., was concerned that the installation of dynamic display signs could detract from the riverfront's aesthetic and contradict the architectural integrity of the RDO district.

### **Rebuttal**

The applicant clarified that the signs are already in place, and they are merely upgrading to digital technology. He pointed out that the gas station predates the establishment of the RDO.

### **Board Comments**

Ms. Radney asked Mr. Foster to elaborate on the RDO.

Mr. Foster explained that the RDO was adopted in 2016 to safeguard the city's investment in the Arkansas River to ensure pedestrian friendly uses. He mentioned that it also imposes building restrictions requiring structures to be situated closer to the trail and mandates specific transparency levels along any trail or riverfront. He clarified that it also limits what uses are allowed along the Arkansas corridor. He stated that while gas stations are prohibited within the district, those already in existence are permitted to remain. He indicated that any modifications to their site or signage would necessitate compliance with the overly requirements.

Ms. Stauffer acknowledged the need for signage to adapt to the new business and for gas prices to be displayed digitally; however, she expressed her opposition to the proposed eight-second dwell time for price changes. She noted that while this may not be a problem in other areas of the city, it is a different matter within the RDO. She concluded that there needs to be a balanced approach, and the current proposal does not achieve that.

Mr. Barrientos expressed his support for the existing signage, but he opposed the idea of the price changing every eight seconds. He stated that approving it in its current form would set a concerning precedent.

Mr. Wallace noted that while improvements to the signage are being made, the signs are becoming taller and larger, which he does not support. He emphasized that they should be held to a different standard since they are in the RDO.

Ms. Williams voiced her support for the RDO, arguing that the current proposal does not enhance the overlay.

The Board requested that the applicant return with alternative plans that would better align with the RDO. The applicant agreed to return with plans that better align with the RDO.

**Board Action**

Motion: Continue to the May 13, 2025 meeting.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

**BOA-23878**

Location: 3420 North Peoria Avenue  
City Council District: 1  
Applicant: AMAX Sign Company, Inc.

**Action(s) Requested**

Variance to permit more than one freestanding sign per street frontage and to exceed the allowable display surface area of freestanding signs for a school use in the RS-3 district (Section 60.050-B.2.b).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Chris Krohn, 9520 E. 55th Pl., mentioned that the property has two distinct entities, and they would like to install a second ground sign to enhance wayfinding.

**Speakers**

None

Mr. Wallace exited the meeting at 1:46 p.m.

**Board Comments**

Ms. Stauffer stated that adding a new sign would help with wayfinding and enhance safety for both sites. Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 5.13-5.14 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the need for wayfinding, which ultimately leads to safety for each facility on the site.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: Wallace

Absent: None

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Property Description**

BEG 20N OF SECR NE NE TH W872.96 N712.50 E872.96 S712.50 TO POB SEC 24 20 12, UNPLATTED, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Mr. Wallace re-entered the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

**BOA-23879**

Location: 3215 East 65th Street South

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Paige Merritt

Mr. Wallace exited the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

**Action(s) Requested**

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-1 district (Section 45.031-D).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Clint Merritt, 3215 E. 65th St., expressed his desire to construct an ADU on his property that follows all zoning regulations. He noted that he had spoken with his neighbors, who have no objections to the plan.

**Speakers**

None

**Board Comments**

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 6.13-6.16 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Barrientos

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: Wallace

Absent: None

*The Board finds that the special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the zoning code and that it will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.*

**Property Description**

*LT 11 BLK 4, HILLCREST ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma*

Mr. Wallace re-entered the meeting at 1:55 p.m.

**BOA-23880**

Location: 2258 East 31st Street South

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Bell Land Use LLC, Robert Bell

**Action(s) Requested**

Variance to reduce the required 35-foot arterial street setback in the RS-2 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3);

Variance to reduce the required 25-foot rear setback in the RS-2 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Robert Bell, 101 E. Aquarium Pl., Jenks, indicated that his client intends to build a house on the property; however, he requires a variance due to the side and front of the home facing arterial streets. He mentioned that the corner of the property is curved, which requires a greater setback from the property line. He pointed out that most properties with a side yard adjacent to an arterial street do not adhere to the required 35-foot setback but instead maintain a 10-to-15-foot setback. He asserted that their proposal aligns with the character of the area.

**Speakers**

None

**Board Comments**

Mr. Wallace noted the presence of several non-conforming lots in the area and affirmed that the proposed development would be consistent with the area. Mr. Barrientos remarked on the unique nature of the lot, given its orientation towards two arterial streets.

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 7.13-7.17 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the uniquely shaped lot and the unique platting for RS-2.

Motion By: Wallace

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Property Description**

LT 1 BLK 1, OAKNOLL, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case BOA-23882 was heard next.

**BOA-23881**

Location: 6161 South Yale Avenue

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Lou Reynolds, Eller & Detrich, P.C.

**Action(s) Requested**

Special Exception to permit a hospital use in the RS-3 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2); Variance to increase the permitted 35-foot height limit in the RS-3 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3); Variance to reduce the required 10-foot setback from R districts in the OH district (Section 15.030-A, Table 15-3); Variance to reduce the required 25-foot setback for special exception uses in an R district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3; Section 5.030-B, Table Note [4]).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Lou Reynolds, 2727 E. 21st St., stated that the uniqueness of the property lies in the fact that most of the property is situated in the OH district, while the proposed site for a new parking garage falls within the RS-3 district, designated as a reserve area for the residential neighbors. He indicated that the plan includes not only the construction of an additional parking garage but also the renovation of the existing two garages to enhance their usability and accessibility. He explained that the new parking garage is designed to accommodate 3,400 vehicles across eight levels, featuring a façade that aims to blend with the natural surroundings. He elaborated that the new parking garage will incorporate 45-inch concrete walls intended to shield headlights and reduce noise. He indicated that the nearest residence to the new building is located at the southeast corner, and the garage is situated 88 feet from the lot line and 200 feet from the home itself. He mentioned that conversations have taken place with the neighbor regarding the planting of up to 20 four-inch caliber trees, each expected to be at least 12 feet tall at the time of planting. He noted that approximately 60 additional trees will be planted around the proposed garage to provide a visual barrier. He stated that construction is projected to extend beyond three years, with a strategy to ensure that two parking garages remain operational throughout the process, as one garage will be demolished only after the new one is completed. He highlighted that the challenges faced are due to the change in grade and the inability to construct on the western side of the property because of a utility vault that serves all the campus facilities.

**Speakers**

(+) Kenneth Ruggiano, 6212 S. Fulton Cir., was in support of the application.

(+) Peter Brobston, 6226 S. Fulton Cir., was in support of the application.

(+) Niel Mavis, 6120 S. Fulton Ave., was in support of the application.

(=) Ken Smith, 502 W. 6th St., indicated that he represents the Whang family living at 5401 E. 65th St., who will be significantly affected by the proposed parking garage. He mentioned that they are currently in discussions with the hospital regarding the installation of appropriate screening with trees, and that after 18 months, following the construction of the south building, the hospital has committed to erecting a sound barrier wall. He expressed his desire for the applicant to officially acknowledge on the record that negotiations with the property owner are ongoing.

Mr. Foster inquired whether the presented plans for screening and landscaping align with the negotiations. Mr. Smith confirmed that the plans reflect the terms that they have been discussing.

(-) A.C. Westlake, 6244 S. Hudson Ave., was concerned that the parking garage would overshadow the nearby homes and expressed apprehension that Saint Francis might rezone the area, allowing for unrestricted future development.

(-) Kathleen White, 5521 E. 61st Pl., was concerned about drainage problems and the potential effect on property values.

- (-) Tabitha Newcomb, 5522 E. 61st Ct., was concerned about the noise generated by the new parking garage.
- (-) Jon Bash, 5416 E. 65th Pl., was concerned about vehicle congestion resulting from the parking garage and cautioned that constructing it to a significant height could set a precedent for further development by Saint Francis on the reserve area.
- (-) Diana Cox, 5441 E. 65th St., was concerned that the new parking garage would infringe on residents' privacy and diminish property values. She noted that she believes that there is a lack of sufficient neighborhood support for the project to proceed.

### **Rebuttal**

Robert McNamara, 6161 S. Yale, Ave., a healthcare architect with Saint Francis Health System, indicated that they assessed potential locations for a parking lot to accommodate employee parking, ultimately determining that the proposed site at the rear of the property was the most suitable. He clarified that the project does not involve increasing the hospital's capacity but aims to address the persistent problem of insufficient parking. He mentioned that the new garage will feature three access points for entering and exiting the hospital. He noted that they conducted three public meetings and utilized various advertising methods to inform the community. He elaborated on their collaboration with the HOA president and board to facilitate the voting process, which involved a single count and submission. He confirmed that the necessary documentation had been signed by both the HOA president and secretary. He highlighted the multiple channels available for residents to stay informed, including a QR code linked to the presentation shared during the HOA meetings. He explained that the neighborhood's voting was conducted via mail or digitally, with an independent public relations firm managing the process, while they provided information as needed. He expressed their commitment to working in good faith with the Whang family towards mediation regarding their property, acknowledging its significant effect. He noted that they have met with the family several times, although a resolution has not yet been reached. He assured the neighbors and the board that there are no plans to encroach further into the reserve area. He stated that the garage will be constructed with a concrete structure designed to better absorb sound, and that a perforated metal will be installed on the south and east sides to reduce noise and light pollution. He stated that the landscape plan has been outlined, and they intend to consult with the neighborhood HOA landscaping group. He concluded that the establishment of the parking garage will effectively address current and future parking challenges for the next 50 years.

### **Board Comments**

Mr. Wallace expressed his understanding of the neighbors' concerns and encouraged them to maintain dialogue with the hospital. He acknowledged the hospital's long-standing presence and explained that the utilization of such facilities evolves over time. He recognized the necessity for additional parking and noted that were it not for the existence of two parking garages, there might be a valid argument against it. He emphasized that the hospital is making significant efforts to address the neighbors' concerns.

Ms. Stauffer conveyed her understanding of the neighbors' perspectives and encouraged ongoing discussions regarding the proposed parking garage. She stated that there are genuine intentions to resolve issues associated with a large construction project and highlighted that the design of the parking garage prevents further encroachment into the neighborhood reserve area.

Ms. Radney expressed her preference for the negotiation between the hospital and the Whang family to be finalized prior to voting on the application. She raised concerns about the lack of data regarding the depth and volume of the existing pond and the potential impact of runoff from the parking garage. She indicated a desire for more information on the detention system and the volume of water to be managed in the area, proposing that the board postpone the matter to gather more definitive information.

Grant Philips, 123 N. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., a civil engineer and project manager, indicated that the pond in question was artificially created prior to the establishment of the neighborhood. He explained that the current

project aims to preserve the pond in its natural state while minimizing runoff into it. He further noted that all drainage designs will undergo permitting through the City of Tulsa and will be evaluated by Development Services. He elaborated that the design of the garage, which features a stairstep configuration, was intentionally made shallower than the pond to mitigate the effects of excavation beneath it. He explained that as the structure extends northward, the garage depth increases to address concerns regarding water seepage from the pond into the garage. He assured the board that their engineering team has conducted studies that validate and endorse their excavation strategy for the garage.

Ms. Radney expressed that providing more detailed information regarding the hospital's developments and the topographical changes would benefit both neighbors and prospective home buyers in the area. She emphasized that refining the information would lead to a more concise understanding for the board.

Ms. Stauffer conveyed her confidence in the permitting process and affirmed that the civil engineers are adequately addressing all concerns raised by the city. She expressed her readiness to cast her vote on the issue.

Ms. Radney voiced her reluctance to rely solely on the city to pass on information to property owners to the east. She advocated for greater transparency with neighbors and indicated that she would vote against the proposal on that premise.

Ms. Stauffer stated that she had gathered sufficient information to reach a decision.

Mr. Reynolds indicated that they are working in good faith with the Whang family and emphasized that it is unnecessary to continue the application due to ongoing negotiations. He remarked that the board rarely, if ever, addresses stormwater issues, which fall outside of their purview, but which are rather the responsibility of Public Works. He assured the board that they will comply with any requests made by Public Works.

Ms. Radney acknowledged Mr. Reynolds's remarks but highlighted that the proposed structure in question is an eight-story parking garage.

Mr. Reynolds reiterated that they have adhered to all city regulations and procedures, urging the board to proceed with a vote on the matter.

Mr. Wallace stated that he agreed with Mr. Reynolds, reiterating that stormwater considerations are beyond their purview. He expressed confidence that city officials reviewing the plans will ensure compliance with all codes.

Mr. Barrientos stated that he had gathered sufficient information to cast his vote. He mentioned that the proposed parking garage represents the least disruptive option.

### **Board Action**

**Motion:** Approve the Special Exception to permit a hospital use in the RS-3 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2), per plans on pages 8.9-8.18 of the agenda packet.

**Motion By:** Wallace

**Ayes:** Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Absent:** None

*The Board finds that the special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the zoning code and that it will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.*

**Board Action**

**Motion:** Approve the Variance to increase the permitted 35-foot height limit in the RS-3 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3), per plans on pages 8.9-8.18 of the agenda packet. The Board finds the hardship to be the existing topographic conditions and the unique adjacency to a residentially zoned area as well as existing utility constraints on the property.

**Motion By:** Wallace

**Ayes:** Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** None

**Absent:** None

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Board Action**

**Motion:** Approve the Variance to reduce the required 10-foot setback from R districts in the OH district (Section 15.030-A, Table 15-3), per plans on pages 8.9-8.18 of the agenda packet. The Board finds the hardship to be the existing topographic conditions and the unique adjacency to a residentially zoned area as well as existing utility constraints on the property.

**Motion By:** Wallace

**Ayes:** Barrientos, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

**Nays:** None

**Abstentions:** Radney

**Absent:** None

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve the Variance to reduce the required 25-foot setback for special exception uses in an R district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3; Section 5.030-B, Table Note [4]), per plans on pages 8.9-8.18 of the agenda packet. The Board finds the hardship to be the existing topographic conditions and the unique adjacency to a residentially zoned area as well as existing utility constraints on the property.

Motion By: Wallace

Ayes: Barrientos, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: Radney

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

*In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: 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; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; 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; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; 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 that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.*

**Property Description**

A TRACT OF LAND BEING A PART OF BLOCK ONE (1) OF WARREN MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL CENTER AND RESERVE AREA "A" OF WARRENTON, AND IN THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW/4) OF SECTION THREE (3), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE THIRTEEN (13) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN (I.B.&M.), CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO RECORDED PLAT, AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS, TO-WIT:

COMMENCING (P.O.C.) AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION THREE (3); THENCE S01°27'46"E ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE NORTHWEST QUARTER (NW/4) OF SAID SECTION THREE (3) FOR A DISTANCE OF 1496.81 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BLOCK ONE (1) OF SAID WARREN MEDICAL PROFESSIONAL CENTER; THENCE N88°43'41"E ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK ONE (1) FOR A DISTANCE OF 943.92 FEET TO A POINT ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK ONE (1) AND THE POINT OF BEGINNING (P.O.B.); THENCE CONTINUING N88°43'41"E ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID BLOCK ONE (1) FOR A DISTANCE OF 185.80 FEET; THENCE N01°07'00"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 571.02 FEET; THENCE N89°00'52"E FOR A DISTANCE OF 246.33 FEET; THENCE S01°34'06"E FOR A DISTANCE OF 938.96 FEET; THENCE S89°01'19"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 206.90 FEET; THENCE N00°30'39"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 18.14 FEET; THENCE S88°55'43"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 304.72 FEET; THENCE N01°26'39"W FOR A DISTANCE OF 162.06 FEET; THENCE N20°09'19"E FOR A DISTANCE OF 200.72 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING (P.O.B.) AREA CONTAINS 7.29 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

**BOA-23882**

Location: 6514 East Pine Place

City Council District: 3

Applicant: Superior Contracting & Development

**Action(s) Requested**

Special Exception to permit a detached house in the CS district (Section 15.020-H, Table 15-2.5).

**Presentation by Applicant**

Al Franks, 6514 E. Pine Pl., expressed a desire to construct a detached house at the rear of the property. He stated that he has spoken to the neighbors, and they are all happy with the fact that it will no longer be boarded up.

**Speakers**

None

**Board Comments**

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

**Board Action**

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 9.10 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Williams

Ayes: Barrientos, Radney, Stauffer, Wallace, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

*The Board finds that the special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the zoning code and that it will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.*

**Property Description**

*LT 3 BLK 2, SPARTAN COURT, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma*

Case BOA-23881 was heard next.

**Other Business**

---

None

**New Business**

---

None

**Board Member Comments**

---

Ms. Radney stated that she appreciated everyone for coming out and making their opinions known.

**Staff Comments**

---

None

**Adjournment**

---

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Date approved: 5/27/2025

Chair: 