



City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment

Minutes of Meeting No. 1383

Tuesday, May 26, 2026, 1:00 p.m.

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

The notice and the agenda of said meeting were posted in the City Clerk's office on May 20, 2026, at 8:44 a.m.

Members Present: Barrientos, Dumas., Hale, Stauffer, 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, Barrientos called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from Meeting 1382, May 12, 2026

Motion: Approval of Minutes.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

New Business

BOA-24040

Location: 2207 South Delaware Court

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Zach Rash

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D); Variance of the exterior finish and roof pitch requirements for an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D.8).

Presentation by Applicant

Lindsay Floyd, 2650 W. 71st St., stated that her client is seeking an additional 94 square feet for a detached garage. She explained that the homeowner needs the additional space to accommodate a work vehicle, a 4'x8' work trailer that requires covered storage, and a tool room designed for security and organization. She mentioned that the recommended dimensions for a two-car garage are between 22 to 24 feet in depth and 28 feet in width.

Alexander Lewis, 3536 E. 23rd St., stated that he is employed at the Port of Catoosa, where he transports tools and supplies to a factory. He mentioned that company policy mandates that both the company vehicle and trailer must be stored in covered parking. He expressed that without covered storage at his residence, he would have to leave the trailer at the factory, resulting in multiple trips each week to retrieve and return it. He pointed out examples of larger garages within a two-block radius and noted that he identified 20–25 similar garages in the wider neighborhood.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer expressed her understanding of the homeowner's personal situation but emphasized that the hardship must be evaluated based on the property itself. She remarked that the structure was constructed prior to the establishment of the modern zoning code, at a time when vehicles were smaller. She indicated that the request seemed to represent the minimum relief necessary to accommodate a two-car garage. Mr. Hale expressed his belief that the hardship is self-imposed.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 2.11 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be that the property was platted before the modern zoning code.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Hale

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 5 BK 6, WILSHIRE MANOR, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24041

Location: 2630 East 16th Street South

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Michael Craig Thomas

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit a carport in the street setback and street yard in the RS-3 district (Section 90.090-C.1).

Presentation by Applicant

Josh Zajac, 1719 S. 94th E. Ave., indicated that the lot spans more than an acre and contains a small house occupied by a single man approaching retirement. He mentioned that the homeowner is seeking to construct a 30 by 50 garage for personal storage purposes. He mentioned that the hardship stems from the RS-3 regulation, which restricts the size of detached accessory structures based on the square footage of the principal residence. He highlighted that larger homes in the vicinity are permitted to build accessory buildings of comparable size or larger as a matter of right, whereas this smaller home restricts the owner despite the presence of a large lot and a neighborhood trend of substantial storage buildings.

Speakers

(-) Teresa Tosh, 2959 W. 58th St., stated that the homeowner had previously indicated to her that he acquired the property with the intention of building a garage shop to establish a business. She noted that he does not reside there and works on vehicles in other detached structures. She expressed concern that the construction of the building could lead to visibility issues when ascending the hill, particularly if multiple vehicles were present at any time.

(+) Tom Clark, 5757 S. 31st W. Ave., stated that he is not a mechanic and he has no plans to start a business. He mentioned that his goal is to create personal storage to organize his belongings and feel comfortable in one location. He expressed that the neighbors had misinterpreted his statements, and he has no desire to disturb the peaceful neighborhood.

Rebuttal

None

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer noted that the proposal includes twice the amount of garage space compared to living space. She indicated that she did not perceive a clear hardship presented by either the applicant or the owner. Ms. Dumas remarked that a wish for additional space does not constitute a hardship. Ms. Williams said that the construction of a large building would have implications for drainage. Mr. Hale observed that if the proposed structure were to be connected to the main residence, it would be regarded as part of the principal building and would not be subject to the 40% cap on detached accessory structures.

Board Action

Motion: Deny the application.

Motion By: Dumas

Ayes: Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Barrientos

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 1 BK 3, GLENDALE ADDITION, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24042

Location: 2823 East 42nd Street North

City Council District: 1

Applicant: Rommel Cannedy, Jr., Rommel Cannedy, and Janet Cannedy

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit a manufactured housing unit in the RS-3 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2.5).

Presentation by Applicant

Pete Webb, 1225 N. Lansing Ave., stated that his client wishes to install a dynamic display sign for his business. He mentioned that after resizing the dynamic display section to comply with code requirements, they subsequently encountered an issue with the separation distance. He pointed out that the neighboring residential lot operates as a church, and the 200-foot radius only intrudes approximately sixty feet into their parking area. He stated that the hardship arises from the shape of the lot and the utility lines that prevent the sign from being positioned elsewhere.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Mr. Hale noted that the request was reasonable given that the residential property serves as a church. Ms. Williams highlighted that the shape of the lot was indeed unusual.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 4.10-4.12 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the unique shape of the lot and the location of the utilities on the lot.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, 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 20 BK 8, LAKE-VIEW HEIGHTS AMENDED RESUBSIVISION PRT B1-2 & B3-6, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24043

Location: 7882 East King Street North

City Council District: 3

Applicant: James Taylor

Ms. Barrientos recused himself and exited the room at 1:58 p.m.

Action(s) Requested

Variance to increase the allowable floor area of a detached accessory building in the RS-3 district (Section 45.030-A).

Presentation by Applicant

Ron Sage, 1331 S. Gary Ave., indicated that the driveway is shared, which complicates the accommodation of two vehicles parked side by side. He highlighted the scarcity of on-street parking on the east side, and due to the offset garages, parking at the rear of the residence poses a challenge. He mentioned that he has already laid the concrete, and the variance requested pertains to a 15 square foot area that is currently in violation. He mentioned that while the driveway would still be functional, its appearance would be less appealing, and it would restrict the turnaround space.

Speakers

(+) Lucy Brumbaugh, 1335 S. Gary Ave., stated that the owner of the home has restored the home and modernized it in a very thoughtful way. She noted that the added concrete has made holidays and family gatherings manageable, reduced congestion, and benefited navigation of narrow shared drives. She pointed out larger paved areas in the area and noted that the change does not harm the neighborhood's character.

(-) Weydan Flax, 1234 S Birmingham Ave., was concerned that the owner was asking for forgiveness rather than asking for permission. He noted that approving the application could undermine the overlay's intent.

Rebuttal

None

Board Comments

Mr. Hale remarked that the driveway could remain functional without the variance, although it would look less appealing. He pointed out nearby properties that feature more extensive paving. Ms. Dumas expressed her reluctance to approve the variance so soon after the character overlay was implemented. Ms. Stauffer commented that it would be illogical to remove a small section when a larger, compliant reconfiguration would be allowed.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 5.10 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the unique size and structure of the lot, and their property was purchased prior to the overlay.

Motion By: Williams

Ayes: Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Dumas

Abstentions: Barrientos

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 2 BLK 4, MAPLEWOOD THIRD ADDITION, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Mr. Barrientos re-entered the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

BOA-24044

Location: 115 East 34th Street South

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Gregory Helms

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit a carport in the street setback and street yard in the RS-3 district (Section 90.090-C.1).

Presentation by Applicant

Bill Powers, 8810 S. Yale Ave., expressed his intention to reconstruct a rear detached garage that had been previously demolished due to its deteriorating condition. He indicated that the hardship lies in the fact that if the existing open space requirements had been in place at the time of the house's construction, it would not have been possible to configure it as it currently stands. He mentioned that their proposal involves constructing an attached garage and adding a bedroom within the designated setbacks and easements, requiring only a minimal amount of concrete for access to the garage.

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 6.10-6.19 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the non-conforming lot.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, 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 36A BK 1, BURGESS ACRES ADDITION, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24045

Location: 2202 South Madison Avenue

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Kevin Kirby

Action(s) Requested

Variance to allow a detached accessory building to exceed one story or 18 feet in height and to exceed 10 feet in height to the top of the top plate in the rear setback in the RS-2 district (Section 90.090-C.2).

Presentation by Applicant

Julian Perez, 1601 N. Atlanta Pl., stated that when he purchased the property nine years ago, it was in ruins, but it has since been fully restored. He noted that the previous owner had divided the home with a concrete wall, and he wishes to maintain this configuration and convert it into a duplex. He mentioned that his goal was to formalize the second unit and have two separate utility bills.

Speakers

(+)Anthony Jimenez, 1602 N. Atlanta Ct., expressed his full support for the duplex project. He highlighted that prior to Mr. Perez's purchase of the property, there was significant illicit activity occurring within the house, which negatively affected the neighborhood. He stated that following the purchase and subsequent renovations, the neighborhood has experienced revitalization.

Board Comments

Mr. Hale commended the applicant for the improvements made to the exterior. He noted that the presence of other duplexes in the area aligns with the applicant's request and the ongoing Neighborhood Infill Overlay application for the area.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 7.10 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, 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 7 BK 5, SUNSET PARK AMENDMENT, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24046

Location: 4416 South Columbia Avenue

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Mark Galbraith

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to increase the maximum allowable driveway width in the RS-1 district (Section 55.090-F.5; Table 55-6).

Presentation by Applicant

Ron Sage, 1331 S. Gary Ave., indicated that the driveway is shared, which complicates the accommodation of two vehicles parked side by side. He highlighted the scarcity of on-street parking on the east side, and due to the offset garages, parking at the rear of the residence poses a challenge. He mentioned that he has already laid the concrete, and the variance requested pertains to a 15 square foot area that is currently in violation. He mentioned that while the driveway would still be functional, its appearance would be less appealing, and it would restrict the turnaround space.

Speakers

- (+) Lucy Brumbaugh, 1335 S. Gary Ave., stated that the owner of the home has restored the home and modernized it in a very thoughtful way. She noted that the added concrete has made holidays and family gatherings manageable, reduced congestion, and benefited navigation of narrow shared drives. She pointed out larger paved areas in the area and noted that the change does not harm the neighborhood's character.
- (-) Weydan Flax, 1234 S Birmingham Ave., was concerned that the owner was asking for forgiveness rather than asking for permission. He noted that approving the application could undermine the overlay's intent.

Rebuttal

None

Board Comments

Mr. Hale remarked that the driveway could remain functional without the variance, although it would look less appealing. He pointed out nearby properties that feature more extensive paving. Ms. Dumas expressed her reluctance to approve the variance so soon after the character overlay was implemented. Ms. Stauffer commented that it would be illogical to remove a small section when a larger, compliant reconfiguration would be allowed.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 5.10 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the unique size and structure of the lot, and their property was purchased prior to the overlay.

Motion By: Williams

Ayes: Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Dumas

Abstentions: Barrientos

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

North ½ LT 24, BARROW'S ORCHARD ACRES, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Mr. Barrientos re-entered the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

BOA-24047

Location: 8625 South Houston Avenue West

City Council District: 2

Applicant: Luke and Deia Sherman

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to increase the maximum allowable driveway width in the RS-1 district (Section 55.090-F.5; Table 55-6).

Presentation by Applicant

Bill Powers, 8810 S. Yale Ave., expressed his intention to reconstruct a rear detached garage that had been previously demolished due to its deteriorating condition. He indicated that the hardship lies in the fact that if the existing open space requirements had been in place at the time of the house's construction, it would not have been possible to configure it as it currently stands. He mentioned that their proposal involves constructing an attached garage and adding a bedroom within the designated setbacks and easements, requiring only a minimal amount of concrete for access to the garage.

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 6.10-6.19 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the non-conforming lot.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, 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 8 BK 1, THE ESTATES AT TULSA HILLS, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24048

Location: 1124 East 37th Place South

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Tanner Consulting, LLC

Action(s) Requested

Variance to reduce the setback requirement from unenclosed off-street parking areas to abutting streets in the OL district (Section 55.080-C.1, Table 55-4).

Presentation by Applicant

Julian Perez, 1601 N. Atlanta Pl., stated that when he purchased the property nine years ago, it was in ruins, but it has since been fully restored. He noted that the previous owner had divided the home with a concrete wall, and he wishes to maintain this configuration and convert it into a duplex. He mentioned that his goal was to formalize the second unit and have two separate utility bills.

Speakers

(+)Anthony Jimenez, 1602 N. Atlanta Ct., expressed his full support for the duplex project. He highlighted that prior to Mr. Perez's purchase of the property, there was significant illicit activity occurring within the house, which negatively affected the neighborhood. He stated that following the purchase and subsequent renovations, the neighborhood has experienced revitalization.

Board Comments

Mr. Hale commended the applicant for the improvements made to the exterior. He noted that the presence of other duplexes in the area aligns with the applicant's request and the ongoing Neighborhood Infill Overlay application for the area.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 7.10 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, 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

BEG 27.5S & 300W NEC S/2 SE NE SE TH W60 S137 E60 N137 POB SEC 24 19 12, UNPLATTED, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-24049

Location: 1422 South Denver Avenue

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Joel Collins

Action(s) Requested

Variance to increase the maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR) in the OM district (Section 15.030-A, Table 15-3).

Presentation by Applicant

Julian Perez, 1601 N. Atlanta Pl., stated that when he purchased the property nine years ago, it was in ruins, but it has since been fully restored. He noted that the previous owner had divided the home with a concrete wall, and he wishes to maintain this configuration and convert it into a duplex. He mentioned that his goal was to formalize the second unit and have two separate utility bills.

Speakers

(+)Anthony Jimenez, 1602 N. Atlanta Ct., expressed his full support for the duplex project. He highlighted that prior to Mr. Perez's purchase of the property, there was significant illicit activity occurring within the house, which negatively affected the neighborhood. He stated that following the purchase and subsequent renovations, the neighborhood has experienced revitalization.

Board Comments

Mr. Hale commended the applicant for the improvements made to the exterior. He noted that the presence of other duplexes in the area aligns with the applicant's request and the ongoing Neighborhood Infill Overlay application for the area.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 7.10 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, 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

Other Business

None

New Business

None

Board Member Comments

None

Staff Comments

None

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:08 p.m.

Date approved: _____

Chair: _____