

**CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
MINUTES of Meeting No. 617  
Tuesday, September 22, 1992, 1:00 p.m.  
City Council Room, Plaza Level  
Tulsa Civic Center

| <b>MEMBERS PRESENT</b>  | <b>MEMBERS ABSENT</b> | <b>STAFF PRESENT</b> | <b>OTHERS PRESENT</b>  |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Bolzle, Chairman<br>Chappelle<br>Doverspike<br>S. White<br>T. White |                       | Jones<br>Moore       | Jackere, Legal<br>Department<br>Hubbard, Protective<br>Inspections |

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Monday, September 21, 1992, at 12:00 noon, as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

**MINUTES:**

On **MOTION** of **S. WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle; Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of August 25, 1992, and September 8, 1992.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Case No. 16089**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit a transmitting tower in an AG zoned district - **SECTION 1204.C.1. - Use Conditions** - Use Unit 4, located east of Sheridan, south side of 61st Street.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Jones informed that a letter (Exhibit A-1) requesting a continuance was received from **Dale Lesturgeon**, manager of City telecommunications.

Mr. Jackere stated that the application has been continued twice, once at the applicant's request and once at the request of the protestants. He explained that the previous notices sent to surrounding property owners described a portion of the tract, but not the entire parcel owned by the City. Mr. Jackere stated that it has been determined to send a notice of the proposed action to all property owners within 300' of the entire tract.

Case No. 16089 (continued)

**Protestants:**

**Rosie Moon**, 6601 East 60th Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she is not opposed to the requested continuance.

A letter (Exhibit A-2f) from **Richard Hasting**, president of Shadow Mountain Homeowners Association, requested denial of the application.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **DOVERSPIKE**, the Board voted 4-0-1 (Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; Bolzle, "abstaining"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 16089 to October 13, 1992.

**Case No. 16124**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit a sand operation in an AG District - **SECTION 201. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICT** - Use Unit 24, located 131st Street and Arkansas River.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Jones informed that the applicant, **Philip Haney**, 1218 East 33rd Street, Suite 200, Tulsa, Oklahoma, has requested by letter (Exhibit B-1) that Case No. 16124 be continued.

**Interested Parties:**

A letter from the City Public Works Department (Exhibit B-2) stated that the road leading to the proposed sand operation will not support heavy truck traffic.

**Protestants:**

**John Bugg**, 2400 1st National Tower, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that he is representing the landowners to the north of the proposed sand operation, and asked that the request for a continuance be denied. He pointed out that the letter from the City states that the road will not support heavy traffic, which is a concern of his clients.

Mr. Alberty advised that the continuance request is timely, and the Board typically permits one continuance for the applicant and the protestants.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **S. WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 16124 to October 13, 1992.

**Case No. 16132**

**Action Requested:**

Variance to waive the screening requirement along the north property line and the west 31' of the south property line on 101st East Avenue - **SECTION 1303.E. DESIGN STANDARDS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING** - Use Unit 5, located 10120 East 62nd Place and 6235 South 101st East Avenue.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Jones informed that day care use was approved on the property at the last meeting, and the remainder of the application was continued to permit the applicant sufficient time to request a variance of the screening requirement. He pointed out that the school has acquired most of the abutting property.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Union Public Schools**, 5656 South 129th East Avenue, was represented by **Gerald Williams**.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **S. WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** to waive the screening requirement along the north property line and the west 31' of the south property line on 101st East Avenue - **SECTION 1303.E. DESIGN STANDARDS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING** - Use Unit 5; finding that the school would be screening property from land that is already owned by the school; on the following described property:

East 150' of the west 304.5' of Lot 6, Block 5, Union Garden Addition, and the west 154.5' of Lot 6, Block 5, except the north 25' for street purposes, Union Garden Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**MINOR VARIANCES AND EXCEPTIONS**

**Case No. 16147**

**Action Requested:**

Minor Special Exception to permit the construction of an accessory building on an abutting lot under common ownership - **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6, located 16544 East 2nd Place.

Case No. 16147 (continued)

**Presentation:**

The applicant, D. K. Fox, 16544 East 2nd Place, informed that he has purchased an abutting vacant lot, and requested permission to construct a 24' by 30' accessory building. He informed that the building will be used for a garage and a hobby work area. A plot plan (Exhibit C-1) and letters of support (Exhibit C-2) were submitted.

**Comments and Questions:**

Ms. Hubbard asked if the driveway will be covered with a hard surface material, and the applicant answered in the affirmative.

In reply to Mr. Bolzle, Mr. Fox stated that there is a one-car garage on the lot with his dwelling.

Mr. Bolzle asked if he will do any work in the garage for those outside his immediate family, and he stated that it will only be used to park his automobile and for his hobbies.

Mr. Doverspike inquired as to the height of the building, and Mr. Fox replied that the structure will be one story, with a 4 - 12 pitch roof.

Ms. White asked Mr. Fox if he is amenable to the execution of a tie contract, which would prevent the sale of one lot without the other, and he replied that he is agreeable to tying the lots together.

**Protestants:**

None.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **DOVERSPIKE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Minor Special Exception** to permit the construction of an accessory building on an abutting lot under common ownership -**SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6; per plot plan submitted; subject to the execution of an appropriate tie contract; subject to no commercial use of the building; subject to no outside advertising or signage; and subject to lighting being directed toward the structure and away from abutting properties; finding the use, per conditions, to be compatible with the residential neighborhood; on the following described property:

Lot 5, Block 11 and Lot 9, Block 19, Rosedew Addition III, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

## NEW APPLICATIONS

Case No. 16134

### Action Requested:

Variance of the required setback from an abutting R district from 75' to 5' - **SECTION 903. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 11, located south of the SE/c of East Pine and Garnett.

### Presentation:

The applicant, Cramer Construction Company, 1303 North Garnett, was represented by **Jake Floyd**, 2909 East 29th, who submitted a plot plan (Exhibit D-2) for the proposed building. He informed that future plans are to construct a business park. Mr. Floyd stated that the proposed commercial office building is the first step in developing the property.

### Comments and Questions:

In response to Mr. Bolzle, Mr. Jackere stated that the application does not seem to be properly advertised, because property owners in the OL District did not receive notice of the applicant's intent.

Mr. Floyd informed that the OL property and the abutting residential property are owned by the same individual.

Mr. Jones inquired as to the distance from the proposed building to the north property line, and Mr. Floyd replied that it will be 7½' from the north boundary. Mr. Jones pointed out that the applicant would not need relief from the OL District if the building was moved back approximately 2'. He stated that the Board could act on the variance concerning the R District and continue the balance of the application to allow Mr. Floyd sufficient time to determine if the building can be moved back.

### Protestants:

**George Barber**, 11401 Limestone Drive, Claremore, Oklahoma, represented **Bob and Rebecca Kirby**, who live on the north side of the property in question. He informed that the construction of the building has already begun, and there is a concern with no screening and the fact that fill dirt has been placed on the lot, which could result in a water run-off problem.

Case No. 16134 (continued)

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**

In response to Mr. Bolzle's question concerning a building permit, Mr. Floyd stated that he applied for a permit, which was issued; however, there was an error in the survey, and the building was placed on the wrong lot. He pointed out that the proposed site and the actual building site are under common ownership. He pointed out that Board approval would not be necessary if the building was 15' to the north. Mr. Floyd stated that all drainage requirements have been met

**Additional Comments:**

Mr. Doverspike inquired as the intended use of the building, and Mr. Floyd replied that the building will be used as office space for Cramer Construction.

In regard to ingress and egress, Mr. Floyd stated that there are two curb cuts on Garnett Road. He informed that there is no work being done on the lot at this time, because the City has issued a cease and desist order.

Mr. Bolzle stated that it will be necessary to continue the case to allow sufficient time to send notice of the applicant's intent to property owners in the abutting OL District, and requested that the applicant return to the next meeting with a plot plan drawn to scale.

In response to Ms. Hubbard, Mr. Floyd stated that the land has not been surveyed.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **S. WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 16134 to October 13, 1992 to allow the applicant sufficient time to advertise for additional relief, and to prepare a detail site plan for the proposed office building.

**Case No. 16135**

**Action Requested:**

Special exception to permit Christmas tree sales in an R and CS District - **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS AND SECTION 701. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 2.

Variance of the thirty day time limitation to allow sales from November 15 through Christmas for a period of three years - **SECTION 1202.C.1. Use Conditions** - Use Unit 2, located SE/c of East 41st Street and South Harvard Avenue.

Case No. 16135 (continued)

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Southwest Nursery**, was represented by **Bill Manley**, 311 East 58th Place, who requested permission to continue a Christmas trees sales operation at the above stated location. Mr. Manley stated that he has sold Christmas trees on the property since 1954, and requested that he be granted a three year approval. An aerial photograph (Exhibit E-1) was submitted.

**Comments and Questions:**

In response to Mr. Bolzle, Mr. Manley stated that he previously received a three-year approval for the business.

**Protestants:**

**Kay Claxton**, 4122 South Jamestown, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she is opposed to the application, and is also speaking for another resident that lives in the neighborhood. She informed that the Christmas tree lot is within 100' of her back yard, and the lighting has increased on the lot. Ms. Claxton noted that the business creates a traffic hazard for the area, and the peace and tranquillity of the neighborhood is disturbed by large trucks making deliveries and equipment being set up during the nighttime hours. Photographs (Exhibit E-2) were submitted.

Mr. Bolzle asked Ms. Claxton if she could suggest some conditions that might make the business more compatible with the area, and she replied that hours of operation should be controlled, and all lighting should be directed away from the residential area. Ms. Claxton stated that she also is opposed to the black storage tents being close to the boundary line behind her home. She informed that Mr. Manley visited with her after the protest was filed, and she advised him of her objections.

Mr. Doverspike asked Ms. Claxton if she has had the same problem over the past four years, and she stated that the problems have accumulated, with last year being the worst year in regard to lighting. She added that the tents that were visible from her back yard last year were not visible the year before.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**

Mr. Manley informed that the amount of property used for the sales operation has not been increased. He stated that two area residents are present to speak in support of the application. Mr. Manley stated that the City Water Department was working in the area last year, which caused some traffic congestion near the tree lot.

Case No. 16135 (continued)

**Additional Comments:**

Mr. Chappelle asked Mr. Manley how long the prefab buildings have been used in the business, and he replied that they have been used approximately six or seven years. He informed that the buildings are erected before the season begins and removed after Christmas. Mr. Manley pointed out that the prefab buildings replaced the tents that were previously used.

Ms. White inquired as to the days and hours of operation, and Mr. Manley stated that the tree lot is open every day from 8:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. He informed that the business begins operation the day before Thanksgiving, and continues through the Christmas season.

Mr. Doverspike asked if deliveries are accepted after 11:00 p.m., and Mr. Manley replied stated that there is no activity on the lot after 11:00 p.m.

Mr. Doverspike inquired as to the number of employees required to operate the sales lot, and Mr. Manley stated that he has approximately 110 part-time employees.

Mr. Jones pointed out that the use, as it currently exists, may have outgrown the lot; however, it might be possible to somehow scale down the business to make it more compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Bolzle stated that he has always been concerned with the fact that automobiles drive over the curb to enter the lot and park on the sidewalk or the City right-of-way.

Mr. White asked if the City has the equipment to measure footcandles, and Mr. Bolzle replied that he is not sure if the City has instruments available to measure the intensity of the lighting, but the business can be required to direct all lighting away from the residences.

The Board agreed that the use is compatible with the area, but the activities on the lot should be controlled.

Mr. Jackere advised that the application could be continued to allow the applicant sufficient time to prepare a plot plan depicting the location of curb cuts, lighting, parking, etc.

**Board Action:**

On MOTION of DOVERSPIKE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 16135 to October 13, 1992, to allow the applicant to prepare a site plan for Board review.



**Case No. 16136**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit a day care as a home occupation in an RS-3 District - **SECTION 402. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 5, located 552 East 55th Place North.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Mount Duffy**, 2104 East 50th Street North, Tulsa, Oklahoma, requested permission to begin operation of a day care center in a house recently purchased for this use.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Bolzle asked the applicant if she will live in the home, and she replied that she lives at another location.

Mr. Jones informed that the applicant will need additional relief, because a day care center in a residential district requires a minimum lot size of 12,000 sq ft, along with other requirements.

Mr. Jackere advised that the Code has been recently amended to include several requirements in order to operate a day care center in a residential neighborhood.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **S. WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 16136 to October 13, 1992, to allow sufficient time for readvertising.

**Case No. 16137**

**Action Requested:**

Appeal the decision of the administrative official that the property is being used for residential purposes - **SECTION 1605. APPEALS FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL** - Use Unit 12, located 3601 East Admiral Place.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Gabrielle**, 3601 East Admiral Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by **Steve Reiker**, 7613 East 4th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, who requested that the case be continued to October 13, 1992, to permit the applicant to prepare plans which would be beneficial in refuting the charges of the administrative official.

Case No. 16137 (continued)

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Bolzle pointed out that the request for a continuance is not timely.

Mr. Doverspike stated that a plot plan is not needed to make a decision on the appeal.

Mr. Jackere advised that the Code does not permit the use of commercial property for residential purposes. He pointed out to Mr. Reiker that the issue before the Board at this time is whether or not the property is being used for residential purposes, and he replied that his client is not using the building for a residence.

Ms. Hubbard informed that the Board previously limited the second story of the building to storage only; however, the field inspector has reported that there is a complete dwelling unit upstairs.

**Protestants:**

**Connie Schilling**, 3523 East Admiral Court, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that she is the president of the Sequoyah Homeowners Association, and lives very near the building in question. She informed that Gabrielle attended a February meeting of the area homeowners, and explained her plans for the building. She also stated at the meeting that her living quarters would be in the upper story of the building; however, at this time, she claims that she does not live there. Ms. Schilling stated that the upstairs portion of the building is always lighted and there are a large number of people visiting the quarters. She further noted that the parking lot has not been covered with a hard surface, and on special nights, the customers park on the grass and in the neighborhood.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**

Mr. Reiker stated that the cooking and rest room facilities were installed by the previous occupant and the area was used for an employee kitchen.

Ms. Hubbard stated that the field inspector found that there were linens on the beds, and it appeared to be living quarters.

Mr. Jackere advised that the arrangement of the rooms is critical in determining the use. He pointed out that a denial of the appeal would not prevent the applicant from filing an application for residential or other uses at this location.

Case No. 16137 (continued)

Ms. Hubbard stated that accurate plans must be presented at her office if the applicant files for other uses on the property.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **S. WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** the **Appeal** and **UPHOLD** the **Decision** of the administrative official that the property is being used for residential purposes - **SECTION 1605. APPEALS FROM THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL** - Use Unit 12; finding that the arrangement of the rooms and the fact that the upstairs portion of the building has a kitchen, bath and furnishings indicate that the quarters are either being occupied, or are ready for occupancy; on the following described property:

South 40' of Lot 10 and all of Lots 11 and 12, Block 1, Sequoyah Hills, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Case No. 16138**

**Action Requested:**

Variance of the number of required parking spaces from 346 to 323 - **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 8, located 2842 East 51st Street.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Brittany Square Apartments**, 2842 East 51st Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by **Sandi Ries**, 2882 East 51st, who explained that the original developers submitted plans with a total of 348 parking spaces, some of which were restricted to compact cars. She stated that there are actually 321 full-size spaces on the lot at this time. Ms. Ries stated that the property has changed management and the current manager is not familiar with the previous parking arrangement. She added that there have been no changes made to the apartment complex, and there has not been a parking problem. She informed that a variance of the parking spaces is required for financing purposes. A plot plan (Exhibit F-1) was submitted.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Doverspike asked if the complex is a part of a PUD, and Ms. Ries answered in the affirmative.

Case No. 16138 (continued)

In response to Mr. Doverspike, Ms. Ries stated that there have been no changes in the buildings or parking lots since the time of construction. She pointed out that the covered parking could have rearranged some spaces.

Mr. Jones informed that spaces are sometimes lost in re-striping. He pointed out that, although Ms. Ries stated that the complex has 321 spaces, the application states that the applicant is requesting a variance of the number of spaces from 346 to 323.

Ms. Ries stated that the parking lot is being striped at this time, and it can be striped to provide 323 parking spaces.

**Protestants:**

None.

**Board Action:**

On MOTION of DOVERSPIKE, the Board voted 4-1-0 (Bolzle, , Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; Chappelle, "nay"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of the number of required parking spaces from 346 to 323 - **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 8; finding that the buildings and parking area have not be altered since the previous plot plan was approved; and finding that approval of the request will not be detrimental to the area, or violate the spirit and intent of the Code; on the following described property:

Lot 2, Block 1, Brittany Square, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Case No. 16139**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit a children's nursery in an RM-1 zoned district - **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT** - Use Unit 5, located 1834 North Owasso.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Yvonne Buyckes**, 1413 North Garrison Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, requested permission to operate a day care center at the above stated location.

Case No. 16139 (continued)

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Jones informed that the property does not comply with the new provisions (12,000 sq ft lot area and 100' frontage) regarding day care centers in residential districts, and the applicant will need additional relief.

**Board Action:**

On MOTION of S. WHITE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 16139 to October 13, 1992.

**Case No. 16140**

**Action Requested:**

Variance of the setback requirement from 50' to 40' to permit a sign - SECTION 1221.C.6. General Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unit 21, located 4750 South Union.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, Oklahoma Neon, 6550 East Independence, Tulsa, Oklahoma, was represented by Duane Gooding, who submitted a sign plan (Exhibit G-1) and informed that his client is proposing to upgrade an existing sign. He explained that the new sign will be increased in height and width, which will cause it to extend into the driveway of the business. Mr. Gooding stated that the existing sign is 48' from the centerline of the street.

**Comments and Questions:**

In response to Mr. Doverspike, Mr. Gooding stated that the new sign will be 6' closer to the street than the existing sign.

**Protestants:**

None.

**Board Action:**

On MOTION of CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the setback requirement from 50' to 40' to permit a sign - SECTION 1221.C.6. General Use Conditions for Business Signs - Use Unit 21; per plot plan submitted; finding that the sign would extend into the driveway if installed at the required setback; on the following described property:

Case No. 16140 (continued)

South 108' of Lot 5, less beginning SE/c thence west 144.3', north 5', east 119.3', north 103', east 25', south 108' to the Point of Beginning, Block 1, Greenfield Acres, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Case No. 16142**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit an RV show and sale as a temporary open air activity from October 23, 1992 through October 25, 1992 - **Section 1202. AREA WIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES** - Use Unit 2, located SW/c of East 21st Street and South 145th East Avenue.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Kim Siex**, 8347 East 11th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a plot plan (Exhibit H-1), and requested permission to conduct an outdoor recreation show on the Eastland Mall property.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Bolzle asked if the show will be limited to the designated area on the plot plan, and the applicant answered in the affirmative.

Ms. Hubbard asked if required parking spaces will be used for the show, and the applicant replied that the RVs will be displayed on the grass.

In reply to Mr. Bolzle, Mr. Jackere stated that it is his opinion that, if a use is specifically listed in a use unit, it should remain in that use unit even if it is temporary.

Mr. Jones pointed out that the application is not properly advertised if the use is found to be classified under Use Unit 17.

Mr. Bolzle stated that there are numerous car sales operations in the City that are displaying cars on the grass.

Mr. Jackere advised that the Board could make a distinction between the storage of vehicles and the parking of vehicles that are frequently moved.

Mr. Jones pointed out that the customers will be parking on the paved area of the Mall parking lot.

Case No. 16142 (continued)

Mr. Doverspike inquired as to the hours of operation for the RV sales, and the applicant stated that RVs will be open for customer viewing from 9:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m., October 23, 1992 to October 25, 1992.


**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **DOVERSPIKE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bolzle, Chappelle, Doverspike, S. White, T. White, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit an RV show and sale as a temporary open air activity from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., October 23, 1992 through October 25, 1992 - **Section 1202. AREA WIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES** - Use Unit 2; finding that the Code does not specifically address the temporary sale of recreational vehicles as an open air activity; and finding that the temporary use will not be detrimental to the area, or violate the spirit, purpose or intent of the Code; on the following described property:

Lot 1, Block 1, Eastland Acres Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:18 p.m.

Date approved: October 13, 1992

  
Chairman

