

CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES of Meeting No. 784
Tuesday, November 9, 1999, 1:00 p.m.
Francis F. Campbell City Council Room
Plaza Level of City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

MEMBERS PRESENT MEMBERS ABSENT STAFF PRESENT OTHERS PRESENT

Dunham, Vice Chair	Arnold	Prather, Legal Dept.
Cooper	Beach	Ackermann, Zoning
Perkins	Stump	Official
Turnbo		Parnell,
White, Chair		Neighborhood Insp.

The notice and agenda of said meeting was posted in the Office of the City Clerk on Friday, November 5, 1999, at 8:47 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Case No. 18500

Presentation:

The applicant withdrew this application and it was stricken from the agenda. The applicant submitted a letter of withdrawal (Exhibit A-1).

Case No. 18554

Presentation:

The applicant withdrew this application and it was stricken from the agenda.

Case No. 18532

Action Requested:

Variance of required 30' of frontage on a public street to permit a lot-split. **SECTION 206. STREET FRONTAGE REQUIRED – Use Unit 6**, located 8160 South Elwood.

Presentation:

Mr. Beach stated that the applicant made a timely request for a continuance to December 14, 1999.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** BQA-18532 to December 14, 1999 at 1:00 p.m.

Case No. 18556

Action Requested:

Special Exception for lawn mower sales and repair in a CS district. **SECTION 701. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 15**, a Variance of 300' setback for outdoor sales from abutting R district to 0'. **SECTION 1214. USE UNIT 14, SHOPPING GOODS AND SERVICES**, and a Special Exception to waive the screening requirement between a CS district and an R district. **SECTION 212.C.1. SCREENING WALL OR FENCE, Modifications of the Screening Wall or Fence Requirement**, located at 8760 South Lewis Avenue.

Presentation:

Mr. Beach stated that the applicant timely requested a continuance to November 23, 1999.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 18556 to November 23, 1999 at 1:00 p.m.

Case No. 18569

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a mini-storage facility in a CS and RM-1 zoned district. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** and **SECTION 701. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 16**, located at 1424 East 71st Street.

Presentation:

Mr. Beach stated that the request for a continuance was not timely; however, there is a problem with the notice and the applicant would like to readvertise the application for the meeting of November 23, 1999.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 18569 to November 23, 1999 at 1:00 p.m.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Case No. 18524

Action Requested:

Reconsideration of a Variance of the allowable size for an accessory building from 750 square feet to 1,800 square feet. **SECTION 402.B.1.d. ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions – Use Unit 6**, located 3732 South 27th West Avenue.

Presentation:

The applicant, **P. Dudley**, 3732 South 27th West Avenue, submitted a site plan (Exhibit B-1). Mr. Dudley stated that his neighbors are objecting to this application because the proposed building will block their view and natural lighting. He indicated that in the City of Tulsa he could build a 750 square foot building with a building permit.

Mr. Dudley indicated that the proposed building would be set back 10' from the property line; which is a vacated alley and an additional 10' that the BOA requested. He stated that with the 20-foot setback and the neighbors house setting 10' back would give 30' of separation.

Mr. Dudley explained that he would like to build the largest accessory building that the BOA will allow with a 20' setback. He indicated that he would be willing to reduce the square footage to 1000 SF, but he prefers to build 1500 SF.

Mr. Dudley stated that the subject neighborhood does not meet the City Codes. He explained that the neighborhood was established before the Town of Redfork joined Tulsa in 1927. The City of Tulsa accepted the neighborhood as it stands and today it requires a variance to build something that is not out of the ordinary for the neighborhood.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White asked staff what the applicant could do to be in compliance without a variance from the BOA. In response, Mr. Beach stated that the applicant is allowed to build a detached building up to 750 SF and position it within three feet of the side or rear property line, as long as the building is in the backyard. Mr. Beach reminded the Board that the applicant cannot occupy more than 20 percent of the required rear yard and the building must be at least 15 feet from the street, unless it is a garage than it would need to be 20' from the street to where it is accessed. Mr. Beach stated that the building could occupy 400 SF of the required rear yard by right.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Martha Wright, no address given, stated that she lives on the west side of Mr. Dudley. She commented that the applicant's statement was misleading and her objection is not because she wants to see the applicant's backyard. She explained that her lot measures 50' x 100' and there is not a great deal of room.

Ms. Wright stated that the applicant informed her that he would be building on the south side of his lot and there was no problem with that because it was down toward her backyard. The applicant changed his mind and now the building will be next to her home; which will block any view she has from her kitchen dining area.

Janice Acres, Ms. Wright's daughter, stated that she supports her family's objection. She explained that the proposal will deface her parents' property and will block their view. She commented that if the proposed building were built on the south end as discussed previously, it would be away from her parents' property.

Elaine Parker, Ms. Wright's daughter, requested that the applicant move the garage to the south end of his property.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Dudley requested the Board to decide how large he could build the proposed building.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White asked the applicant why he has not considered placing the proposed building farther south on the lot. In response, Mr. Dudley stated that on the south side there is a City clean-out (catch basin) and it runs onto his property line. Mr. Dudley indicated that in the past there was an existing garage on the south side and the City made the owners tear it down because it was in the way.

Mr. Dunham asked the applicant where the catch basin was located. In response, Mr. Dudley stated that the catch basin is located on the south side of the subject property on the fence line.

Ms. Turnbo stated that she would choose option number three because it would be of least of the variances. The hardship would be that the house was built before the zoning was adopted in 1970.

Mr. White stated that if the building was positioned south, the applicant could have the larger building requested.

Mr. Dudley stated that the farther south he positions the proposed building, the longer the driveway will have to be and this will cost him more money. He explained that he would have to access from 37th Place because he is adding onto the house and will not be able to enter the garage from 27th Street.

Mr. Beach suggested a compromise between the neighbors and the applicant. He stated that if the garage was moved south until it aligns with the existing house it will be farther away from the street and eases some of the burden on the neighbor to the west.

Ms. Turnbo asked Mr. Dudley if he would agree to align his proposed garage with the north side of his home. In response, Mr. Dudley stated that he has no problem with aligning his proposed garage with the north side of his home.

Mr. Cooper asked Ms. Turnbo to restate the hardship. Ms. Turnbo stated that the property was annexed into the City of Tulsa before the Zoning Code was adopted. Ms. Turnbo stated that the proposed building will be within the borders and it will not be very offensive.

Mr. Dunham stated that the neighborhood has numerous over-sized buildings existing and some are larger than the proposed building.

Case No. 18524 (continued)

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **PERKINS**, the Board voted 4-1-0 (Dunham, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; Cooper "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the allowable size for an accessory building from 750 square feet to 1,200 square feet. **SECTION 402.B.1.d. ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions – Use Unit 6**, per plan submitted, subject to the proposed building being set back 28' to align with the existing home on the north side and the proposed building set back 30' on the west property line, finding that the neighborhood has existing over-sized buildings and the subject property was developed before the City Zoning Code was adopted; on the following described property:

Lot 1, Block 26, Original Town of Red Fork, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County,
State of Oklahoma.

Case No. 18540

Action Requested:

Special Exception in RS-3 and CS zoning districts to allow for the construction of one-bedroom duplexes as part of the "Crestview II" development. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS AND SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, located on the east side of North Cincinnati Avenue and South of East 36th Street North.

Presentation:

William LaFortune, 2900 Mid-Continent Tower, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, stated that the staff report indicates that staff has no concerns with the request. He informed the Board that he would like to make two corrections to the application; which will not affect the notices but is necessary for the record. He explained the current ownership of the subject property and that his clients are "Tulsa Crestview II Housing Partners".

Mr. LaFortune submitted a site plan (Exhibit C-1) and photographs (Exhibit C-2). Mr. LaFortune stated that the site plan shows what Crestview II will be when it is developed. He requested the Board to approve the special exception requested.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Case No. 18540 (continued)

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Special Exception in RS-3 and CS zoning districts to allow for the construction of one-bedroom duplexes as part of the "Crestview II" development. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS AND SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, per plan submitted, finding that the special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code, and will no be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare; on the following described property:

A tract of land that is all of Lot 2 and Reserve "A" in Block 1, Crestview, a subdivision in the NW/4 of Section 24, T-20-N, R-12-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma and being located in RS-3 and CS zoned districts.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Case No. 18553

Action Requested:

Variance of setback of an accessory building from the street from 20' to 11'. **SECTION 402.B. ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, Accessory Use Conditions – Use Unit 6, and a Variance of minimum 20% coverage of required rear yard to 22.8%. **SECTION 210.B. YARDS**, Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards, located 1348 South Gary Place.

Presentation:

Kenna Chapin, 1348 South Gary Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a site plan (Exhibit D-1) and stated that the hardship is that the lot width is 50 feet instead of the 60 feet that is typical for an RS-3 lot. She explained that her property is located on a corner and she is building a side entry garage, which replace the existing garage. The proposed garage is compatible with the existing neighborhood.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham asked why the proposed garage could not be moved east by 15 inches in order to meet the Code. In response, Ms. Chapin stated that if the proposed garage was moved the 15 inches it would cause more driveway onto her backyard and this would reduce the amount of backyard space.

Mr. Stump asked the applicant if she planned to use the existing pad for the proposed garage. In response, Ms. Chapin stated that they would be pouring a new foundation and flooring.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **COOPER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of setback of an accessory building from the street from 20' to 11'. **SECTION 402.B. ACCESSORY USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, Accessory Use Conditions – Use Unit 6, and a Variance of minimum 20% coverage of required rear yard to 22.8%. **SECTION 210.B. YARDS**, Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards, per plan submitted; on the following described property:

Lot 12, Block 7, East Lawn Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

Case No. 18557

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a children's nursery in an RS-3 District. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 5, a Variance of minimum lot size of 12,000 SF. **SECTION 404.F.2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, REQUIREMENTS**, a Variance of minimum frontage of 100'. **SECTION 404.F.3. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, REQUIREMENTS** and a Variance of minimum building setback of 25' from abutting properties in an R district. **SECTION 404.F.4. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, ERQUIREMENTS**, located 5220 South 40th West Avenue.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Dawn Colbert-Dixon**, 5220 South 40th West Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a site plan (Exhibit H-1) and stated that she is requesting a special exception for a children's nursery in a residential district. She indicated that her hardship is that the lot and structure are existing and it cannot be changed.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Perkins asked the applicant how many children she plans to have attending the facility. In response, Ms. Colbert-Dixon stated that there would be 22 to 24 children enrolled with four employees.

Ms. Perkins asked the applicant what the ages of the children would be. In response, Ms. Colbert-Dixon stated that there will be four infants, eight toddlers (2-years old), 12 three year olds.

Ms. Perkins asked the applicant where she plans to put 24 children in an 1175 SF home. Ms. Perkins questioned the facilities having ample restrooms, play area, etc. In response, Ms. Colbert-Dixon stated that there would be enough room for the 24 children. Ms. Colbert-Dixon explained that DHS requires a minimum of 32 SF per child.

Ms. Perkins asked the applicant if the parking spaces for the employees are paved. In response, the applicant stated that there is enough room to park (three spaces) and the spaces are paved.

Mr. Stump asked the applicant if the parking spaces are in the front yard. In response, Ms. Colbert-Dixon stated that the parking spaces are on the side of the house, one beside the other. Mr. Stump stated that there is not enough room on the side of the house to have the spaces side by side. Mr. Stump asked the applicant if there is a long driveway running along the side of the house for parking. The applicant answered affirmatively.

Mr. Stump informed the applicant that she couldn't park one car behind the other and count the spaces as more than one parking spaces. Mr. Stump questioned where the employees would park and where the parents would park while dropping off their children. In response, Ms. Colbert-Dixon stated that the parents could park out in front of the house. Mr. Stump commented that there would not be enough room for the parents dropping off their children and the employees to park.

Ms. Turnbo stated that the lot is not large enough for this type of facility. She expressed concerns with the number of children and the parents coming and going to drop off their children.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **PERKINS**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** Special Exception to permit a children's nursery in an RS-3 District. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 5, a Variance of minimum lot size of 12,000 SF. **SECTION 404.F.2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, REQUIREMENTS**, a Variance of minimum frontage of 100'. **SECTION 404.F.3. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, REQUIREMENTS** and a Variance of minimum building setback of 25' from abutting properties in an R district. **SECTION 404.F.4. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, ERQUIREMENTS**, finding that it would be detrimental to the neighborhood, on the following described property:

Lots 1 and 2, Block 23, South Haven Amended, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma and being located in an RS-3 zoned district.

Case No. 18558

Action Requested:

Variance of the rear yard coverage of 20% to permit a detached garage and to permit a second story work room. **SECTION 210.B. YARDS**, Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards – Use Unit 6, located 1547 South Gary Avenue.

Presentation:

Jerry J. Buchanan, 1547 South Gary Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a site plan (Exhibit I-1) and stated that his request is to replace an existing 16' x 30' deteriorated garage with a 22' x 26' with a second floor work room.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Turnbo asked the applicant if there were other two-story garages in the neighborhood. In response, the applicant stated that there are some being built.

Ms. Perkins asked the applicant if he would be using the workroom for strictly a personal workroom and not a commercial operation. In response, the applicant stated that it would be a wood shop.

Ms. Turnbo asked the applicant if he would be running a business and hiring employees. In response, the applicant answered negatively.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the rear yard coverage of 20% to permit a detached garage and to permit a second story work room. **SECTION 210.B. YARDS**, Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards – Use Unit 6, per plan submitted, finding that the size of the lot and other similar structures in the neighborhood currently exists, on the following described property:

Lot 13, Block 2, Exposition Heights Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma and being located in an RS-3 zoned district.

Case No. 18562

Action Requested:

Waiver of the landscape requirement. **SECTION 1002. LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS – Use Unit 2**, a Special Exception to waive screening requirement from an R district. **SECTION 1303.3. DESIGN STANDARDS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING AREAS**, a Variance of 50' setback to 0' for six or more parking spaces. **SECTION 1302. SETBACKS** and a Special Exception to allow Use Unit 2 – "Governmental Services, NEC". **SECTION 1202. USE UNIT 2. AREA-WIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES**, located 4235 North 93rd East Avenue.

Presentation:

Mark Rogers, Operation Supervisor for the City of Tulsa Public Works Department, submitted a site plan (Exhibit L-1) and stated that the City of Tulsa would like to build a parking lot for employees and city equipment. He indicated that the subject property would be shared with the Oklahoma Air National Guard. He explained that the Oklahoma Air National Guard would utilize the parking on weekends when there are weekend drills.

Mr. Rogers stated that the subject district was a part of the noise abatement buyout by the Airport Authority in 1992. He indicated that the Airport Authority intended to rezone the subject property for a use compatible with airport uses. Mr. Roger submitted a letter from the Airport Authority (Exhibit L-2).

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White asked staff if there was a question regarding the legal description. Mr. Rogers stated that the Mohawk Village Subdivision was to the east of North 93rd East Avenue and everything to the west of North 93rd West Avenue is Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Mr. Beach asked the applicant where the City intends to build the parking lot. In response, the applicant stated that the parking lot would be east of the paved street only. Mr. Beach stated that the applicant's legal description includes more property than is intended to be developed.

Mr. Rogers stated that there are existing trees between the proposed parking lot and North 93rd East Avenue. He indicated that there is a row of trees on the east side of the proposed parking lot. He pointed out that there is a PSO easement that runs across the subject area and any landscaping done within the 100' easement would be limited.

Mr. Stump stated that the applicant could count the existing trees that will remain after the improvements are made, toward the landscaping requirement. The Landscape Ordinance has three different classifications of tree, according to their mature height. The Landscape Ordinance has taken into account the need to have trees located under power lines that will not interfere with the power lines. The applicant could choose trees that would not interfere with the power lines when they reach maturity. Mr. Stump reminded the Board that the Landscape Ordinance is imposed by the City and he would hate to see the City ignore the ordinance on their own property.

Mr. Rogers stated that the reason for requesting the waiver of the screening requirement is because there are no residential homes. In response, Mr. Stump stated that it would be appropriate to waive the screening requirement because there is nothing to protect or screen from.

Ms. Turnbo stated that the applicant should meet the landscaping requirements and the PSO issue can be worked out.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TURNBO**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** the Waiver of the landscape requirement. **SECTION 1002. LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS – Use Unit 2, and APPROVE** a Special Exception to waive screening requirement from an R district. **SECTION 1303.3. DESIGN STANDARDS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING AREAS**, a Variance of 50' setback to 0' for six or more parking spaces. **SECTION 1302. SETBACKS** and a Special Exception to allow Use Unit 2 – "Governmental Services, NEC".

SECTION 1202. USE UNIT 2. AREA-WIDE SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES, finding that residential will not be developing in the subject area, finding that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

Lots 7-8, Block 1, Mohawk Village, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma and being located in an RS-3 zoned district.

Case No. 18560

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow an airport and airport accessory uses on property zoned RS-3 and IL. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; SECTION 901. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS.** – Use Unit 2, located Southwest corner of Gilcrease Expressway and North Memorial Drive.

Presentation:

Dallas Dickens, Benham Group, Engineering Consultant for the Airport Authority, submitted a site plan (Exhibit J-1) and stated that the subject property is owned by the Airport Authority. He indicated that the subject property is vacant at this time and was part of the buy out several years ago. The future use for the site is for rental car agencies that will be relocated to the subject site.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Special Exception to allow an airport and airport accessory uses on property zoned RS-3 and IL. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS; SECTION 901. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS.** – Use Unit 2, per plan submitted, on the following described property:

All of Blocks 11 thru 16 and the adjacent vacated rights-of-way for Xyler, Woodrow, and Virgin Pl. streets and 71st E. Ave., all of Blocks 17, 19, 20, 21 and Lots 1 thru 7 and Lots 18 thru 24 and Lots 1 thru 6, Block 22 and adjacent vacated rights-of-way for Ute and Tecumseh streets and 71st E. Ave. and 73rd E. Ave., all in Mohawk Ridge Addition, AND all that part of Block 3 and Blocks 5 thru 11 and the adjacent vacated rights-of-way for Xyler, Woodrow, and Virgin Pl. streets and 73rd E. Ave., 73rd E. Pl., 73rd E.

Ct. and 75th E. Ave., lying W of the W R/W line of the Gilcrease Expy, all in Douglas Park Addition, AND the N 275' of the S 315' of the W 175' of the SW/4 NE/4 of Section 26, T-20-N, R-13-E, AND the W 175' of the NW/4 SE/4 of Section 26, T-20-N, R-13-E, less the N 40' thereof and lying N of the N R/W line of the BNSF RR AND all that part of the SE/4 of Section 26, T-20-N, R-13-E, lying N of the N R/W line of the BNSF RR and lying W of the W R/W line of the Gilcrease Expy, less the W 175' thereof, and less Lots 9 thru 21, Block 11 of Douglas Park Addition, all in the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, and being located in an RS-3 and IL zoned districts.

Case No. 18555

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a home occupation (Use Unit 14) sale of firearms.
SECTION 401.A. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 14, located 1525 North Marion Avenue.

The applicant was not present and staff could not contact the applicant by phone.

Interested Parties:

Councilor Roscoe Turner, 3415 East Haskell Street, submitted petitions opposing the special exception from surrounding neighborhood (Exhibit F-2) and stated that there is an elementary school less than 5/10 of a mile to the east and another school less than one-half mile to the west. The neighbors do not feel that the proposal will be compatible with the neighborhood.

Councilor Turner concluded that the applicant can find a store front that is appropriate for firearm sales rather than conducting sales in the neighborhood.

Darrell Gilbert, 4417 East Woodrow Place, stated that he does not want to deny Mr. Case any opportunity to have an occupation, but the neighborhood does feel that this is an inappropriate home occupation. Retail sales of weapons would not be conducive to the neighborhood and would be detrimental to the subject area.

Mr. Gilbert indicated that there are several commercial buildings within the area, which are vacant and would suitable for this type of occupation. Mr. Gilbert concluded by requesting the Board to deny this application.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White announced that there are 167 signatures on the submitted petitions opposing this application.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **COOPER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** Special Exception to allow a home occupation (Use Unit 14) sale of firearms. **SECTION 401.A. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 1, finding that requested special exception will be injurious and detrimental to the neighborhood, finding that the applicant did not provide evidence to the appropriateness of the requested use to Home Occupation Rules, on the following described property:

Lot 22, Block 27 of Blocks 9 through 30, Louisville Heights Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma and being located in an RS-3 zoned district.

Case No. 18561

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a mobile home in a RM-1 district. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 9, a Special Exception to extend the one-year time limit indefinitely. **SECTION 404.E.1. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, REQUIREMENTS** and a Variance of the required side yard from 10' to 2 ½'. **SECTION 403.A. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, Bulk and Area Requirements in the RE, RS, RD, RT and RM Districts, located 1209 North Rockford Avenue.

The applicant was not present and could not be reached by phone.

Interested Parties:

Jean Cooper, 1211 North St. Louis, submitted a petition opposing the subject application (Exhibit K-2). Ms. Cooper stated that the neighborhood does not want a mobile home in the subject area.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White stated that a mobile home does not belong in this location. He explained that the subject area is working hard to keep the neighborhood looking nice.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** Special Exception to allow a mobile home in an RM-1 district. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 9, a

Special Exception to extend the one-year time limit indefinitely. **SECTION 404.E.1. SPECIAL EXCEPTION USES IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS, REQUIREMENTS** and a Variance of the required side yard from 10' to 2 ½'. **SECTION 403.A. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, Bulk and Area Requirements in the RE, RS, RD, RT and RM Districts, finding that the special exception and variance requested would be detrimental to the neighborhood, on the following described property:

Lot 8, Block 1, Wildman's Addition and being located in a RM-1 zoned district.

Case No. 18563

Action Requested:

Variance of setback from Edison from the required 100' to 90' from centerline for a canopy. **SECTION 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 5, located 3919 West Edison Street North.

Presentation:

Clint Case, 1704 East Fur Drive, Sand Springs, Oklahoma 74063, submitted a site plan (Exhibit M-1) and stated that he plans to build a 11,000 SF church facility on a 2 ½ acre site. The reason for the variance request is due to the stormwater retention area that was required. He indicated that the northeast side of the property would be left open for future expansion.

Mr. Case stated that the porte-cochere encroaches 10 feet into the required setback.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Beach stated that based on the information given to staff, the building could be moved north and east to avoid the detention pond and probably gain a few parking spaces in the process.

Mr. Case stated that there is a drive around to the back of the building to allow parking on either side of the church, which will be at the edge of the detention pond.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Mr. Dunham stated that he does not have a problem with the application due to the detention pond area being required.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance of setback from Edison from the required 100' to 90' from centerline for a canopy. **SECTION 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 5, per plan submitted for canopy area only, finding that the detention pond creates a hardship and finding that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan on the following described property:

The E 402.00' of the S 260.00' of Block 1, West Edison Plaza, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Osage County, State of Oklahoma and being located in a CS zoned district.

Case No. 18564

Action Requested:

Variance of side yard setback of 5' down to 3.7'. **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 6, located 3019 South Quaker Avenue.

Presentation:

Steve Olsen, no address given, submitted a site plan (Exhibit N-1) and stated that the subject residence is currently 3.7' from the property line. He explained that his clients would like to construct a new garage that will be in line with the existing home.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance of side yard setback of 5' down to 3.7'. **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 6, Per plan submitted; finding that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan on the following described property:

Lot 3, Block 1, Edgewood Drive Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma and being located in an RS-1 zoned district.

Case No. 18565

Action Requested:

Variance of the required parking spaces for shopping center from 466 to 393. **SECTION 1219.D. Use Unit 19. HOTEL, MOTEL AND RECREATION FACILITIES, Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements – Use Unit 12, 13, 14 and 19, located northwest corner of East 41st Street and South Hudson.**

Presentation:

Robert Franden, 525 South Main, Suite 1000, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103, submitted a site plan (Exhibit O-1) and stated that if the current parking rules are enforced the center is deficient. He explained that the shopping center is an old center. He indicated that in the past the 225 parking space requirement had been applied for restaurants rather than 400.

Mr. Franden stated that with the 225 parking space requirement, his client will still be seven spaces deficient and if the 400 parking space requirement is applied he will be 73 spaces deficient. **INAUDIBLE.**

Mr. Franden commented that the amount of space in the center is set and it will be deficient in parking no matter what happens. He indicated that there are several existing uses that require a good amount of parking. He explained that the peak parking period is during the noon hour; however, during the rest of the day and evening the parking is sufficient. Mr. Franden concluded by requesting that the existing use be approved.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White reported that a letter of opposition has been received from the property owners to the west (Jim Dill) of the subject tract (Exhibit O-2).

Mr. Franden stated that when the center was originally built, the parking requirement was less. He reiterated that the center does not have a parking problem except at noon when Ricardo's Restaurant is busy.

Ms. Perkins asked if the property management have the responsibility to make sure that the tenant mix stays within compliance with the number of parking spaces. In response, Mr. Franden agreed and stated that if the mix of tenants were looked at through the years it would show that the majority of the tenants are more service center oriented. Mr. Franden stated that under any mix, the center would be deficient regarding parking spaces.

Mr. Stump stated that the center could continue under the parking requirement that it was built under, as long as it is continued and not discontinued for more than three years in a four-year period.

Mr. Franden explained that each time he requests a permit, he has a problem with the parking issue and would like to get it cleared up by having the BOA approve the variance for what exists at the center today.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **COOPER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the required parking spaces for shopping center be changed as follows: that all current and future uses shall meet the parking as required under the Code in total less 73 spaces. **SECTION 1219.D. Use Unit 19. HOTEL, MOTEL AND RECREATION FACILITIES**, Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements – Use Unit 12, 13, 14 and 19, finding that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

A tract of land that is part of the S/2 of the S/2 of Section 22, T-19-N, R-13-E of the IBM, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, said tract of land being described as follows, to-wit: Starting at a point on the Sly line of said Section 22, said point being 25.00' Ely of the SW/c of the SE/4; thence N 0°01'50" E and parallel to the Wly line of the SE/4 for 310.00' to the point of beginning of said tract of land; thence beginning N 89°59'40" W and parallel to the Sly line of Section 22 for 80.00'; thence N 0°0'20" E for 2.00'; thence N 89°59'40" W for 66.50'; thence S 0°0'20" W for 2.00'; thence N 89°59'40" W for 145.08'; thence due S for 260.00' to a point, said point being 50.00' Nly of the Sly line of Section 22; thence N 89°59'40" W and parallel to said Sly line for 200.00' thence due N for 769.58' to a point on the Sly line of Lot 12 in Block 9 of Highview Estates Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, said point being 22.01' Ely of the SW/c thereof; thence due E along said Sly line for 24.21' to a corner of said Lot 12; thence N 56°30'00" E along the SEly line of Lot 12 for 123.00' to a SE/c of Lot 12; thence S 33°30'00" E along the Sly right-of-way line of E. 39th Pl. S. for 30.34' to a point of curve; thence SEly and Ely along said right-of-way, on a curve to the left with a central angle of 56°30'00" and a radius of 150.00' for 147.92' to a point of tangency; thence due E along said right-of-way for 223.24' to a point, said point being 25.00' Ely of the Wly line of the SE/4 of said Section 22; thence S 0°01'50" W and parallel to said Wly line for 485.02' to the point of beginning and being located in a CS zoned district.

Mr. White announced that he would be abstaining from Case No. 18566 and 18567.

Case No. 18566

Action Requested:

Variance of required frontage from 150' to 0' to permit a lot-split in a CS district. **SECTION 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 19, located at the southwest quadrant 21st Street and Garnett.

Presentation:

J. M. Denny, 9936 East 55th Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a site plan (Exhibit P-2) and stated that the owner currently owns the irregularly shaped parcel, which was the former "Tiffany Bowl". He indicated that his client is interested in selling off a pad site, which would be the square piece off of Garnett. In do in this his client will cutoff access to the larger parcel, which his client is retaining ownership to.

Mr. Denny stated that his client is requesting a variance from the frontage requirement. His client understands that he will have to make provisions for access and utilities for both parcels. Through the mutual access easement that his client has in mind will create two points of access to the larger parcel rather than the one that exists now on the 200' frontage on Garnett.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Cooper asked the applicant what the hardship is regarding the subject property. In response, Mr. Denny stated that the subject property, as it exists today, has a limited marketability. The use on Garnett would be consistent with the fast food restaurants and smaller sale sites, which is what his client is looking to develop for the smaller parcel facing Garnett.

Mr. Cooper asked the applicant how the rear parcel would be more marketable by doing this. Mr. Denny stated that he doesn't know what his client's future intentions are for the larger parcel, but it will create marketability for the 200' of frontage on Garnett.

Mr. Dunham stated that he does not know if the configuration of the subject property would meet the hardship requirements. The uses in the back of the subject property need the frontage on Garnett, as long as they have access. It is a large tract with a strange configuration.

Mr. Cooper stated that he does not see a hardship. He commented that you do not improve the marketability of a property by cutting it off from its frontage.

Ms. Turnbo stated that this would be a self-imposed hardship.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **COOPER**, the Board voted 4-0-1 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo "aye"; no "nays", White "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** Variance of required frontage from 150' to 0' to permit a lot-split in a CS district. **SECTION 703. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS** – Use Unit 19, finding that the applicant could not state a hardship and that the request would be detrimental to the subject area and violate the spirit and intent of the Code; on the following described property:

A tract of land in Lots 1, 2, and 4, Block 1, Tiffany Park Addition, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, said tract being described as follows: Beginning at the NE/c of said Lot 2; thence N 00°06'30" E for 55.24' to the SE/c of Lot 4; thence due W for 150.00' to the SE/c of the W 150' of Lot 4; thence N 00°06'30" E for 175.00' to the NE/c of the W 150' of Lot 4; thence due W for 150.00' to the NW/c of Lot 4; thence due W for 339.11'; thence S 00°06'30" W for 520.24' to the S line of Lot 1' thence due E for 339.11' to the SW/c of Lot 2; thence due E for 150.00' to the S-SE/c of Lot 2; thence N 00°06'30" E for 140.00' to the NW/c of Lot 3; thence due E for 150.00' to the E-SE/c of Lot 2; thence N 00°06'30" E for 150.00' to the point of beginning and being located in a CS zoned district.

Case No. 18567

Action Requested:

Variance of the required street frontage. **SECTION 206. STREET FRONTAGE REQUIRED** – Use Unit 6, a Variance of the lot width in an RS-3 zoned district from 60' to 50' to obtain a lot split. **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** and Variance of the side yard setback from 5' to 4.7'. **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, located east of the northeast corner of East 36th Street and South Quincy.

Presentation:

J. M. Denny, 9936 East 55th Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted a site plan (Exhibit Q-1) and stated that his client is interested in dividing the parcel in order to build a second house on the property to the east. The 50' lot frontage is consistent with the other uses in the subject area. He indicated that his client intends to remove the pool deck and the wood frame storage building that encroaches if this application is approved.

Mr. Denny indicated that the property has been divided evenly east and west, but unfortunately it left less than a 5' side yard. He stated that his client is requesting a variance for the side yard.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Perkins asked Mr. Denny if the pool encroaches as well as the pool deck. In response, Mr. Denny stated that he understands that at this time it is only the pool deck that encroaches. Mr. Stump informed the Board that there are no setbacks for pools in the Zoning Code. Mr. Stump stated that he believes that there is five-foot setback from the property line in the building code regarding swimming pools.

Mr. Stump informed the applicant that there is not a 60-foot frontage requirement, but a 60-foot average lot width.

Mr. Dunham stated that he is not clear about the pool encroachment. In response, Mr. Stump stated that there is no variance needed for the pool, but if there is a building code issue, the applicant will not be allowed to divide the property as requested.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Nick Enterline, 1411 East 36th Street, stated that he is the owner of the subject property. He indicated that he has no problem with removing the deck and have a yard setback of 7.5' on the side of the pool.

Mr. Dunham asked the applicant if he is proposing to have a 7.5-foot setback on the west line of the east lot. In response, the applicant answered affirmatively.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **COOPER**, the Board voted 4-0-1 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo "aye"; no "nays", White "abstentions"; none "absent") to **STRIKE** the variance of the required street frontage, and **APPROVE** a Variance of the lot width in a RS-3 zoned district from 60' to 50' to obtain a lot-split. **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** and Variance of the side yard setback from 5' to 4.7' on the west lot and the setback for the west side of the east lot shall be not less than 7.5';. **SECTION 403. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**; subject to the elimination of the wood frame building and the encroachment of the pool deck on the west lot, finding that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

Lot 2, Block 5, Olivers Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, and being located in an RS-3 zoned district.

Case No. 18568

Action Requested:

Variance of maximum building height in OL zoned District from one-story to two-stories. **SECTION 603. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE OFFICE DISTRICTS** and a Special Exception to increase F.A.R. from .30 to .34. **SECTION 603. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE OFFICE DISTRICTS**, located 4416 South Harvard.

Presentation:

Patrick Carr, 4713 East 87th Place, submitted a site plan (Exhibit R-1) and stated that he intends to develop the subject property for a law office. He indicated that the proposed building would appear to be a one-story building from Harvard, but it would be a two-story building.

Mr. Carr stated that the reason for the variance request is because of the configuration of the topography of the land. There is a fourteen-foot drop from Harvard to the back side of the lot. He commented that it is difficult to utilize the subject property with a one-story project. He indicated that there are similar buildings built in the same configuration along the west side of Harvard.

Mr. Carr displayed photographs of similar buildings along the west side of Harvard.

INAUDIBLE.

Mr. Carr stated that he has a staff of 23 and would like more room to accommodate growth in the future. He concluded that the proposed building would add value to the surrounding area.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. White asked Mr. Carr if he was able to talk with the neighbors regarding this proposal. In response, Mr. Carr answered negatively.

Mr. Carr informed the Board that his proposal provides for 40 parking places, which is more than is required by the Code.

Mr. Carr stated that the maximum height of the buildings would be within the Code maximum of 35'. He explained that where the subject property drops, the building would exceed the 35' in height when measuring from the lowest to the highest point.

INTERESTED PARTIES COMMENTS:

Damon Fell, 4441 South Gary Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that his property abuts the subject property. He expressed concerns regarding property values decreasing, lighting for the parking area being intrusive and problems with water drainage. He commented that the two-story building will be towering into their back yards and will cause privacy problems. He stated that he opposes a two-story building.

Ron Wood, 4421 South Gary Place, stated that his property backs up directly to the subject property. He expressed similar concerns regarding the drainage and the building towering over his back yard. He concluded that he would like the drainage issue addressed.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Stump stated that the drainage problems would be addressed during the permitting process. He explained that perhaps there may have to be some on site detention since there does not seem to be a receiving stream that has capacity to take more runoff.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL:

Mr. Carr stated that he would like to meet with the neighbors and work out the issues expressed by the interested parties.

In response to Mr. Cooper, Mr. Carr stated that a one-story building will still be perched high on the subject property because of the topography and the ground level will be looking into the neighbors back yard. He commented that the only way to avoid this issue is to dig down 14 feet from Harvard, which is impossible because of the lay of the land.

Ms. Turnbo asked if the windows could be limited on the back of the proposed building in order to give the neighbors more privacy. In response, Mr. Carr stated that the windows are not very high up.

Ms. Perkins stated that the applicant could build a one-story building and it would still have a high wall in the back.

Mr. White stated that the windows in the back on a single-story would be the same height as the second level.

Mr. Fell stated that he is not here to object to the proposal, but would like to discuss the issues with the applicant.

After a lengthy discussion it was determined to continue this application in order to allow the applicant to meet with the neighbors.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TURNBO**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 18568 to November 23, 1999 at 1:00 p.m. in order to allow the applicant to meet with the interested parties.

Case No. 18570 and 18571

Action Requested:

Case No. 18570: Variance to permit two signs per street frontage in OM zoning. **SECTION 602.B.4.b. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions, and Case No. 18571:** a Variance to permit two signs per street frontage. **SECTION 602.B.4.b. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions,** located 2440 East 81st Street and 8408 South Delaware.

Presentation:

Kevin Hutchison, 6550 East Independence, Tulsa, Oklahoma, submitted photographs (Exhibit T-2) a site plan (Exhibit T-1 & U-1) and stated that the two variance requests are both the same and owned by a common owner. He indicated that the building on 81st Street is zoned OM and the Delaware location is zoned RM. Both properties have the same

requirements regarding square footage of signs allowed per lineal foot of street frontage and the number of signs allowed.

Mr. Hutchison stated that the reason for the variance is because there are already existing signs consuming the allotted number, but there is allowable square footage available. He indicated that it is difficult to distinguish the subject business from the other businesses in City Plex Towers and Oral Roberts University. The proposed signage, combined with the existing signs, does not exceed the allowable square footage for each frontage allowed under the Code.

Mr. Hutchison indicated that the proposed sign on the 81st Street building faces the University and cannot be viewed from any residential areas and the proposed sign on Delaware can be viewed from a residential area; however, the homes are behind a concrete wall and a row of mature hardwoods. Mr. Hutchison concluded that the building sets below the grade of Delaware and the view is further obstructed by a PSO electrical substation.

There were no interested parties wishing to speak.

Board Action:


On **MOTION** of **DUNHAM**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Dunham, Cooper, Perkins, Turnbo, White "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** Case No. 18570: a variance to permit two signs per street frontage in OM zoning. **SECTION 602.B.4.b. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions, and Case No. 18571: a Variance to permit two signs per street frontage. SECTION 602.B.4.b. ACCESSORY USES PERMITTED IN OFFICE DISTRICTS, Accessory Use Conditions**, per plan submitted, finding that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan on the following described property:

Case No. 18570: Part of Lot 1, Beg. at the NW/c thence S 1008.29' E 546.16' thence on curve to the left 704.16' thence on curve to the left 33.26' W 41.82' N 254.33' E 50.01' thence on curve to the left 31.77' thence on curve to the left 128.44' thence on curve to the right 171.12' N 21.30' thence on curve to the left 9.22' W 939.9' to the POB less beg. at the NW/c Lot 1 thence E 431.84' S 1008.79' W 431.84' N 1008.65' to POB, Block 1, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, and being located in an OM zoned district.

Case No. 18571: Part of Lot 1 Beg. 663' W & 986.05' N of the SE/c thence E 320' S 500' W 320' N 500' to the POB, Block 1, Oral Roberts University Heights 2ND Addition, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, and being located in an RM-1 zoned district.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

Date approved: 1-11-2000


Chairman