

CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES of Meeting No. 934
Tuesday, May 23, 2006, 1:00 p.m.
Francis F. Campbell City Council Room
Plaza Level of City Hall
Tulsa Civic Center

**MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Dunham, Chair
Henke, Secretary
Stead
Stephens

**MEMBERS
ABSENT**

Tidwell

**STAFF
PRESENT**

Cuthbertson
Huntsinger

**OTHERS
PRESENT**

Ackermann, Legal

The notice and agenda of said meeting was posted in the City Clerk's office, City Hall, on Thursday, May 18, 2006, at 2:30 p.m., as well as at the Office of INCOG, 201 W. 5th St., Suite 600.

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

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

REQUEST TO CONTINUE AND CASES TO WITHDRAW

Case No. 20238

Action Requested:

Special exception to allow a cell tower in an AG district and a special exception of the required 110 percent distance from an R district, located: 3101 West Edison.

Presentation:

Mr. Cuthbertson informed the Board that the applicant has asked for a continuance to the meeting on June 13, 2006. They needed time to finalize new site plans for the Board.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Henke**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 20238 to the meeting on June 13, 2006, regarding the following described property:

A tract of land lying in and being part of Lot 3 and the Northwest Quarter (NW/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) of Section 33, Township 20 North, Range 12 East of the Indian Meridian as described in Book 326, Page 167, Deed Records of Osage County, Oklahoma; Said tract being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a mag nail found for the Southwest corner of said SE/4; Thence N 88°28'27" E on the South line of said SE/4, a distance of 1112.89 feet to a point on said South line; Thence N 01°31'33" W perpendicular to said South line, a distance of 626.12 feet to a 1/2" iron rod with cap set for the Southwest corner, said corner being the Point of Beginning; Thence N 01°27'23" W a distance of 43.00 feet to a 1/2" iron rod with cap set for the Northwest corner; Thence N 89°36'43" E a distance of 25.00 feet to a 1/2" iron rod with cap set for the Northeast corner; Thence S 01°27'23" E a distance of 43.00 feet to a chiseled "X" set for the Southeast corner; Thence S 89°36'43" W a distance of 25.00 feet to the Point of Beginning, containing 1,075.00 square feet or 0.025 acres, more or less, City of Tulsa, Osage County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20267

Action Requested:

Variance of the minimum lot width for duplex use in an RM-2 district, located: 6030 South Newport and 6019 South Madison Place.

Presentation:

Mr. Cuthbertson informed the Board the applicant has withdrawn this case and has asked for a refund.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Henke**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a request for refund, as recommended by staff, for \$150.00, on the following described property:

LT 4 through LT 6 BLK 6, LT 19 through LT 23 BLK 6, BROADVIEW HGTS ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20269

Action Requested:

Variance of the maximum permitted height for an accessory building in the required rear yard; and a Variance of the maximum permitted square footage for detached accessory buildings, in an RE district, located: 2121 East 29th Street South.

Presentation:

Mr. Cuthbertson informed the Board that the second variance of the maximum permitted square footage for detached accessory buildings, in an RE district has been withdrawn. It was anticipated by staff that it might be needed but they discovered that it was in compliance with the code too late to take it off of the agenda.

LT 7& 8 BLK 9, FOREST HILLS, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20281

Action Requested:

Minor Variance of the required side yard abutting a street from 15 ft. to 13 ft., located: 229 East Reading Street North.

Presentation:

Mr. Cuthbertson stated that Tulsa Development Authority realized they did not have a hardship and reworked the site plan. They withdrew this case.

Lot 3, Block 2, DICKASON GOODMAN ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

MINUTES

On **MOTION** of **Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Henke, Stead, Stephens "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of April 11, 2006 (No. 931).

On **MOTION** of **Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Henke, Stead, Stephens "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of April 25, 2006 (No. 932).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Case No. 20254

Action Requested:

Variance of the required 50 ft distance from the driving surface of a signalized intersection to 27 ft and the required 20 ft distance from the driving surface of a street to 13.5 ft. to permit a changeable copy sign, located: 8080 South Yale Avenue.

Presentation:

John Moody, 1800 South Baltimore, Suite 900, represented the applicant and owner of the property. He covered the history of this case as in the previous hearing. He reminded the Board that the previous sign had changeable copy for time and temperature, but it was not a scrolling copy. In 1992 the zoning code was changed to eliminate any distinction between the time and temperature and the scrolling, flashing or animated or changeable copy signs. They are all considered the same by the code. A sign plan and other exhibits were provided (Exhibit A-1, A-2, A-3).

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Stephens asked for the difference in the size of the original sign and the new one. Mr. Moody stated the original was two feet in height. Mr. Henke noted the new one is three feet. Mr. Cuthbertson stated the old sign was 11 square feet, and the proposed changeable copy sign is 30 square feet, roughly three times the size. Mr. Moody believed the message board is smaller than it appeared on the original drawing. He stated the actual sign is 2 ½ ft. wide and the previous sign was about 5 ft. x 2 ft. Mr. Ackermann noted that the TMAPC approved the previous sign in the PUD. Mr. Dunham asked if the applicant put up a sign the same size as the previous sign would they need any relief.

Interested Parties:

Emily Lyons, 1801 North Willow Avenue, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, was with the sign company. She stated that the sign is 9 ft. x 3 ft., equaling 27 sq. ft. for the scrolling message board.

Mr. Moody stated that Mr. Garriott had no issue with the display surface area. He had to obtain a detailed sign plan approval for the PUD. Ms. Tomlinson could recommend it if it was no larger than the original changeable copy sign. Therefore, he was asking for a variance for the difference of the new, larger sign.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Stead asked for a hardship for the two variances. Mr. Dunham noted that the applicant could decrease the size of the sign and keep it in the location they desired. Mr. Moody replied there is not another place for the sign. He pointed out that the City made the changes that reduced the size of the lot, so it is not a self-imposed hardship. They wanted to increase the size of the sign to make it comparable to the size of nearby signs, like Walgreens. He noted that it would not interfere with the traffic because of the location.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **DENY** a Variance of the required 50 ft. distance from the driving surface of a signalized intersection to 27 ft and the required 20 ft. distance from the driving surface of a street to 13.5 ft. to permit a changeable copy sign, stating the applicant has the right to put up no

more than a 2' x 5' LED or changeable copy sign, on the following described property:

LT 2 LESS BEG SWC TH N335 E280 S89.36 E98.02 S245.64 W377.42 POB & LESS BEG NEC TH S225 SW28.25 W14.13 NE34.08 N220.87 NL E10 POB FOR ST BLK 1, COUNTRY HOLLOW, COUNTRY HOLLOW CENTER, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

NEW APPLICATIONS

Case No. 20268

Action Requested:

A Variance of the setback for a garage from a side street; and a Variance of the maximum coverage of the required rear yard; to permit a 3.5 ft. addition to an existing garage, located: 1704 South College Avenue East.

Presentation:

Diana Harbour, 1704 South College Avenue, came to present her application. Photographs were submitted (Exhibit B-1).

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Stead asked for the hardship. Ms. Harbour stated the house was built in 1925 and they have not been able to park in the garage as it is too small. They have maintained the property to be compatible with the neighborhood. They have experienced hail damage every year for the last three years. Mr. Dunham noted that it is non-conforming and lines up with neighboring garages.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the setback for a garage from a side street; and a Variance of the maximum coverage of the required rear yard; to permit a 3.5 ft. addition to an existing garage, finding the literal enforcement of the terms of the code would result in an unnecessary hardship, and that such extraordinary exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other properties in the same use district; and finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

LT 1 BLK 2, HICKORY MANOR ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20269

Action Requested:

Variance of the maximum permitted height for an accessory building in the required rear yard, located: 2121 East 29th Street South.

A Variance of the maximum permitted square footage for detached accessory buildings, in an RE district was withdrawn as shown on the agenda.

Presentation:

Allen Madewell, 5314 South Yale, represented the owners, John and Linda Kantor. They proposed to increase the height of a cabana that is under construction from 18 ft. to 24 ft. at the ridge, and need the variance because it extends into the backyard setback five feet. Only 43 in. of the width would be encroaching and it would still be twenty feet to the existing fence line, which is also the property line. The house to the back of it is also 50' to 60' away from the subject property. The concept was to match the English architecture of the historic home, built in 1936. They want to keep the impact to the side at a minimum. The lot has a curving arc so that it has setbacks from 29th Street and Yorktown, allowing only a small area for construction in the side yard. The original design has a motor court at the back of the house, which functioned as the main entrance. The front entrance was secondary so the house basically has no back yard. The feel is as a country estate and they built as far back on the property as possible. The plan was to keep as much open space as possible between the buildings. A site plan and photographs were provided (Exhibits C-1, C-2 and C-3).

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Stead asked if the 24 ft. height would be in excess of the garage height. Mr. Madewell replied it would be similar and the garage is probably 21 to 22 ft. in height. Mr. Madewell stated that the hardship was the non-conforming lot, curved small area for construction and without a rear yard.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the maximum permitted height to 24 ft. for an accessory building in the required rear yard, per plan, finding a non-conforming large lot, structure built in 1936, and to be compatible with the existing architecture; finding the literal enforcement of the terms of the code would result in an unnecessary hardship, and that such

extraordinary exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other properties in the same use district; finding it will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

LT 7& 8 BLK 9, FOREST HILLS, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20270

Action Requested:

Variance of the frontage requirement in a CS district; to permit a lot split, located: 6350 South Lewis Avenue.

Presentation:

Rick Riddle, 5314 South Yale, Suite 200, represented the owner for a variance to permit a lot-split. He provided a survey (Exhibit D-1).

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham asked if they were going to change anything on the existing improvements or access points. Mr. Riddle replied that nothing else would be changed.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

Board Action:

On **Motion of Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the frontage requirement in a CS district; to permit a lot split, per survey, finding that by reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; 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 Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

LT 18 LESS PRT BEG SECR LT 18 TH N175 W150 S175 E150 POB, PRT LT 18 BEG SECR LT 18 TH N175 W150 S175 E150 POB, PECAN ACRES, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20271

Action Requested:

Variance of the requirement that illumination of a sign shall be by constant light (Section 302.B.2.b) to permit an LED message board, located: 5050 East 111th Street South.

Presentation:

Greg Hollinger, 14803 South Columbia Avenue, Bixby, Oklahoma, represented St. James United Methodist Church, Board of Trustees. He stated it is a 14 acre parcel with mature trees, ponds, jogging trails, and green areas used for community sports events and practices. Homeowner's Associations also use their facility. The pastor has a vision to update the church as funds become available. They hired the sign company to construct a new sign of 16' x 10', with a total display area of 120 sq. ft. The allowable size is 150 sq. ft. with a maximum height restriction of 20'. He provided photographs and a site plan (Exhibits E-1 and E-2). He pointed out the sign would be located 318' to the west of the residence to the east; 600' to the residence to the south; 700' to the property line to the west; and 130' from the residence to the north. The plan includes an LED constant light message board to announce activities at the church.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham asked if it would have flashing or blinking lights. Mr. Hollinger replied it would not. Ms. Stead asked the size of the lighted portion. Mr. Hollinger replied it would be 2' x 10'. Ms. Stead noted they have a lot of frontage and acreage.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Henke**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the requirement that illumination of a sign shall be by constant light (Section 302.B.2.b) to permit an LED message board, per plan, limiting the constant light display area to 2 ft. 4 in. x 9 ft. 5 in., no flashing or scrolling, finding that by reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; 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 Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

LT 1 BLK 1, N/2 NW NW LESS W/2 W/2 N/2 NW NW & LESS E593.79 N/2 NW NW SEC 34 18 13 6.10ACS, ST JAMES UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20272

Action Requested:

Variance of the required setback from the side yard for an accessory building not in a required rear yard from 5 ft to 4 ft. Sec. 210B.5.b, located: 2015 East 4th Place South.

Presentation:

Amelia Valdez, 2015 East 4th Place South, stated there was a concrete slab on the property with a 18' x 18' building on the property.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Dunham asked if this is an existing building for which they are requesting permission. The applicant replied in the affirmative.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

Board Action:

On **Motion of Stead**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Henke Stephens, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the required setback from the side yard for an accessory building not in a required rear yard from 5 ft to 4 ft. Sec. 210B.5.b, finding the 1930 structure is inadequate for today's use; by reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; 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 Code, or the Comprehensive Plan, on the following described property:

E70 OF S350 BLK 17, GILLETTE-HALL ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20275

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit Use Unit 5 (Tulsa Technology Center) on the subject property, located: 3500 South Memorial.

Presentation:

Randall Pickard, 1500 South Utica Avenue, Suite 400, represented the applicant. A site plan without sidewalks was provided (Exhibit F-1).

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Stead noted the staff report mentioned sidewalks would be required and it should be shown on the site plan. Mr. Pickard understood and stated they have a revised site plan, which they will provide to the Board.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties who wished to speak.

Board Action:

On **Motion** of **Henke**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Special Exception to permit Use Unit 5 (Tulsa Technology Center) on the subject property, and the revised site plan to be submitted will reflect construction of new sidewalks along Memorial, finding it will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare, on the following described property:

PART OF THE N/2 OF THE SE/4 OF THE NE/4 OF SEC 23, T-19-N, R-13-E OF THE I.B.&M, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ACCORDING TO THE U.S. GOV'T SURVEY THEREOF, COMMENCING AT A PT 360.00 FT S & 60.00 FT W OF THE NE/C OF N/2 SE/4 NE/4 (THE POINT OF BEGINNING);

TH S 00°01'30" E PARALLEL TO AND 60.00 FT FROM THE E BNDRY OF SAID N/2 SE/4 NE/4 (THE W ROW LN OF MEMORIAL DR) A DIST OF 298.47 FT; TH S 00°05'01" W A DIST OF 659.45 FT; TH S 00°02'41" E A DIST OF 318.65 FT; TH S 06°39'23" W A DIST OF 128.43 FT; TH S 00°02'04" E A DIST OF 218.24 FT; TH S 57°35'46" W A DIST OF 235.50 FT; TH N 64°45'48" W A DIST OF 344.40 FT; TH N 59°36'06" W A DIST OF 367.26 FT; TH N 57°14'45" W A DIST OF 840.47 FT; TH N 89°58'34" E A DIST OF 288.87 FT; TH N 00°02'08" W A DIST OF 374.69 FT; TH N 81°46'51" W A DIST OF 266.39 FT; TH N ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT A DIST OF 52.69 FT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 93.0 FT; TH N 00°02'08" W A DIST OF 142.74 FT; TH S 89°59'11" E A DIST OF 250.00 FT; TH N 00°02'08" W A DIST OF 54.87 FT S 89°59'11" E A DIST OF 758.37 FT; TH N 00°01'30" W A DIST OF 298.13 FT; TH N 89°58'30" E A DIST OF 516.57 FT; RETURNING TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. SAID TRACT CONTAINING 1,745,852.5 SQ. FT. OR 40.08 ACRES, MORE OR LESS,

LESS AND EXCEPT LOT TWO (2), BLOCK ONE (1) INTERCHANGE PLACE, AN ADDITION TO THE CITY OF TULSA, ACCORDING TO THE RECORDED PLAT THEREOF, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Case No. 20276

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a duplex in an RS-3 district; and a Variance of the duplex requirements in an RS-3 district: minimum lot area, land area, livability space, and frontage (Section 404.C), located: 3736 South Norfolk Avenue East.

Presentation:

Cathryn Wall, 4156 South St. Louis Avenue, submitted a packet of exhibits (Exhibit G-1). They proposed to build a duplex on the subject property. She stated there are duplexes, town homes and multi-family dwellings throughout the Brookside area. She stated it would be cottage style and appear from the front as a single-family dwelling.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Stead asked if it would be two-story and Ms. Wall responded it is one and one-half stories. Mr. Henke asked for the size of each unit. Ms. Wall stated they do not have blue prints yet, but they want no less than 1,350 sq. ft. per unit. She added that the liveability space is the issue today. Ms. Stead wanted to hear from the neighborhood.

Interested Parties:

Larae Wright, 1102 East 37th Place, stated she is in support of the application.

Dan Cruse, 1101 East 28th Street, stated that there are a few duplexes in the neighborhood but he bought property surrounded by single-family dwellings. He expressed concern for the future value of his property and duplexes greatly change the look of the neighborhood. He was opposed to the application.

Herb Beattie, 3474 South Zunis, stated he represented the Board of the Brookside Neighborhood Association. They see the project as a nice investment and yet they have the same concerns as Mr. Cruse. He stated they have serious neighborhood inspection issues but he knew the Board could not address them.

Sally McGrew, 1101 East 38th Street, stated she is Mr. Cruse's wife. She expressed concern that it would be larger than allowed for a duplex. She was concerned that it would probably be rental property. She did not think there would be adequate parking and noted there is no curb on Norfolk. She did not think they needed any more on-street parking. Ms. McGrew noted the plan for a 1 ½ story structure and stated one neighbor to the back has a pool and she and her husband plan to put one in also.

Dan Kitchens, 1041 East 37th Place, stated he was opposed to the application for the same reasons as previously listed.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Carol Ashcraft, 1861 East 15th Street, owner of CAA Properties, believed this would be a good urban infill project. They planned to put parking in the rear and focus the front toward the street. They were deciding on the style of architecture to blend in with the neighborhood. She pointed out there are duplexes one block away on the side street.

Comments and Questions:

Ms. Stead considered the lot to be too small. Ms. Wall pointed out that at 36th Place and Norfolk there is a duplex on what appeared to be a 50 ft. lot and duplexes on 37th Street on 60 ft. lots, which is smaller than the subject property. They plan to build three-bedroom, 2 bath units to lease or sell. She added that the code would allow two-stories.

Board Action:

Motion by **Stead** to **DENY** a Special Exception to permit a duplex in an RS-3 district; and a Variance of the duplex requirements in an RS-3 district: minimum lot area, land area, livability space, and frontage (Section 404.C), failed for lack of a second.

On **Motion** of **Stephens**, the Board voted 2-2-0 (Stephens, Henke "aye"; Dunham, Stead "nay"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **CONTINUE** Case No. 20276 for the applicant to bring detailed site plan and elevations to the next meeting or an upcoming meeting when the applicant has these available, and the motion failed for lack of three affirmative votes.

On **Motion** of **Stephens**, to **APPROVE** a Special Exception to permit a duplex in an RS-3 district; and a Variance of the duplex requirements in an RS-3 district: minimum lot area, land area, livability space, and frontage (Section 404.C), subject to receiving detailed site plans and elevations for review and approval or denial, and suggest that the interested parties meet with CAA Properties prior to the meeting when this case is placed on the agenda again, and that these parties be notified of that meeting, more discussion ensued.

Mr. Stephens withdrew his motion.


On **Motion** of **Henke**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Dunham, Stephens, Henke, Stead "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Tidwell "absent") to **APPROVE** a Special Exception to permit a duplex in an RS-3 district; finding the Special Exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare, and the Special Exception is contingent upon or subject to approval by the Board of Adjustment of a detailed site plan, and elevations; and to **APPROVE** four Variances of the duplex requirements in an RS-3 district: minimum lot area, land area, livability space, and frontage (Section 404.C), to include a minimum lot area of 6,750 sq. ft., a minimum land area per dwelling unit of 4,200 sq. ft., minimum frontage of 67.5 sq. ft.,

minimum livability space per dwelling unit of 1,350 sq. ft., finding that by reason of extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances which are peculiar to the land, structure or building involved, the literal enforcement of the terms of the Code would result in unnecessary hardship; that such extraordinary or exceptional conditions or circumstances do not apply generally to other property in the same use district; and that the variances 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, and subject to approval of a detailed site plan and elevations, on the following described property:

N/2 EACH LTS 17 & 18 BLK 2, RIVERLAWN ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Date approved: June 13, 2006


Chair