

CITY OF TULSA BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Tulsa City Council Chambers
175 East 2nd Street, 2nd Level
One Technology Center
Tuesday, October 24, 2023, 1:00 p.m.

Meeting No. 1326

Members Present

Bond, Chair
Radney, Vice Chair
Stauffer
Barrientos
Wallace

Members Absent

Staff Present

A. Chapman

Others

A. Blank, Legal

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the City Clerk's office, City Hall, on October 20, 2023, at 1:01 p.m.

Mr. Bond called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

On **MOTION** of **Barrientos**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Wallace, Stauffer, Barrientos, Bond, Radney "ayes", no "nays"; no "abstentions", none "absent") to **Approve the approval** of the **Minutes** of August 8, 2023 (Meeting No. 1321).

Unfinished Business

23580 – Ryan Neurohr, Image Builders

Action Requested: Special Exception to permit a Dynamic Display sign in a Residential District containing a School Use (Sec. 60.050-B.2.c); Special Exception to permit a dynamic display sign within 200 feet of Residentially Zoned Lots (Sec. 60.100-F)

Location: 525 E. 46th St. N. (CD 4)

Presentation

Walter Moore, 11410 N. 145th E. Ave., stated that he is the director of operations for Image Builders, and he is representing the applicant. He explained that they are requesting a special exception to place a display sign in a residential district, and that the school is not in a residential district, but it is within 200 feet of one.

Mr. Bond asked if there have been any concerns from neighbors. Mr. Moore stated that they have not heard anything from the neighbors surrounding the school.

Mr. Barrientos asked if he would be using the same location as the existing sign. Mr. Moore responded that they will be using the same location and the existing pole.

Comments and Questions

Ms. Stauffer and Ms. Radney stated that they do not have any issues with the request.

Mr. Bond stated that he does not have any concerns since it will be the same location as the old sign.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Barrientos**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Wallace, Barrientos, Radney “ayes”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Special Exception to permit a Dynamic Display sign in a Residential District containing a School Use (Sec. 60.050-B.2.c); Special Exception to permit a dynamic display sign within 200 feet of Residentially Zoned Lots (Sec. 60.100-F), per the conceptual plans on pages 2.10-2.16 of the agenda packet.

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

Property Description

SW SE SW SEC 12 20 12, SUBURBAN ACRES THIRD ADDN, FAIRHILL 2ND ADDN CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23582 – Wallace Design Collective

Action Requested: Special Exception to amend a previously approved site plan for a Country Club in an RS-1 District (Table 5.020, Table 5-2; Sec.70.120)

Location: 2636 E. 61st St. S. (CD 9)

Presentation

Justin Debruin, 4912 E. El. Paso St., stated that they are requesting to demolish the existing structure and build a larger footprint for the restaurant. He stated that they will be complying with all city codes; they just need to amend the previously approved site plan.

Mr. Bond asked if there were any concerns from the surrounding neighbors. Mr. Debruin stated that they had not heard anything.

Comments and Questions

Mr. Bond stated that he does not have any issues with the request since it is in a self-contained area far away from residential areas.

Mr. Barrientos, Ms. Stauffer, and Ms. Radney stated that they do not have any issues with the application.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Stauffer**, the Board voted 4-0-1 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney “ayes”; no “nays”; Wallace “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Special Exception to amend a previously approved site plan for a Country Club in an RS-1 District (Table 5.020, Table 5-2; Sec.70.120) per the conceptual plans show on pages 3.6-3.11 of the agenda packet.

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

Property Description

NE LESS 36.39AC & NW LESS 8.5AC & LESS 2.16AC FOR RD & LESS BEG 208.71N SWC NW TH N1704.80 E50 S1704.79 W50 TO POB SEC 5 18 13 268.793ACS

New Applications

23584 – Richard Troost

Action Requested: Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an RS-2 District (45.031-D); Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A, 45.031-D.6)

Location: 23 S. Toledo Ave. (CD 4)

Presentation

Richard Troost, 1307 S. Atlanta Ave., stated he is representing the applicant who bought the property with an ADU and now they are wanting to add to the dwelling unit. He explained that the hardship is that the mother and the son were abandoned by the father and the grandfather has taken them into his home to live. He mentioned that the son and the mother would be living in the ADU and so they need enough room for both.

Mr. Bond asked if the ADU was already built when they bought the house. Mr. Troost answered that it was already built when they bought the home.

Mr. Barrientos mentioned that the hardship cannot be personal, but it must be unique to the property. Mr. Troost stated that they do not have another hardship.

Mr. Chapman read an email sent by Mr. Troost and informed the board that the home is on two lots and is close to Interstate 244.

Mr. Radney asked if they need relief to finish out the build. Mr. Troost answered stating that yes, they need relief because everything is built, they just need to add all the accessories inside the structure.

Ms. Stauffer confirmed that the owner owns both lots and the previous owner added the ADU close to the home because of the noise from the highway. Mr. Troost agreed with Ms. Stauffer's statement.

Ms. Radney asked for the total square footage of the ADU. Mr. Troost stated that it is 956 square feet.

Comments and Questions

Ms. Radney stated that she would be inclined to support it. She stated that it is consistent with the city's vision to have additional living places within the city limits.

Mr. Wallace pointed out that since the property is two lots the applicant could sell off the other lot or build another structure on the other lot. He asked what the thoughts of the board were to condition that the applicant would need to have the lots combined. Ms. Radney and Mr. Bond stated that they would not be in support of that.

Ms. Radney and Mr. Bond stated that they can support limiting the ADU to the lot that it is already built on, which is lot 192.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Wallace**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace "ayes"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **Approve** the request for a Special Exception to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit in an RS-2 District (45.031-D); Variance to allow the floor area of detached accessory buildings to exceed 500 square feet and 40% of the floor area of the principal residential structure (Section 45.030-A, 45.031-D.6), finding the hardship to be uniqueness of the property with the proximity to the highway, per the conceptual plans show on pages 4.11, 4.12, 4.14, and 4.15 of the agenda packet.

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

In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: that the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; that the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.

Property Description

LT 192 & 193 BK 2, RODGERS HGTS SUB CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23585 – Justin Haddock

Action Requested: Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5); Variance to reduce the required 2,500 square feet of open space per unit and 60-foot lot width for a duplex use in an RS-3 District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3); Special Exception to increase the permitted driveway width in an RS-3 district (Sec. 55.090-F.3)

Location: 307 S. 66th E. Ave. (CD 3)

Presentation

Justin Haddock, 1055 N. Owasso Ave., representing the realtors for the home, explained that they have not had any issues with the neighbors surrounding the area to build the duplexes.

Mr. Bond asked if he knew how many duplexes were in the neighborhood. Mr. Haddock replied that he did not know.

Mr. Bond asked what the hardship was. Mr. Haddock answered saying that a typical width of lots in RS-3 is 60 feet and theirs are 50 feet.

Comments and Questions

Mr. Wallace clarified that the two lots to the south of the proposed duplex are zoned for a duplex, and the proposed location is in between commercial and in front of commercial properties. He acknowledged that it is unusual lot to have a single-family residence built there. Ms. Radney concurred with Mr. Wallace.

Ms. Radney asked what the open space would be reduced to. Mr. Haddock replied that it would be 629 square feet.

Ms. Radney asked what the hardship was to reduce the open space. Mr. Haddock responded that the porch and the deck, which conform to the other homes in the area, reduces the open space area.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Wallace**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace "ayes"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **Approve** the request for a Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district (Table 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5); Special Exception to increase the permitted driveway width in an RS-3 district (Sec. 55.090-F.3); Variance to reduce the required 2,500 square feet of open space per unit and 60-foot lot width for a duplex use in an RS-3 District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3), finding the hardship to be the existing non-conforming lot in the RS-3 District, per the conceptual plans show on pages 5.13-5.14 of the agenda packet, subject to the condition that the reduction in the required open space will not be reduced further beyond what has been presented in the conceptual plans.

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

In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: that the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; that the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.

Property Description

LT 15 BLK E, CREST VIEW ESTATES CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23586 – Justin Haddock

Action Requested: Variance to reduce the required 2,000 square feet of open space per unit for duplex uses in the RD District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3); Variance to reduce the required 15-foot side street setback in an RD District (Sec. 5.030, Table Note [3])

Location: 317 & 327 S. 66th E. Ave. (CD 3)

Presentation

Justin Haddock, 1055 N. Owasso Ave., stated that he is requesting a variance to reduce the required open space and the required side street setback.

Mr. Bond asked what the side street setback would be reduced to. Mr. Haddock answered that it would be reduced to 5 feet.

Ms. Stauffer asked what the hardship was.

Interested Parties

Zhuline Phillips, 1055 N. Owasso Ave., stated that the lot is only 50 feet wide. She stated that if they were to try to build a duplex smaller on the end lot while trying to meet the setback, they would not be able to get a home on the land. She stated that even if a residential home was placed there, it would not work. She stated that they could have done two stories, but they have chosen not to because one story is more consistent with the neighborhood.

Ms. Radney asked the size of each duplex. Ms. Phillips answered that they were each 1,026 square feet.

Comments and Questions

Mr. Bond stated that he would support the application.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Stauffer**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace “ayes”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Variance to reduce the required 2,000 square feet of open space per unit for duplex uses in the RD District (Sec. 5.030, Table 5-3); Variance to reduce the required 15-foot side street setback in an RD District (Sec. 5.030, Table Note [3]), finding the hardship to be the width of the lot, per the conceptual plans show on pages 6.10, 6.11, 6.15, 6.16 of the agenda packet.

In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: that the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision’s intended purpose; that the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.

Property Description

LT 14 BLK E; LT 13 BLK E, CREST VIEW ESTATES CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23587 – Roy McManus

Action Requested: Special Exception to permit a Dynamic Display sign in a residential district containing a church use (Sec. 60.050-B.2.c) and to permit a dynamic display sign within 200 feet of residentially zoned lots (Sec. 60.100-F)

Location: 1703 W. 41st St. S. (CD 2)

Presentation

Roy McManus, 4111 S. 74th E. Ave, representing the Trinity Baptist Church, explained they are seeking a special exception to allow a dynamic display sign within 200 feet of the residential zoned lots. He stated that the existing sign is located on the corner of 41st and Union, and that the church wants to move the sign farther away from the corner because of several cars hitting it and with it being in the right-of-way. He stated that the zoning code distance requirement would place the sign right up against the building and would not be useful as a double-sided sign.

Mr. Bond asked if there have been any concerns from the neighbors. Mr. McManus answered that he had not heard of any concerns.

Comments and Questions

Mr. Bond stated that he does not have any issues with the application.

Mr. Wallace stated that the area is mostly commercial with no homes facing church, and that he does not have any issues with the application. He stated that he was in favor of having the sign pushed back.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Barrientos**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace “ayes”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Special Exception to permit a Dynamic Display sign in a residential district containing a church use (Sec. 60.050-B.2.c) and to permit a dynamic display sign within 200 feet of residentially zoned lots (Sec. 60.100-F), per the conceptual plans show on pages 7.7, 7.8, and 7.11 of the agenda packet.

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

Property Description

LTS 1 THROUGH 8 & 25 - 26 LESS BEG NEC LT 26 TH W20 S20 E20 N20 POB BLK 6, CLINTON HOMESITES CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23588 – Carlos Reyes

Action Requested: Variance to reduce the required 3-foot setback for accessory buildings in the rear setback (Sec.90.090-C.2.b)

Location: 1152 N. Boston Ave. (CD 1)

Presentation

Carlos Reyes, 5008 S. Irvington Pl., stated that he is requesting a reduction of the 3-foot setback for an accessory building. He stated that originally on the plans, the accessory building was going to be built according to the code but when the concrete was laid, they measured from the fence instead which gives them only 1 foot and 3 inches.

Mr. Bond asked if the home is original, and Mr. Reyes answered affirmatively.

Mr. Bond asked if there have been any concerns from the neighbors. Mr. Reyes stated that there have not been any issues.

Comments and Questions

Mr. Bond stated that this is very common in the neighborhood, and he would not be surprised if there are more applications for receiving relief.

Mr. Wallace stated that with the home also being right next to an alley makes it unique.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Radney**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace “ayes”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Variance to reduce the required 3-foot setback for accessory buildings in the rear setback (Sec.90.090-C.2.b), finding the hardship to be the uniqueness of the historic lot, and the building context of the houses and accessory structures that are surrounding the property, per the conceptual plans shown on the plat survey that was submitted to the board in the agenda packet.

In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: that the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision’s intended purpose; that the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.

Property Description

LT 7 & N 12 1/2 BLK 3 RESERVE OF 7, THE POWDER AND POMEROY ADDN, THE POWDER AND POMEROY SECOND ADDN AMD CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23589 – Acura Neon

Action Requested: Variance to increase the allowed sign area of 32 square feet for a wall sign in an AG District (Sec.60. 050.a)

Location: 3727 E. Apache St. N. (CD 1)

Presentation

Daniel Smith, 320 S. Boston Ave., stated that he is requesting a variance to increase the wall sign at the northeast campus of Tulsa Community College. He explained that they are adding a new entry into the academic building on the west side of the campus where the sign is proposed to be. He stated that surrounding the campus, there are several businesses with large signs, so it would not be injurious to the neighborhood.

Ms. Stauffer asked where the sign would be facing. Mr. Smith stated that it would face Harvard.

Mr. Bond asked if there have been any concerns from the neighbors that he is aware of. Mr. Smith responded that he had not heard anything.

Ms. Radney asked how much relief he would need. Mr. Smith answered that he would need an extra 17 square feet.

Ms. Radney asked how far they are setback from Harvard. Mr. Smith stated that they are about 450 feet from Harvard.

Comments and Questions

Ms. Stauffer acknowledged that TCC is a large campus and that the sign would have to be proportioned to how big the facility is. Mr. Bond agreed with Ms. Stauffer's assessment on granting the variance.

On **MOTION** of **Radney**, the Board voted 4-0-1 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, "ayes"; no "nays"; Wallace "abstentions"; none "absent") to **Approve** the request for a Variance to increase the allowed sign area of 32 square feet for a wall sign in an AG District (Sec.60. 050.a), finding the hardship to be the uniqueness of the educational institution and the need to have appropriate way finding for a building that is set back significantly from the main commercial corridor, per the conceptual plans shown on pages 9.9-9.11 of the agenda packet.

In granting the Variance, the Board finds that the following facts, favorable to the property owner, have been established: that the physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the subject property would result in unnecessary hardships or practical difficulties for the property owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were carried out; that literal enforcement of the subject zoning code provision is not necessary to achieve the provision's intended purpose; that the conditions leading to the need of the requested variance are unique to the subject property and not applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification; that the alleged practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship was not created or self-imposed by the current property owner; That the variance to be granted is the minimum variance that will afford relief; That the variance to be granted will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood in which the subject property is located, nor substantially or permanently impair use or development of adjacent property; and that the variance to be granted will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the zoning code or the comprehensive plan.

Property Description

SW SW & S/2 NW SW & W/2 SE SW LESS BEG 1951.92E & 50N SWC SW TH W475 N50.98 CRV LF 213.52 NELY 273.96 NW99.37 N112.16 E347 S635.58 POB & LESS 5.33ACS FOR RDS SEC 21 20 13 69.83ACS, MOHAWK HARVARD, MOHAWK HGTS SECOND CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23590 – Lou Reynolds

Action Requested: Minor Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a museum use in an RE District (Table 5.020, Table 5-2; Sec.70.120)

Location: 2727 S. Rockford Rd. **(CD 4)**

Presentation

Lou Reynolds, 2727 E. 21st St., stated that the original site plans are from 1988 and have not been modified since. He explained that they have held a couple of meetings with the neighbors surrounding the area and the project was well received. He stated that the two things that will be changing on the site plan are the addition of the Tandy Pavilion and the road that needs to be improved to comply with the fire code. He stated that the building will be 6,660 square feet and a little more than half will be utilized for support service.

Comments and Questions

Mr. Bond expressed that these two things will improve the neighborhood and public welfare.

Mr. Wallace stated that what Philbrook has done has been amazing for the community, and that adding more amenities is better for the city.

Mr. Bond pointed out that having proactive meetings with the neighborhood and being forthcoming makes it easier for the board.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Barrientos**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace “ayes”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Minor Special Exception to modify a previously approved site plan for a museum use in an RE District (Table 5.020, Table 5-2; Sec.70.120), per the conceptual plans show on pages 10.7-10.8 of the agenda packet.

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

Property Description

ALL PHILBROOK, PHILBROOK AMD, ROCKBRIDGE PARK CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

23591 – Christopher Smith (W Design)

Action Requested: Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for a Broadcasting or Recording Studio in an IM District (Sec. 55.050-K)

Location: 1724 E. 7th St. S. (CD 4)

Presentation

Weldon Bowman, 608 E. 3rd St., explained that the applicants are moving their offices to the proposed location. He stated that according to the zoning code, a broadcasting studio is required to have 6 parking spaces, but he is requesting that it be reduced to three parking spaces. He stated that the site allows them to have no more than three parking spaces. He stated that there are only two full-time employees and one of them works remotely, so they have no problem with the reduction.

Comments and Questions

Board members expressed their support for the application.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Wallace**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace “ayes”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none “absent”) to **Approve** the request for a Special Exception to reduce the required parking ratio for a Broadcasting or Recording Studio in an IM District (Sec. 55.050-K), per the conceptual plans show on page 11.9 of the agenda packet.

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

Property Description

S 100 E/2 OF LT 15 BLK 1, CENTRAL PLACE SUB CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Other Business

Proposed 2024 Board of Adjustment Meeting Dates

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **Radney**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bond, Stauffer, Barrientos, Radney, Wallace "ayes"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **Approve** the request for the Proposed 2024 Board of Adjustment Meeting Dates.

New Business

Board Member Comments

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:51 p.m.

Date approved: 12-12-23

Chair: A. K. O