



City of Tulsa Board of Adjustment

Minutes of Meeting No. 1374

Tuesday, January 13, 2026, 1:00 p.m.

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

The notice and the agenda of said meeting were posted in the City Clerk's office on January 7, 2026, at 12:19 p.m.

Members Present: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Audrey Blank, Nathan Foster, Erin Roark, Caleb Rocha

Speaker Key:

(+) indicates a speaker generally supportive of an item;

(-) indicates a speaker generally opposed to an item; and

(=) indicates a speaker generally neutral or who has questions about an item.

Motions and actions require an affirmative vote of three members. When there is less than a full Board, the Board may consider a request to continue agenda items to a later meeting date.

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

Approval of Minutes

Minutes from Meeting 1373, December 13, 2025

Motion: Continue of Minutes to January 27th.

Motion By: Williams

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

Unfinished Business

BOA-23971

Location: 10342 South 66th East Avenue

City Council District: 8

Applicant: Landon Brown

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D); Variance to reduce the required five-foot side setback in the RS-3 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3).

Presentation by Applicant

Nathalie Cornett, 2727 E. 21st St., indicated that the current garage was constructed in 1981 and is approximately 700 square feet. She mentioned that the side setbacks at that time were three feet; however, it was built at two feet and nine inches. She explained that because it does not conform to the three-foot requirement, they do not qualify for legal non-conforming status. She explained that rather than being able to ask for a special exception, it is categorized as a variance. She noted that the hardship arises from the size of the lot, as the rear setback is disproportionate due to the large lot.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Mr. Hale expressed his belief that the hardship is self-imposed. Ms. Dumas expressed her appreciation for the additional information provided by the applicant. Mr. Barrientos voiced his support for the accessory dwelling unit.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 2.15-2.17 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be that the size of the lot is disproportionate at 22,000 square feet versus the requirement of 6,900 square feet.

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Hale

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

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

Property Description

LT 2 BLK 3, SHERIDAN PARK, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

New Business

BOA-23977

Location: 2125 North Delaware Place

City Council District: 1

Applicant: Damaris Soriano & Jose Rodriguez

Action(s) Requested

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

Presentation by Applicant

Jose Rodriguez, 2125 N. Delaware Pl., stated that he purchased a mobile home built in 1997 and wishes to place it on the property. He mentioned that it would be situated on a concrete slab, and he plans to skirt the mobile home with brick.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer remarked that while she does not have issues with manufactured homes, she is concerned about the age of the mobile home. Mr. Barrientos said that mobile homes typically have a lifespan of about 40 years. He expressed disapproval given the age of the mobile home. Ms. Williams commented that the mobile home does not align with the neighborhood. Ms. Dumas stated that based on the information provided by the applicant, it would not contribute positively to the character of the neighborhood.

Board Action

Motion: Deny.

Motion By: Hale

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

BOA-23979

Location: 2226 South 92nd East Avenue

City Council District: 5

Applicant: Pete Webb

Action(s) Requested

Variance to allow dynamic display signs to exceed the maximum sign area of 48 square feet in the CS district (Section 60.080-E); Variance to increase the maximum display area for a freestanding sign in the CS district (Section 60.080-C.3.b.1, Table 60-3).

Presentation by Applicant

Pete Webb, 1225 N. Lansing Ave., expressed a desire to install a sign on the property to promote the business "Dads Law." He mentioned that the lot is triangular, limiting the amount of frontage available for the sign's size. He indicated that the dynamic display would need to be larger due to its proximity to the highway.

James Wirth, 500 W. 7th St., stated that if all sides of the property frontage were considered, there would be no need to request an increase in the display area. He argued that enlarging the dynamic display would enhance safety for drivers by improving visibility. He noted that his clients often arrive at his location during very challenging times in their lives, and it is crucial for them to easily locate the business. He emphasized that the exit is situated right by their establishment, and they wish to avoid any last-minute visibility issues that could lead to safety concerns. He explained that a dynamic display ensures consistent visibility regardless of the time of day or weather conditions.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Mr. Hale acknowledged that the lot's shape restricts the possibility of constructing a larger freestanding sign. He pointed out that the variance for the dynamic display is a self-imposed limitation. Ms. Dumas expressed her concerns regarding the installation of large signage without a hardship. She suggested that there are numerous alternative marketing strategies to guide clients to a business without necessitating a change in zoning regulations. Ms. Stauffer conveyed her understanding of the challenges associated with increasing the maximum display area for a freestanding sign due to the method of calculating frontage. She expressed her disapproval of exceeding the limitation for a dynamic display.

Board Action

Motion: Deny the Variance to allow dynamic display signs to exceed the maximum sign area of 48 square feet in the CS district (Section 60.080-E).

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

Motion: Approve the Variance to increase the maximum display area for a freestanding sign in the CS district (Section 60.080-C.3.b.1, Table 60-3), per plans on page 4.10 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Dumas, Hale

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LT 10 BLK 2 LESS TRACT IN S.E. COR, MEMORIAL ACRES ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23980

Location: 2424 East 21st Street South

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Pete Webb

Action(s) Requested

Variance to increase the maximum display area for wall signs in the OM district (Section 60.080-B.1).

Presentation by Applicant

None

Speakers

None

Board Comments

None

Board Action

Motion: Continue to the January 27th meeting.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

BOA-23981

Location: Southeast corner of East 8th Street South and South Quincy Avenue

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Jonathan Belzley, New Leaf Development

Mr. Hale recused himself and exited the room at 1:57 p.m.

Action(s) Requested

Variance to reduce the required 10-foot street setbacks in the RM-2 and NIO districts (Section 5.030, Table 5-3; Section 20.080-D, Table 20-5).

Presentation by Applicant

Bruce Bolzle, 2610 E. 44th St., indicated that the property was rezoned in 2021, and in 2022, an approval was made to reduce the setbacks. He mentioned that the start of the project was delayed due to interest rates and material costs. He stated that interest rates have decreased while the demand for housing has increased. He noted that the previously approved variance has expired, and he is now seeking its renewal. He explained that the development will consist of six townhouse units, and without the variance approval, they would be limited to five units.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer remarked that this represents a modest relief in providing essential housing. She emphasized that the hardship stems from the fact that the lot predates the existing zoning regulations.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 6.11-6.12 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be that the neighborhood and the lot size predate the current zoning code.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: Hale

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LTS 15 & 16 BLK 5, EAST LYNN ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Mr. Hale re-entered the meeting at 2:11 p.m.

BOA-23982

Location: 3915 South Florence Avenue

City Council District: 9

Applicant: Chance Delancey

Action(s) Requested

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

Presentation by Applicant

None

Speakers

None

Board Comments

None

Board Action

Motion: Continue to the January 27th meeting.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

BOA-23983

Location: 827 South 127th East Avenue

City Council District: 3

Applicant: RCJ Designs

Action(s) Requested

Variance to increase the allowable floor area of detached accessory buildings in the RS-2 district (Section 45.030-A); Variance to reduce the required five-foot side setback in the RS-2 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3).

Presentation by Applicant

Jessi Stringer, 1428 S. New Haven Ave., reported that the property currently contains four existing structures. She explained that her client plans to demolish two of these structures and build a new residential home. She noted that her clients were unaware that one of the buildings lacked proper permits at the time of purchase. She articulated that their hardship arises from the property significantly exceeding the minimum lot requirements, and that there is no alternative site on the property suitable for construction due to the floodplain constraints.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Mr. Barrientos pointed out that the lot is unique in that it is surrounded by commercial property. Mr. Hale stated that the size of the lot offers a larger accessory structure. Ms. Dumas stated that it makes it easier to approve knowing that the current owner did not build the structure and it would prevent demolition of two of the four existing structures.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 8.11 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship that the two structures are existing.

Motion By: Dumas

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

SW NE SE SE LESS W20 FOR RD, UNPLATTED, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23984

Location: 6616 East Archer Street North

City Council District: 3

Applicant: Ashraf Salim

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to increase the permitted fence height of four feet within the street setback (Section 45.080-A).

Presentation by Applicant

Ashraf Salim, 11525 E. Skelly Dr., expressed his desire to construct a six-foot wrought iron fence around his property. He mentioned that there is a significant issue with individuals driving through his property to reach the other side due to the area's traffic conditions. He indicated that two sides of his property are already enclosed, and he intends to fence in the remaining sections.

Speakers

- (-) Hassan Javed, 4406 W. Broadway Ct., Broken Arrow, was concerned that the proposed fence might hinder first responders' access to his adjacent property. He stated that it could impede his clients' safe exit from the property.
- (-) David Cox, 1010 N. Garnett Rd., was concerned of the potential obstruction of first responders' access to his neighboring property.

Speakers

The applicant clarified that the area he plans to fence in will not affect the adjacent neighbor. He emphasized that the property in question is separate from the other commercial properties mentioned by the speakers. He noted that he owns the adjacent property, but it is not included in the fencing plans.

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer remarked that the fence can be positioned as the applicant desires. She pointed out that what the applicant is requesting is an increase in the fence's height. Ms. Williams expressed her gratitude to the speakers for sharing their thoughts. She acknowledged their concerns but reassured them that the applicant's request would not adversely affect them in any manner.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 9.10 of the agenda packet, subject to the condition that fence is similar to the existing wrought iron fence.

Motion By: Dumas

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

PRT NW NW BEG NEC W640.4 GOV LT 4 TH W140.4 S273 E140.4 N273 POB LESS N30 FOR ST, Section 2, Township 19 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23985

Location: 13111 East 21st Street South

City Council District: 6

Applicant: Shahnaz Kasmani

Action(s) Requested

Amendment to CDP-33 to allow a Personal Vehicle Sales use within the Community Development Project (CDP) (Section 30.020).

Presentation by Applicant

Shahnaz Kasmani, 13111 E. 21st St., expressed his desire to sell cars on the property. He pointed out that the area is surrounded by commercial buildings and several car dealerships are in close proximity.

Staff Comments

Mr. Foster mentioned that Community Development Projects were created prior to the establishment of the PUD, which enabled property owners to present concepts for large-scale developments and to subdivide them into development areas. He indicated that most of these proposals have either expired or been abandoned, although a few remain active. He emphasized that the zoning code stipulates that the Board of Adjustment retains authority over the development plans.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 10.14 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Hale

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LT 6 BLK 1, PLAZA HILLS CENTER, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23986

Location: 402 South Florence Avenue

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Femi Fasesin

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D); Special Exception to increase the allowable floor area of detached accessory buildings containing an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D).

Presentation by Applicant

Femi Fasesin, 421 S. Olympia Ave., expressed his intention to enlarge the garage situated at the rear of the property and convert it into an accessory dwelling unit.

Daniel Banuelos, 402 S. Florence Ave., stated that he wishes to add an accessory dwelling unit to accommodate his father. He mentioned that he had consulted with the neighbors, who did not object to his proposal.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 11.13 and additional exhibits of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

N 1/2 LT 4 & E 10 VAC ALLEY BLK 8, PLEASANT VIEW ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23988

Location: 1428 East 17th Place South

City Council District: 4

Applicant: RCJ Designs

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D).

Presentation by Applicant

Jessi Stringer, 1428 S. New Haven Ave., expressed her desire to construct an accessory dwelling unit on the property. She mentioned that the property was reduced in size due to the PUD, which is the reason for the construction being planned in the rear setback. She indicated that the unit is larger to accommodate the narrow lot.

Speakers

(=) Chip Atkins, 1638 E. 17th Pl., was concerned that many of the accessory dwelling units approved by the Board of Adjustment have been utilized as Airbnb rentals. He conveyed that he does not oppose the applicant's intention to build an accessory dwelling unit, given its proximity to numerous condominiums and apartment buildings. He noted that many neighbors are facing privacy issues due to accessory dwelling units being converted into short-term rentals.

Rebuttal

The applicant clarified that her client does not plan to use the accessory dwelling unit as an Airbnb. She expressed no objection to the board imposing conditions on the approval to prevent the unit from being used as a short-term rental.

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer acknowledged Mr. Atkins's comments, stating that he made a valid point regarding the number of units recently converted to short-term rentals. Mr. Hale inquired whether the board intends to implement a stipulation against Airbnb rentals for accessory dwelling units in the future, and what the criteria would be. Ms. Dumas expressed her reservations about regulating accessory dwelling units that are permitted by right in the City of Tulsa.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 12.13-12.18 of the agenda packet, subject to the condition that it not be used as a short-term rental.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Dumas

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

N162 E50 OF LT 10 BLK 26, PARK PLACE, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23989

Location: 524 East Mohawk Boulevard North

City Council District: 1

Applicant: Brianna Parker

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit a duplex in the RS-3 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2, Table 5-2.5).

Presentation by Applicant

Brianna Parker, 7122 S. Sheridan Rd., expressed her desire to construct a one-story, 2,000 square-foot duplex on her property. She mentioned that each unit of the duplex will feature four bedrooms and two bathrooms. She indicated that she attempted to engage with the neighbors in the vicinity, but they did not respond to her. She highlighted the presence of several duplexes within the neighborhood.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 13.11-13.18 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Hale

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LT 5 BLK 13, DEVONSHIRE PLACE RESUB B9-13 City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23990

Location: 138 North Toledo Avenue

City Council District: 3

Applicant: Kyle Gibson

Action(s) Requested

Variance to reduce the required lot area and lot area per unit in the RS-3 district to permit a lot split (Section 5.030, Table 5-3).

Presentation by Applicant

None

Speakers

None

Board Comments

None

Board Action

Motion: Continue to the January 27th meeting.

Motion By: None

Ayes: None

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

BOA-23991

Location: 254 East Hazel Boulevard South

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Bill Powers

Ms. Dumas exited the room at 3:33 p.m.

Action(s) Requested

Variance to reduce the required five-foot side setback in the RS-2 district (Section 5.030-A, Table 5-3).

Presentation by Applicant

Bill Powers, 8810 S. Yale Ave., conveyed his intention to expand his client's home, which would extend over the current driveway. He noted that the home is non-conforming, as it was built prior to the implementation of the modern zoning code. He explained that due to the home's layout, there are no alternative options for expansion.

Ms. Dumas re-entered the room at 3:37 p.m.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Mr. Hale acknowledged that the design is appealing but remarked that it constitutes a self-imposed hardship. Ms. Stauffer commented that it represents the minimum relief necessary, considering that the home predates the existing modern zoning code and that the residences are situated near one another.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 15.11-15.19 of the agenda packet, finding the hardship to be the age of the structure predates the modern zoning code.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Hale

Abstentions: Dumas

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LT 2 BLK 14, SUNSET TERRACE, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23992

Location: 2636 East 61st Street South

City Council District: 9

Applicant: John Droz

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to amend a previously approved site plan for a Country Club use in the RS-1 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2; Section 70.120).

Presentation by Applicant

Mike McLaughlin, 321 E. 111th St., Jenks, stated that he wishes to add two pickleball courts to the Southern Hills Country Club.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Members of the board stated that they were inclined to support the application as presented.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on pages 16.12-16.14 of the agenda packet.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

*A tract of land in Section 32, Township 19 North, Range 13 East, and Section 5, Township 18 North, Range 13 East, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows:
beginning at the southwest corner of Lot 3, Block 2; Southern Villas Addition, thence East 165.09'; thence south 330.18'; thence east 165.11'; thence south 815.5'; thence southeast 368.48'; thence east 295.42'; thence south 656'; thence west 955'; thence south 825'; thence west 827.98'; thence north 165.05'; thence west 1,817.73'; thence south 330.5'; thence west 1,444.5'; thence north 208.71'; thence west 168.71'; thence north 2,389.4'; to a point which is 25' south and 40' east of the northwest corner of Section 5, Township 18 North, Range 13 East; thence along the south boundary line of East 61st Street South to a point, said point being 329.4' north of the POINT OF BEGINNING; thence south 329.4' to the POINT OF BEGINNING.*

BOA-23993

Location: 10100 East 61st Street South

City Council District: 7

Applicant: Mike Thedford

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to amend a previously approved site plan for a School use in the RS-3 district (Section 5.020, Table 5-2; Section 70.120).

Presentation by Applicant

Mike Thedford, 123 N. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., expressed his intention to build temporary classrooms during the three-year construction period for the main building.

Speakers

None

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer remarked that since this is a temporary measure, it is essential to limit the duration to three years out of respect for the neighbors. The board members concurred with Ms. Stauffer's assessment.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 17.11 of the agenda packet, subject to the condition that the approval be limited to three years from today's date.

Motion By: Hale

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LT 1 BLK 1, RE-UNION, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

BOA-23994

Location: 1711 South St. Louis Avenue

City Council District: 4

Applicant: Joshua Friesenhahn

Action(s) Requested

Special Exception to permit an accessory dwelling unit in the RS-3 district (Section 45.031-D).

Presentation by Applicant

Joshua Friesenhahn, 921 E. 36th St., expressed a desire to demolish the existing non-conforming accessory dwelling unit and construct a new accessory dwelling unit that complies with the code. He indicated that the new accessory dwelling unit would be two stories tall and would exceed the height of the primary residence. He noted that there are several two-story structures in the vicinity. He clarified that the accessory dwelling unit would not serve as a short-term rental.

Speakers

(=) Chip Atkins, 1638 E. 17th Pl., remarked that while there are numerous two-story buildings in the neighborhood, none of them are accessory dwelling units that surpass the height of the main home. He expressed his support for the project but raised concerns regarding the height of the proposed unit. He reiterated that his previous apprehensions regarding short-term rentals would also pertain to this project.

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer conveyed her discomfort with the accessory dwelling unit being taller than the primary residence. She emphasized the uniqueness of the neighborhood and the varying heights of buildings present. Mr. Hale pointed out that there is already a precedent for two-story accessory dwelling units throughout the neighborhood. He inquired whether the board would impose a condition on the accessory dwelling unit to prohibit its use as a short-term rental. Ms. Stauffer responded that the applicant agreed to the condition against short-term rentals. Ms. Dumas expressed her belief that the board should refrain from applying use standards to properties without a comprehensive understanding of the regulations governing short-term rentals.

Derek Leupen, 1711 S. St. Louis Ave., stated that he has never had short-term rentals nor does he have any intentions to do so. He mentioned that after listening to discussions regarding short-term rentals, he found it confusing that some properties were restricted from being used as short-term rentals while others were permitted. He noted that, unlike the other application, his property already had an accessory dwelling unit.

Mr. Hale inquired whether the owner was agreeable to include the stipulation, while questioning the necessity of it. Mr. Leupen confirmed that this was accurate.

Board Comments

Ms. Stauffer remarked that the distinction lies in the presence of a neighbor who is also advocating for the concerns of the neighborhood.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, per plans on page 18.13 of the agenda packet, subject to the condition that it is not used as a short-term rental.

Motion By: Stauffer

Ayes: Barrientos, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: Dumas

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

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

Property Description

LT 10 BLK 20, ORCUTT ADDN, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma

Other Business

Nomination and election of officers for the 2026 calendar year.

The board discussed Mr. Barrientos assuming the role of Chair of the Board, Ms. Stauffer serving as Vice-Chair, and Ms. Williams taking on the responsibilities of Secretary.

Board Action

Motion: Approve, Mr. Barrientos as Chair, Ms. Stauffer as Vice-Chair, and Ms. Williams as the Secretary.

Motion By: Dumas

Ayes: Barrientos, Dumas, Hale, Stauffer, Williams

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Absent: None

New Business

None

Board Member Comments

None

Staff Comments

None

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:14 p.m.

Date approved: 01/27/26

Chair: 