

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES of Meeting No. 1093
Tuesday, May 14, 2013, 1:00 p.m.
Tulsa City Council Chambers
One Technology Center
175 East 2nd Street

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Henke, Chair Snyder Tidwell, Secretary Van De Wiele White, Vice Chair		Miller Back Sparger Walker	Swiney, Legal

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the City Clerk's office, City Hall, on Wednesday, May 9, 2013, at 9:18 a.m., as well as at the Office of INCOG, 2 West Second Street, Suite 800.

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

Ms. Back read the rules and procedures for the Board of Adjustment Public Hearing.

MINUTES

On **MOTION** of **TIDWELL**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none absent) to **APPROVE** the **Minutes** of the April 23, 2013 Board of Adjustment meeting (No. 1092).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

21562—Barron & McClary

Action Requested:

Variance to increase the allowable coverage in the required rear yard from 694 square feet to 1,088 square feet for a detached garage and carport in the RS-2 District (Section 210.B.5.a); Variance to increase the maximum allowable floor space for detached accessory buildings in an RS-2 District from 1,100 square feet (based on the rule of 40%) to 1,140 square feet (Section 402.B.1.d). **LOCATION:** 2250 South St. Louis Avenue East (CD 4)

Presentation:

The applicant has requested a continuance to May 28, 2013 due to changes made in the site plan.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White “aye”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none absent) to **CONTINUE** the request for a Variance to increase the allowable coverage in the required rear yard from 694 square feet to 1,088 square feet for a detached garage and carport in the RS-2 District (Section 210.B.5.a); Variance to increase the maximum allowable floor space for detached accessory buildings in an RS-2 District from 1,100 square feet (based on the rule of 40%) to 1,140 square feet (Section 402.B.1.d) to the meeting on May 28, 2013; for the following property:

N.18 LT 17 ALL LT 18 S.39.2 LT 19 BK 4, TERWILLEGER HGTS, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21550—Jesus Moreno

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow Automotive and Allied Activities for a car lot (Use Unit 17) in a CS District (Section 701, Table 1); Variance of the requirement that no

merchandise may be displayed outside within 300 feet of an R district (Section 1217.C.2). **LOCATION:** 2232 North Harvard Avenue East (CD 3)

Presentation:

Jesus Moreno, 3429 South 110th East Avenue, Tulsa, OK; the applicant was returning today from a previous meeting. No presentation was made today but the applicant was available for any questions.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked what the business hours would be and the amount of cars to be displayed. Mr. Henke asked Ms. Back about the fencing that was discussed at the previous meeting.

Ms. Back stated the fencing was discussed at the last meeting, and a picture was presented that was placed on the overhead screen depicting the existing fencing on the west side of the property which will meet the code requirements.

Mr. Moreno stated that he would like to have hours of operation to be Monday through Saturday, 8:00 to 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Snyder asked Mr. Moreno to tell the Board what type of lighting was going to be installed on the subject property. Mr. Moreno stated that currently there is no lighting on the outside of the building and he would like to install two or three light poles to illuminate the front area.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none absent) to **APPROVE** the request for a **Special Exception** to allow Automotive and Allied Activities for a car lot (Use Unit 17) in a CS District (Section 701, Table 1); **Variance** of the requirement that no merchandise may be displayed outside within 300 feet of an R district (Section 1217.C.2). This approval will be with the conditions that the fence on the west side of the subject property will be maintained by Mr. Jesus Moreno to meet the proper standards and code requirements. All lighting will be directed away from the residential district on the west side of the subject property. The hours of operation will be from 8:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday. For the hardship, this is a commercial strip of land that is on both sides of Harvard, and the subject property has been adjacent to the residential property for many years, and there will not be any additional problem with the existing privacy fence in place. This approval will be subject to conceptual plan on page 2.9. 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. Finding 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; for the following property:

S 133.5 LT 1 BLK 2, BECKY GAILES ADDN SUB PRT B1-4 MARION TERR & PRT FITTS, MARION TERRACE ADDN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21558—Andrew A. Shank

Action Requested:

Verification of the spacing requirement for a digital outdoor advertising sign of 1,200 feet from any other digital outdoor advertising sign facing the same traveled way (Section 1221.G.10). **LOCATION:** North of the NE/c of East 91st Street & Highway 169 (CD 7)

Presentation:

Andrew Shank, 2727 East 21st Street, Suite 200, Tulsa, OK; stated this case is a follow-up on the digitization that took place approximately a year ago for the north face of the subject sign, and today’s request is for the south face of the same sign.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White “aye”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none absent) based upon the facts in this matter as they presently exist, the Board **ACCEPTS** the applicant’s verification of spacing between outdoor advertising signs, subject to the action of the Board being void should another outdoor advertising sign be constructed prior to this sign; for the following property:

A TRACT OF LAND THAT IS PART OF THE SOUTH HALF OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE/4) OF SECTION EIGHTEEN (18), TOWNSHIP EIGHTEEN (18) NORTH, RANGE FOURTEEN (14) EAST OF THE INDIAN BASE AND MERIDIAN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID SE/4; THENCE S 88°58’03” W ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF

SECTION 18, FOR 1322.83 FEET; THENCE N 01°01'57" W FOR 60.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND; THENCE S 88°58'03" W FOR 392.16 FEET TO A POINT ON THE EXISTING MINGO VALLEY EXPRESSWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY; THENCE N 78°46'03" W ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 70.62 FEET; THENCE S 88°58'03" W ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 350.00 FEET; THENCE N 83°48'43" W ALONG SAID RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 204.22 FEET TO A POINT ON NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY AS ACQUIRED BY CONDEMNATION BY OKLAHOMA TURNPIKE AUTHORITY, CASE NO. CJ 98-05826, ORDER FOR CONFIRMATION OF REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS FILED APRIL 22, 1999; THENCE N 01°01'57" W ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 475.46 FEET; THENCE N 06°57'38" E ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR 732.32 FEET; THENCE N 89°58'35" W ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 14.89 FEET; THENCE N 06°16'25" E ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 18.44 FEET, TO A POINT ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY AS ACQUIRED BY CONDEMNATION BY OKLAHOMA TURNPIKE AUTHORITY, CASE NO. CJ 98-5736, ORDER FOR CONFIRMATION OF REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS FILED JUNE 14, 2005; THENCE N 89°03'03" E ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 2.99 FEET; THENCE N 07°01'11" E ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 286.42 FEET; THENCE N 05°05'34" W ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 220.08 FEET; THENCE N 01°51'52" E ALONG SAID NEW U.S. HIGHWAY NO. 169 RIGHT-OF-WAY, FOR 315.18 FEET; THENCE N 89°01'16" E FOR 2144.76 FEET; THENCE S 01°16'35" E FOR 2011.05 FEET; THENCE S 88°58'03" W FOR 8.00 FEET; THENCE S 01°16'31" E FOR 36.75 FEET; THENCE S 43°50'46" W FOR 39.51 FEET; THENCE S 88°58'03" W FOR 1236.57 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID TRACT OF LAND, CONTAINING 105.37 ACRES OF LAND MORE OR LESS, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21563—Lonnie Basse

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit seasonal sales (Use Unit 2) in a CS and IL District (Section 901, Table 1) not to exceed 179 days in a calendar year (Section 1202.C.1); Special Exception to allow alternative off-street parking materials (gravel) for parking area (Section 1202.C.1). **LOCATION:** 5950 South Garnett Road East (CD 7)

Presentation:

Melissa Basse, 4721 South Columbia Place, Tulsa, OK; stated she and her husband will be moving their business, The Pumpkin Patch, to the subject property. The subject property has existing gravel that has been in place for a long time and it would be easier to add to that base, and it fits into the community.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Ms. Basse if she leased the subject property. Ms. Basse stated that she leases the subject property and has a 20 year lease for the subject property.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none absent) to **APPROVE** the request for a Special Exception to permit seasonal sales (Use Unit 2) in a CS and IL District (Section 901, Table 1) not to exceed 179 days in a calendar year (Section 1202.C.1); Special Exception to allow alternative off-street parking materials (gravel) for parking area (Section 1202.C.1), this will be per conceptual plan on page 5.7. The two Special Exceptions will be linked together, whereby, if the seasonal sales cease then Special Exception for the parking materials will also cease. This approval for the two Special Exceptions will have a time limit of 10 years from today's date, May 14, 2013. Finding the Special Exceptions 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; for the following property:

PRT SE SE BEG 233W & 50N SECR SE TH W574.88 N1091.83 E749.26 S934.13 W8 S103 W75 S235 POB SEC 31 19 14 21.005AC, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21489-A—Mark Bragg

Action Requested:

Variance to permit a second dwelling above the detached garage, in an RS-3 district (Section 207); Variance to reduce the required side yard from 5 feet to 3 feet to permit an addition onto the primary house (Section 403. A, Table 3). **LOCATION:** 1621 South Detroit Avenue East **(CD 4)**

Presentation:

Mark Bragg, 1624 South Detroit, Tulsa, OK; stated he currently lives across the street from the subject property. He purchased the subject property with the intention of moving and down-sizing. He came before the Board for the garage and he is back before the Board to ask for permission to install an addition to the house and have living quarters above the garage. The zoning code allows for a three foot setback for the garage, and the house would also have a three foot setback which would be like all the other houses in the neighborhood. Mr. Bragg presented a petition to the Board with 15 neighbor's signatures showing they are in favor of the proposed project. Mr. Bragg also

presented a letter from the Tulsa Historic Preservation Commission showing they too are in favor of the proposed project. The present zoning code does not respond to the character of the neighborhood therefore he would ask for the Board's approval of this project.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked Mr. Bragg what had changed between October and now, because at that time Mr. Bragg had stated that he was not interested in rental space above the garage. Mr. Bragg admitted that at the previous hearing he had stated that at that time he was not interested in rental space above the garage but he would come back to the Board of Adjustment if he changed his mind in the matter. He still is not interested in having rental space but he wants that privilege. That is why he is before the Board today.

Ms. Snyder asked Mr. Bragg if he was wanting the space above the garage to be living quarters, or if he was wanting to rent the space to a third party. Mr. Bragg stated that he thought it was the same thing, but he is asking for the privilege to rent the space to a third party.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked staff if the applicant has enough of a request for today's hearing. Ms. Back stated that it is her understanding of the code and after speaking with a building official that an owner may have detached quarters on their property as long as it is used for family members and not rented as an income property. That is what was established the last time Mr. Bragg was before the Board. There have been other cases where the owner has used detached structures for family members. What Mr. Bragg is asking now is have the ability to utilize the subject structure in the future as rental space.

Ms. Snyder stated that on page 6.15 in the agenda packet there is a paragraph stating that the subject property would be allowed to be out of conformance if it was pre-existing prior to the code with other requirements concerning the structure, has been it established that there were quarters previously on the subject property. Mr. Bragg stated that he has a letter from the previous home owner that states there were quarters on the property, but they were demolished. Mr. Bragg stated that he has found the foundation, sewer line, water line, and the gas line for the previous structure but the structure itself was missing. When he wanted to rebuild the garage he had to come before the Board because the existing foundation did not fit into the existing code requirements. The zoning code states that a structure of "X" amount of square feet can be built in the back 20 feet of the property. In this neighborhood all the garages are built in the back 20 feet and are not attached but are detached. Therefore the zoning code does not fit for the whole neighborhood because the code assumes the garage will be attached and limits the space to the last space in the yard. Under the current zoning code a garage cannot be replaced and the zoning code is why he had to ask the Board for a special exception to build the garage back just as it previously existed.

Ms. Snyder asked if the previous garage and quarters had not been demolished would that apply to an apartment being rented. Mr. Henke asked if Mr. Bragg would still need

relief for the second dwelling. Mr. Swiney stated that Mr. Bragg would still need permission, or a special exception, to rent out the apartment. But if the space were to be for a family member or a housekeeper he would not need a special exception.

Mr. Van De Wiele asked if the request being made today, as advertised, would allow for the space to be rented. Mr. Swiney stated that it would because it was advertised as a second dwelling. Ms. Back stated that what was previously requested in October did not allow Mr. Bragg to have garage living space to be a rental space.

Mr. Van De Wiele left the meeting at 1:30 P.M.

Mr. Swiney stated in the definition of the code a single family detached dwelling refers to a dwelling unit. A dwelling unit is then defined as a set of rooms for not more than one family living independently from any other family. That is the difference. If Mr. Bragg were to place his mother-in-law in the garage living space that is not a separate dwelling unit it is part of the family unit, but if the space is to be rented out to a separate tenant it becomes a second dwelling unit separate from the Mr. Bragg's home.

Mr. Bragg stated that there are several rented garage apartments in the neighborhood, so the proposed project would not be out of character for the neighborhood. Mr. Swiney asked Mr. Bragg how he came to know about the garage apartments. Mr. Bragg stated that he had canvassed the neighborhood.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 4-0-1 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, White "aye"; no "nays"; Van De Wiele "abstaining"; none absent) to **APPROVE** the request for a **Variance** to permit a second dwelling above the detached garage, in an RS-3 district (Section 207); **Variance** to reduce the required side yard from 5 feet to 3 feet to permit an addition onto the primary house (Section 403. A, Table 3). Finding for the hardship that there are numerous garage apartments, or second dwellings, above detached garages in the immediate neighborhood, and there had been a garage apartment on the subject property before it was destroyed by fire. As for the second variance for the sideyard reduction from five feet to three feet, this is for an addition to the house that will not project any closer to the side property line than the existing structure, and it will be filling in an L-shaped area of the original structure. This approval will be per plan on page 6.7. Finding 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; for the following property:

LT 7 BLK 5, MAPLE PARK ADDN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21565—Dale Bennett

Action Requested

Variance to allow 2 projecting wall signs to extend above the parapet wall in the CBD District (Section 1221.C.11). **LOCATION:** 302 East 1st Street South **(CD 4)**

Presentation:

Dale Bennett, Claude Neon Federal Sign Company, 1225 North Lansing, Tulsa, OK; stated the request is to allow two projecting wall signs be raised 2'-11" above the roof line but not past the parapet line of the building.

Interested Parties:

Seth Nimmo, Rib Crib, 8802 East 110th Place, Tulsa, OK; stated the BBQ arrows on the proposed do not extend above the highest point of the second parapet but will extend above the lower parapet wall. He respectfully requests for the Board's approval on this project.

Michael Sager, 328 East 1st Street, Tulsa, OK; stated he is the closest party to this building in every direction, and he is absolutely in favor of the redevelopment of this space. Mr. Sager owns the buildings to the east and south, and the building across the street west of the subject property. The building that he owns to the east of the subject property is only about eight inches away and his building has windows facing the proposed project, and he is fully in favor of the proposed sing locations.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Mr. Van De Wiele re-entered the meeting at 1:43 P.M.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **SNYDER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, White “aye”; no “nays”; Van De Wiele “abstaining”; none absent) to **APPROVE** the request for a **Variance** to allow 2 projecting wall signs to extend above the parapet wall in the CBD District (Section 1221.C.11). Finding that the actual sign does not extend above the tallest parapet wall but extends above the lower parapet wall which was done for design purposes. This approval will be per plan on pages 7.10 and 7.11. Finding 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; for the following property:

W50 LT 6 BLK 86, TULSA-ORIGINAL TOWN, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21566—Gregory Helms

Action Requested:

Variance to reduce the rear yard setback in an RS-1 District from 25 feet to 10 feet for an addition to existing single-family residence (Section 403.A, Table 3).

LOCATION: 10922 South Knoxville Avenue East **(CD 8)**

Presentation:

Greg Helms, 424 East Main Street, Jenks, OK; stated the house sits on an irregularly shaped lot, and what prompts the variance request is that the southwest corner of the house sits approximately 100 feet closer to the property line than the opposite corner of the house. The proposed project is to have an addition on the house which will not meet with the 25 foot setback requirement. The 10 feet is not being requested for the entire property but only where the proposed triangular addition will be. Most of this triangular addition is a covered patio that will be a trellised patio not a solid roof. Even with this proposed addition there will still be approximately 125 feet to the closest house. Once the addition is complete the property will be re-landscaped for screening between the properties.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **VAN DE WIELE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White “aye”; no “nays”; no “abstentions”; none absent) to **APPROVE** the request for a Variance to reduce the rear yard setback in an RS-1 District from 25 feet to 10 feet for an addition to existing single-family residence (Section 403.A, Table 3), subject to conceptual plan on pages 8.8 and 8.9 showing the proposed enclosed area of encroachment. The Board has found that this most irregularly shaped lot and the orientation of the house on the lot, along with the topography of the subject property would necessitate this variance. That in granting this variance the Board has found 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; for the following property:

LT 10 BLK 3, PHILCREST, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA

21567—Ray Toraby

Action Requested:

Variance to allow a 39'-10" tall ground sign to be setback 53'-0" instead of the required 64'-10" setback in a CS District (Section 1221.D.1). **LOCATION:** 9140 East 31st Street South **(CD 7)**

Presentation:

Ray Toraby, 7115 East 81st Place, Tulsa, OK; stated he has been in the sign business in Tulsa for over 36 years. The new owners of the shopping center are committed to spending over three million dollars to help revitalize the shopping center. They have had the existing sign redesigned to help them attract anchor tenants for the shopping center. To help make this possible an electronic sign has been designed which is to be installed in the same foot print of the existing sign but will taller and have a modified base. If the new height makes it a requirement to move the sign it would be placed in the existing parking lot and disrupt the current traffic flow. Mr. Toraby visited with 33 merchants in the area and they support the proposed project. The merchants also signed a petition showing their support. The new sign will be designed to match the new Spanish design of the shopping center.

Ms. Snyder asked Mr. Toraby about the LED message center. Mr. Toraby stated that the LED message center that is currently there will stay but be raised to allow the passerby to comfortably read the message center. Currently the message center is approximately seven feet from the ground with limited visibility and the new sign design will allow it to be raised.

Interested Parties:

There were no interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WHITE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Henke, Snyder, Tidwell, Van De Wiele, White "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none absent) to **APPROVE** the request for a **Variance** to allow a 39'-10" tall ground sign to be setback 53'-0" instead of the required 64'-10" setback in a CS District (Section 1221.D.1), subject to conceptual plan on page 9.10. The new sign is to be in the same location as the existing sign. Finding that the hardship to be that in moving the sign to the 64'-10" setback would place the sign into the drive lane of an established parking lot thus reducing the number of parking spaces available for the shopping center. Secondly, there are numerous signs in the immediate area are similarly as high and similarly as close to the street. Finding 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; for the following property:

**PRT LT 1 BEG MOST ELY NEC TH S510 W337.40 N63.32 E33.62 N218.57 W93.57
N328.11 NL LT 1 E172.35 NWC LT 2 BRIAR VILLAGE S100 E225 POB BLK
1,BRIAR VILLAGE RESUB BRIARWOOD CTR SECOND AMD, BRIAR VILLAGE
APTS RESUB PRT L1 B1 BRIAR VILLAGE, CITY OF TULSA, TULSA COUNTY,
STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Date approved: 5/27/13



Chair