The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the City Auditor, Room 919, Tuesday, June 12, 1984, at 11:31 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairman Smith called the meeting to order at 1:13 p.m.

MINUTES:

On MOTION of CHAPPELLE and SECOND by VICTOR, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve the Minutes of May 17, 1984 (No. 413).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Case No. 13126

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 208—One Single-Family Dwelling Per Lot of Record—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the required street frontage from 30' to 0' to permit a lot split in an RS-1 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located north of the northeast corner of Birmingham and 69th Street.

Presentation:
The applicant, E. A. Schermerhorn, 227 East Skelly Drive, was not present.

Protestants:
A protestant informed he was under the impression that this case was going to be withdrawn.

Comments and Questions:
Mr. Jones informed that Staff has been unsuccessful in getting in touch with the applicant over the telephone.

Mr. Gardner informed the Board could deny this case without prejudice. The applicant would be able to refile if he still needs the relief.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions";
Case No. 13135

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 430—Bulk & Area Requirements in the Residential Districts—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the setback from the centerline of 14th Street from 50' to 36' to permit a carport in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located at the southwest corner of 14th Street and Delaware.

Presentation:
The applicant, Cal Johnson, 2151 East 29th Street North, was present.

Protestants: None.

Comments and Questions:
Mr. Smith informed one of the Board members has a conflict with this case and the Board will not be able to vote on this at this meeting since there are only three members present.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to continue Case No. 13135 to the June 28, 1984, meeting.

Case No. 13157

Action Requested:
Special Exception—Section 310—Principal Uses Permitted in the Agriculture District—Use Unit 1224—Request an exception to permit an oil well in an AG district under the provisions of Section 1680, located south of the southeast corner of 71st Street and South Elwood.

Presentation:
The applicant, Charles Sublett, Suite 1776, One Williams Center, requested by letter (Exhibit "A-1") that this item be continued to the June 28, 1984, meeting to allow time for republication of the notice.

Protestants: None.

Board Action:
On MOTION of CHAPPELLE and SECOND by VICTOR, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to continue Case No. 13157 to the June 28, 1984, meeting to allow time for republication of the notice.

Case No. 13159

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the lot width from 75' to 70' and 69', of the lot area from 9,000 sq. ft. to 5,323 sq. ft. and 4,830 sq. ft., of the rear yard setback from 25' to 13' and
Presentation:
The applicant, Lloyd L. White, 8920 East Newton Place, was represented by Wesley Malone, Route 8, Box 649, Claremore. Mr. Malone informed they would like to have a carport because their driveway is slanted, and in the winter they sometimes have a problem with their car sliding into the street because of ice. There are about 18 other carports in the area. One of the existing carports is right across the street from the subject tract. He submitted a plot plan (Exhibit "C-1").

Protestants: None.

Comments and Questions:
Ms. Hubbard informed she has not had an opportunity to check into the carport across the street to see if it is there legally.

Mr. Jackere informed the question is not how many carports are in the neighborhood, but what is unique about the property that would justify the variance.

There was discussion about how this could affect the average building setback line in this area.

Mr. Victor asked the applicant if this carport is existing, and Mr. Malone informed that it is not.

Mr. Victor asked the applicant what the carport would be built of, and Mr. Malone informed it will be like the one across the street from the subject tract.

Mr. Gardner informed that the applicant has suggested that the topography of the land is his hardship. If the area has 18 carports in it, the people are wanting to build the carports and the precedent is already established. This is different than many other applications because most other neighborhoods do not have this many carports, nor do they want them.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—under the provisions of Use Unit 1206) of the 50' setback from the centerline of East Newton Place to 35' and of the side yard setback from 5' to 1' to allow a carport in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, on the following described property:

Lot 10, Block 9, Amended Van Acres Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

6.14.84:415(5)
Case No. 13166 (continued)

2, Block 10. If the applicant will withdraw the portion of the legal description that he does not need the relief on, the Board can hear the east half of Lot 2 for the variance. Some of the protestants have no problem with the open air storage of automobiles on Lot 2. The protestants were confused because of the advertisement being for Lot 1. If approval is granted, it should be only for the east half of Lot 2.

Mr. Williams informed he is only interested in the south 100 feet width by 285 feet depth of Lot 2. This does abut a residential area.

Mr. Jackere informed the applicant wants this approval on the south 100' of the east half of Lot 2.

There was discussion about having a fence on the east boundary of the subject tract. Mr. Williams informed he will have a fence put up on the property.

Mr. Victor asked the applicant if the property is paved all the way back to the east property line. Mr. Williams informed that the front two-thirds of the lot is paved and the back of the lot is rocked. He did not intend to pave the rest of it, but he doesn’t have to use the rocked part to store the cars on. The cars on the gravel are very few and are there for a very short period of time.

Additional Protestants:
Mrs. Heinz, 8337 East 14th Street, submitted 26 photographs (Exhibit "D-5") to show what is on Memorial from 11th to 15th. This area has turned into a slum area. She is concerned about the drainage in the area. She described the area.

Randy Smith, 8335 East 14th, informed his property was damaged by flood waters and he is concerned about the drainage from the car lot. He was concerned about this bringing more traffic to the area and was concerned about the children in the area.

Ms. Hubbard informed the Board of Adjustment never approved the piece of property on 14th Street for car sales. Mr. James informed he does not object to what the applicant is asking for today if it is not on 14th Street.

Mr. Victor asked if this can be limited to storing used cars. He was informed that it could be limited to used car display only.

Additional Comments:
Mr. Smith informed that two of the conditions of the previous cases were the paving of the lot and the fencing of the entire eastern boundary of the subject tract.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 1217.3(b)—Use Conditions—under the provisions of Use Unit 1217) to
Case No. 13172 (continued)

Mr. Yaeger asked the Board if this item could be continued so Mr. Bolick could come to speak on his own behalf.

Mr. Gardner informed the Board could just approve the uses in Use Unit 12, and then if the applicant needed more relief, he could come back. Use Units 13 and 14 are strictly retail businesses.

Mr. Yaeger described other businesses and services in the area.

Board Action:
On MOTION of CHAPPELLE and SECOND by VICTOR, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to DENY a Special Exception (Section 910—Principal Uses Permitted in Industrial Districts) to permit Use Units 12, 13, and 14 in an IL district under the provisions of Section 1680, on the following described property:

Lot 16, Block 1, Tulsa Southeast Industrial District an Addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

MINOR VARIANCES AND EXCEPTIONS:

Case No. 13174

Action Requested:
Variance - Section 430.1 - Bulk and Area Requirements in the Residential Districts - Use Unit 1206 - Request a variance of the 85' setback from the centerline of 31st Street to 70' to permit an addition to an existing dwelling in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located at the southwest corner of 31st Street and 121st East Avenue.

Presentation:
The applicant, Melva Garner, 3106 South 121st East Avenue, was represented by Russell Garner. Mr. Garner informed they would like to add a den on to the back of their house. The addition will be sitting back six inches further from 31st Street than the house. He submitted a plat (Exhibit "E-1").

Protestants: None.

Board Action:
On MOTION of CHAPPELLE and SECOND by VICTOR, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the Residential Districts—under the provisions of Use Unit 1206) of the 85' setback from the centerline of 31st Street to 70' to permit an addition to an existing dwelling in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, per plat submitted, on the following described property:

Lot 1, Block 8, Briarglen Extended, an addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

6.14.84:415(9)
Case No. 13162

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 208—Street Frontage Required—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the required street frontage from 30' to 0' to permit a lot split on a private road in an RS-2 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located west of 57th Street and Birmingham Avenue.

Presentation:
The applicant, James F. Mahoney, 3049 West 57th, informed there was a 50' street easement there and the City closed that street—it is now in District Court to be vacated. He informed there is no access to get into tract B of the subject tract. He described to the Board how he will get into the tract. Mr. Mahoney informed there is sewer and water to the subject tract. The Planning Commission did approve this lot split.

Protestants: None.

Interested Party:
There was an interested party present who just wanted to know what was going on on this subject tract. He does not object to this in any way.

Board Action:
On MOTION of CHAPPELLE and SECOND by VICTOR, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 208—Street Frontage Required—under the provisions of Use Unit 1206) of the required street frontage from 30' to 0' to permit a lot split (L-16178) on a private road in an RS-2 district under the provisions of Section 1670, subject to the applicant providing a mutual access easement to all three pieces of the property, on the following described property:

That part of Lot 4, Block 2, and Lots 1 and 2, Block 7, of the amended plat of Southern Hills Manor addition lying north and west of the Joe Creek Channel, to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 13165

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the lot width from 60' to 47', of the lot area from 6,900 sq. ft. to 6,580 sq. ft., of the land area from 8,400 sq. ft. to 7,755 sq. ft., and of the side yard from 5' to 1.6' all to permit a lot split in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located east of the southeast corner of Harvard and Latimer.

6.14.84:415(11)
Case No. 13175 (continued)

Presentation:
The applicant, Mickey Cordova, 1101 Roosevelt, Sand Springs, informed he would like to put a new 60' by 14' wide mobile home on the subject tract. The tract has the utilities already to it. The mobile home will only be visible from one house. There is already an existing house on the subject tract. He informed the mobile home will be at least 200' behind the existing house—that portion of the property is zoned Agricultural. There are other mobile homes in the area. One is about 200' to the northwest of the proposed location of the mobile home. The mobile home will not be used for rental purposes.

Protestants:
Mike McElfresh, 4407 West Easton Court, informed the subject tract is northeast of his residence. He does not know why the applicant wants to put a mobile home on the subject tract because the tract flooded and the property is in a flood-prone area. He does not think the City would approve the mobile home. He does not know of another mobile home in the area and he is concerned about a precedent this will set in the area. The city is considering buying out all the property that was flooded on May 27, 1984. Mr. McElfresh was also concerned about the septic tank situation in the area.

Walter Neal, 521 North 44th West Avenue, informed he lives directly south of the subject tract. He had a question about the address that was given on the agenda. He informed this property is definitely in a flood plain. He described the flooding problems they have had in the area. He informed there are no visible mobile homes from West Edison in the area and he is concerned about a precedent this could set. He had a question as to how big the lot was that the notice was talking about when it said they wanted two dwellings per lot of record.

Comments and Questions:
Ms. Hubbard informed that the Building Inspector's office is not issuing any Zoning Clearance permits for mobile homes without City Commission approval. The City Commission is reviewing them on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Smith informed Mr. Neal that the lot the applicant is talking about is the entire tract that is owned by the applicant. He informed that it would be up to the Health Department as to whether or not two houses could be hooked up to the same septic tank.

Mr. Gardner described why the address reads as it does and why the address on the notice differs from the address on the agenda. Both addresses refer to the same piece of property.

There was discussion about the moratorium on mobile homes and how it affects the approvals given by this Board.

Mr. Gardner informed that if drainage is a concern, the Board could approve this subject to the approval of the drainage. If land use is a concern, they need to come to grips with that regardless of the zoning. They need to decide if this is appropriate.
Case No. 13173 (continued)

Comments and questions:

Mr. Victor informed that in many cases like this the dogs are older and smaller. He feels that three German shepherds could protect her home as well as five dogs could.

There was discussion about cases similar to this and the Board’s action on such cases.

Mr. Smith read the protest petition which stated that the signers resented six dogs being located on the subject tract.

Mr. Jackere informed that the petition states a protest against six dogs and the applicant does not have six dogs—she has only five. The Board does not know if the protestants would object to only five dogs. He could not use this petition if this went to Court.

Board Action:

On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to DENY a Special Exception (Section 420—Accessory Uses in Residential Districts—under the provisions of Use Unit 1206) for a home occupation to permit a kennel (5 dogs) in an RS-2 district under the provisions of Section 1680, with the provision that the applicant be given 30 days to dispose of two of the dogs, on the following described property:

A tract of land more particularly described as follows to-wit: Beginning Six hundred sixty-five (665) feet East and Five hundred twelve (512) feet South of the Northwest corner of the South Half of the Northwest Quarter (S/2 NW/4) of Section Sixteen (16), Township Nineteen (19) North, Range Fourteen (14) east of the Indian Base and Meridian, thence East One hundred fifty (150) feet; thence One hundred twenty-eight (128) feet to the place of beginning, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, according to the recorded plat thereof.

Case No. 13176

Action Requested:

Special Exception—Section 410—Principal Uses Permitted in Residential Districts—Use Unit 1205—Request an exception to permit off-street parking for a church and/or education building in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1680, located west of the southwest corner of 29th West Avenue and Easton Place.

Presentation:

Easton Heights Baptist Church was represented by Henry P. Clark, 671 North 28th West Avenue. Mr. Clark informed they would like to convert Lots 7 and 8 of Block 6, Easton Heights Addition, to parking lots. Lot 9 has a residence on it that will be used for educational purposes. They would eventually like to use the balance of Lot 9 for
Case No. 13177 (continued)

Comments and Questions:
Mr. Jackere informed this property abuts residential property and would require screening and no outside storage under the use conditions of Use Unit 17.

Mr. Harris informed there are several salvage yards in the area.

Mr. Jackere informed that the application, if approved today, would not permit the outside storage of the vehicles he wants to sell.

Mr. Gardner informed the Board could act on the merits of the application today. They could then continue the application and let the applicant readvertise for the open storage.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to continue Case No. 13177 to the June 28, 1984, meeting to allow for readvertisement.

Case No. 13178

Action Requested:
Special Exception—Section 710—Principal Uses Permitted in Commercial Districts—Request an exception to permit Use Unit 17 in a CS district under the provisions of Section 1680, located north of the northeast corner of 36th Street North and Atlanta.

Presentation:
The applicant, John D. Harris, 4417 South Lewis, informed the subject tract is about 10.5 acres in size. They would like to take the part of the property that fronts on Lewis and use it for automobile sales.

Interested Parties:
There were interested parties present.

Comments and Questions:
Mr. Gardner informed the Board can limit approval of this application to the portion of the property along Lewis.

Mr. Jackere informed the applicant is going to amend his legal description. Mr. Harris informed he does not want to have this use within 300 feet of any residential area to the east of the property.

Mr. Gardner informed this should be limited to the west 300 feet of the subject property. That would leave 330 feet to the east.

Mr. Gardner informed the applicant needs to tell the Board specifically what he wants to do on the lot. Mr. Harris informed he only wants to sell used automobiles off of the lot. There will be no repair work done at this location. They will sell automobiles up to and including three-quarter ton pickup trucks.
Case No. 13180 (continued)

Mr. Barker informed it is his understanding that if they were to detach the garage, the variance would not be required.

Mr. Gardner informed that a detached accessory building can go within three feet of the property line.

Mr. Jackere asked the applicant if he has checked the livability space, and Mr. Barker informed that he has.

Mr. Smith asked the applicant why the lot is so shallow. Mr. Barker described what has occurred on the property. He informed that this will back up to a garage on the property to the north.

Interested Party:
Grant Hall, 1202 East 18th, informed he came today to see what the applicant's plans were. Mr. Hall described the history of the property and the surrounding properties.

Comments and Questions:
Mr. Smith asked the applicant which way the drainage would go. Mr. Smith described the drainage of the property.

Mr. Victor informed he thinks the hardship for the variance could be the shallowness of the lot. The home is consistent in size with other homes in the area.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"); no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—under the provisions of Use Unit 1206) of the rear yard setback from 20' to 5' to allow construction of a dwelling in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, per plot plan and subject to it meeting all the other Bulk and Area Requirements of the zoning district, on the following described property:

The South 109.8' of East 34' Lot 13; the South 109.8' Lot 14; and the South 109.8' of West 28' Lot 15, Block 4, Maple Ridge addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 13182

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the rear yard setback from 20' to 10' to permit construction of a dwelling in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located north and west of the northwest corner of 19th Street and St. Louis.

Presentation:
The applicant, Robert E. Buchner, 1850 Utica Square, was present.
Case No. 13185

Action Requested:
Special Exception—Section 410—Principal Uses Permitted in a Residential District—Use Unit 1205—Request an exception to permit a Day Care for children in the daytime hours in an RS-3 district, under the provisions of Section 1680, located south of the southwest corner of 12th Street and Yale Avenue.

Presentation:
The applicant, Frank Steven Tate, 2611 East 15th Place, requested by letter (Exhibit "J-1") that this item be withdrawn and that he be refunded the public hearing portion of his fees.

Protestants: None.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to withdraw Case No. 13185 and to refund $25 to the applicant.

Case No. 13186

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 430.1—Principal Uses Permitted in a Residential District—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance to reduce the rear yard requirement in an RS-1 district from 25' to 9.4' and the front yard requirement from 35' to 27' as per plot plan, under the provisions of Section 1670, located east of the northeast corner of 47th and South Atlanta.

Presentation:
The applicant, John W. Sublett, #1 Williams Center, Suite 1776, requested by letter (Exhibit "K-1") that this application be withdrawn.

Protestants: None.

Board Action:
On MOTION of CHAPPELLE and SECOND by VICTOR, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to withdraw Case No. 13186.

Case No. 13187

Action Requested:
Variance—Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—Use Unit 1206—Request a variance of the setback from the centerline of 26th Street from 55' to 40' to allow an addition to an existing dwelling in an RS-2 district under the provisions of Section 1670, located at the southeast corner of 26th Street and Boston Place.
Case No. 13188 (continued)

would like to place the sign between the trees. He submitted three photographs (Exhibit "M-1") and described them. The sign will be 3' x 8' and will be about 12 feet off the ground. It will be lit with constant light—there will be no flashing lights.

Protestants: None.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Smith informed they would need a removal contract on this sign.

Board Action:

On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 630—Bulk and Area Requirements in the Office Districts—under the provisions of Use Unit 1211) of the 50' setback from the centerline of East 51st Street to 36' to permit a 3' x 8' sign in an O&M district under the provisions of Section 1670, with the provision that the bottom of the sign be about 12 feet above the ground with a constantly lit background on the sign, and subject to a removal contract, on the following described property:

The North 190' of NW/4 of NW/4 of NW/4 of NE/4 of Section 33, T-19-N, R-13-E, City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 13189

Action Requested:

Special Exception—Section 710—Principal Uses Permitted in the Commercial Districts—Use Unit 1215—Request an exception to permit a dry cleaners in a CS district under the provisions of Section 1680, located at the northwest corner of 21st Street and 114th East Avenue.

Presentation:

Omega Cleaners and Laundry, Inc., was represented by Brent Allen, 3020 South 101st East Avenue, Apartment 6-K. Mr. Allen submitted the approval from the County Health Department for them to install the machines (Exhibit "N-1").

Protestants: None.

Comments and Questions:

There was discussion about what kind of solvent would be used in the business.

Mr. Gardner informed the Health Department has approved this and they are the primary concern. He asked the applicant if the Health Department required him to extend the walls up past the ceiling. Mr. Allen informed the front part of the building has a drop ceiling, but the back part where the machinery is does not have a drop ceiling.

Mr. Allen informed that the entire operation will be at this location.
Case No. 13191 (continued)

Protestants: None.

Comments and Questions:
There was discussion about other houses in the neighborhood and how this house will be sitting on the lot.

Mr. Gardner asked the applicant if this lot flooded in the May flood, and the applicant informed that it did. Ms. Hubbard informed they are not issuing any building permits at all without the approval of the Hydrology Department.

Mr. Gardner informed that the record should show that the Board is aware that there is a problem with drainage. The Board could probably find that the variance is appropriate based on the setback of the structures to the north and south.

There was discussion about whether or not this house would block the view of the house to the south of it. Mr. Fisher informed it would not block their view.

Board Action:
On MOTION of VICTOR and SECOND by CHAPPELLE, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Chappelle, Smith, Victor, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Clugston, Purser, "absent") to approve a Variance (Section 430.1—Bulk and Area Requirements in the RS, RD, and RM Districts—under the provisions of Use Unit 1206) of the setback from the centerline of Florence Avenue from 60' to 45' to permit construction of a dwelling in an RS-1 district under the provisions of Section 1670, per plot plan submitted, and per Hydrology Department approval on the following described property:

Lot 2, Block 2, Parkwood addition to the City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 13193

Action Requested:
Special Exception—Section 420—Accessory Uses in Residential Districts—Use Unit 1206—Request a special exception for a home occupation to permit dog grooming in an RS-3 district under the provisions of Section 1680, located north of the northwest corner of 33rd West Avenue and 61st Street.

Presentation:
The applicant, Merylene Owens, was represented by Keith Owens, Route 9, Box 999A. They would like to have a small dog grooming business in their residence to supplement his income. They would like to be able to groom from three to five dogs a day. Mr. Owens described the surrounding area and where the neighboring houses are located. He will keep the animals inside. People would drop their dogs off for the day only—there would be no dogs there overnight. He submitted a plan (Exhibit "P-1") and described how the business will be set up at the location. They will groom all breeds of dogs. The days of