

COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

MINUTES of Meeting No. 217
Tuesday, June 16, 1998, 1:30 p.m.
County Commission Room
Room 119
County Administration Building

MEMBERS PRESENT MEMBERS ABSENT STAFF PRESENT OTHERS PRESENT

Alberty, Chair
Eller
Looney
Tyndall
Walker

Beach
Arnold

Glenn, County
Inspector

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the County Clerk on Thursday, June 11, 1998, at 2:29 p.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

MINUTES:

On **MOTION** of **ELLER**, the Board voted 4-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; Looney "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of May 19, 1998, (No. 216).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Case No. 1550

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow church and accessory uses (Christian School and daycare center). **SECTION 310. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 5**, located 13413 E. 106th St. N.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Beach stated that this case has been withdrawn.

Interested Parties:

None.

Case No. 1565

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a church and church uses (Use Unit 5) in an RS zoned district. **SECTION 410. TABLE 1 PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 5** and a Special Exception to permit a carport on lot other than where principle use is located. **SECTION 420.2.H. YARDS, Permitted Yard Obstruction**, located 13026 W. Southard.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked if this case had previously been continued and Mr. Beach answered yes.

Mr. Alberty asked if there was any word such as a letter from Mr. Craig. Mr. Beach stated that they have not heard anything from him. Mr. Beach mentioned that the case has been continued several times in order for the applicant to consult with the County Inspector regarding his building plans.

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Glenn if he has talked to Mr. Craig and Mr. Glenn answered that he has had no contact with him and he still does not have a drainage plan.

Without any objection Chairman Alberty withdrew the case.

Case No. 1570

Action Requested:

Variance of minimum lot area in AG district of 2 ac, down to 1.14 acres on tracts 1 and 2; a Variance of 2.2 acres of land per D.U. down to 1.14 ac on tracts 1 and 2 and a Variance of 200' lot width down to 150' on tracts 1 and 2. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** and a Variance from 2 ac to 1.5 ac on tract 3. **SECTION 330 BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** and a Variance from 2.2 acres land area per dwelling unit to 1.5 acres on tract 3 for lot split purposes. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** and a Variance of setback from centerline of 129th E. Ave. and 176th St. from 85' down to 45' on entire tract. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** located 17707 N. 129th E. Ave.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Louis F. Desilvio**, submitted a site plan (Exhibit A-1) and stated that his family has owned the property for five generations and he has owned the property since 1973. Mr. Desilvio mentioned that he wants to split the property between each of his three daughters. When they started to split the lots Mr. Desilvio found that there are a lot of rules and regulations that are in play because they are on two arterials. Mr. Desilvio stated that there is an 85' setback on both sides. On Tract 3, which is on the corner, requires 85' taken out of 330'. That would not be bad except for the fact that the terrain is such that it drops off and they could not build without getting as closer to the road than the required setback. Mr. Desilvio would like it to be 45' from the centerline to the building line. If that were to happen they would be able to build. The way they split the lot into three tracts is they used the terrain and the driveway on the existing house to determine that there is 500' to be split into three lots. Mr. Desilvio stated that the whole issue is Tract 3.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty stated that it was hard for them to visualize what was going on without a topo map. Mr. Desilvio submitted a topo map to the Board (Exhibit A-2).

Mr. Walker asked the applicant if there were any other tracts as small as his. Mr. Desilvio answered that he did not know. There is a housing development about a mile down the street. Mr. Desilvio stated that he has signed a document allowing his neighbor across the street to build a garage 50' from the centerline and that was approved by the Board on October 19, 1998.

Mr. Desilvio pointed out to the Board the drop-off on the topo map and stated that they need to position the house farther up on the lot.

Mr. Desilvio stated that he had recommendations from the County Inspector and the County Engineer.

Interested Parties:

Larry Glenn, County Inspector, stated that on 129th St. going North and 176th St. E. going East there are no plans for expansion or enlarge those two streets. The County has no problem or objection or concerns with the granting of the variances.

Mr. Alberty stated that he had a problem with keeping this on a major street and highway plan as an arterial street if it will continually be varied. Mr. Alberty suggested that if this is not going to be developed, then maybe consideration should be given to amending the major street and highway plan to a collector street. If it is amended to a collector street, then it would be 60', which is 30' on either side and that would be a step forward. Mr. Alberty said that it goes against his grain to continue to waive the Major Street & Highway Plan because they are forcing people to come in, file an application for the waiver, then the Board recommends that it be waived.

Case No. 1570 (continued)

Mr. Glenn agreed with Mr. Alberty stating that especially 129th St. N. should be looked at from a County standpoint. Mr. Glenn stated that 176th St. going east has some flood plain problems so that particular street would take a little more consideration before they do away with the arterial.

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Glenn if he was just recommending 129th right now and maintaining the setback and dedication on 176th. Mr. Glenn said no, at this point in time, anything going north and east of 129th St. and 176th St. the County has no objection to the setback being waived.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Desilvio stated that Mr. Alberty's suggestions to make the street a collector really does fit the need more than the original plan did. It is all country in this area. Mr. Desilvio doubts that any major development in Tulsa County would ever go in those two directions. Mr. Desilvio stated that even if the street was made a collector street today, it would give him 30' but he still would have a problem with the setback. The hardship comes into play then because he has to have the house close to the corner because of the topography of the land.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty stated that it is not that simple to amend a major street and highway plan because the federal government is involved. Mr. Desilvio asked Mr. Alberty how many years they were projecting when they originated that plan? Mr. Alberty thinks it was 2000.

Mr. Desilvio stated that the Board's purpose is to take consideration for factors that don't fit in between the lines.

Mr. Walker asked the applicant why he couldn't reduce the acreage down. Mr. Desilvio answered that they have three children and the way the land lays the only way to split the land is to take the south 500' and divide it by three. That is how the whole thing started in the beginning. Mr. Desilvio does not want to get into a family dispute because you have to have two net acres. Mr. Desilvio stated that the easiest thing to do is to apply for the variances that he has applied for that gives them a net 45' from the center of the road where they can build.

Mr. Alberty stated that the fact of wanting to split the property into three lots creates the hardship. If he had two daughters, it would work. Mr. Alberty pointed out to Mr. Desilvio that where he drew the north line could be adjusted. Mr. Alberty stated that he is not persuaded by the presentation of the hardship and he sympathizes with his family problem, but that is not what the Board is set up to do. Mr. Alberty does not support the request.

Case No. 1570 (continued)

Mr. Walker stated that it is certainly agriculture in nature and that Mr. Desilvio could have what he wanted by right if he rezoned the property.

Mr. Looney stated that since Mr. Desilvio could get everything he wanted, except the setback, by rezoning the property he is inclined to support the request simply because it could be accomplished by other means.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 2-3-0 (Eller, Looney, "aye"; Alberty, Tyndall, Walker "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance of minimum lot area in AG district of 2 ac, down to 1.14 acres on tracts 1 and 2; a Variance of 2.2 acres of land per D.U. down to 1.14 ac on tracts 1 and 2 and a Variance of 200' lot width down to 150' on tracts 1 and 2. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** and a Variance from 2 ac to 1.5 ac on tract 3. **SECTION 330 BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** and a Variance from 2.2 acres land area per dwelling unit to 1.5 acres on tract 3 for lot split purposes. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** and a Variance of setback from centerline of 129th E. Ave. and 176th St. from 85' down to 45' on entire tract. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6**. The hardship being the rezoning of the property could end up giving the applicant what he wants and also that the topography limits the setbacks to build a house, subject to all permits being granted.

MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF MAJORITY VOTE.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Case No. 1574

Action Requested:

Variance of minimum lot width of 200' to 150' for lot split purposes. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** located 10317 N. New Haven.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Carolyn Armstrong**, submitted a site plan (Exhibit B-1) and stated that she is Ruby L. Herndon's daughter. Ms. Herndon owns the property and wants to split it. Ms. Armstrong stated that her father has just passed away and Ms. Herndon cannot take care of the entire property by herself.

Case No. 1574 (continued)

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked Ms. Armstrong if she was wanting to split the property right down the middle – 150' on each side and Ms. Armstrong answered yes.

Mr. Alberty asked the applicant if there are any other lots in the area that are similar to what she is asking for. Ms. Armstrong answered yes.

Mr. Alberty asked what type of sewage treatment system is on the property? Ms. Armstrong answered that there is a lagoon on the property. She has spoken with someone from County Health Department and they said they would approve the lot split if Ms. Armstrong would put a sprinkler system in. Ms. Armstrong said that they would put that in.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance of minimum lot width of 200' to 150' for lot split purposes. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** subject to Health Department, Water Department and County Inspector's office requirements finding the hardship to be another smaller lot in the area and with the lay of the land on the following described property:

Lot 3, Block 1, Cummings Acres, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

Case No. 1575

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a manufactured home in a RS zoned district. **SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS**, located 514 S. 63rd W. Ave.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Richard W. Griffith**, 514 S. 63rd W. Ave., submitted a site plan and support letters (Exhibits C-1 and C-2) and stated that he wants to put a manufactured home on property.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked the applicant if he owns the property. Mr. Griffith stated that he is in the process of buying it.

Mr. Alberty asked the applicant if there are other mobile homes in the area. The applicant answered yes, there are about four or five in the immediate area.

Case No. 1575 (continued)

Mr. Alberty asked if Mr. Griffith would have a problem with tie downs and skirting on the mobile home as a condition of approval. Mr. Griffith stated that he had no problem with that.

Mr. Alberty asked if he has contacted the health department about sewage disposal. Mr. Griffith answered that there were two mobile homes on the property several years ago and the property already has septic tanks set up on it.

Mr. Walker asked the applicant what the size of the mobile home is. Mr. Griffith answered 68'x16'.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Special Exception to allow a manufactured home in a RS zoned district. **SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** subject to skirting and tie downs and health department and building permit approval on the following described property:

Lot 1, McDole Resub of Lot 32, Partridge, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

Case No. 1576

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow two mobile homes in a RS zoned district. **SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 9** and a Variance to allow three dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF REOCD**, located SW/c W. 22nd St. & S. 59th W. Ave.

Presentation:

The applicant, **C.R. Hawkins**, 3716 S. 63rd W. Ave., submitted a site plan (Exhibit D-1) and stated that he has a daughter that needs a place to live. Mr. Hawkins stated that he put one trailer on the property in 1981. The trailer is a 16'x80x and is tied down and skirted. Mr. Gross from the County was out on the sewer disposal system and he has no problems with the system.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Hawkins if he was the applicant on the original mobile home. Mr. Hawkins answered yes. Mr. Alberty stated that the application was approved in 1981 for a period of five years and asked the applicant if he was aware of that. Mr. Hawkins answered no.

Case No. 1576 (continued)

Mr. Hawkins stated that there are trailers everywhere in this area.

Mr. Alberty asked which home is the current one. Mr. Hawkins answered the one on the back of the property, it is a 14'x70' and the new one will be on the east part of the lot and there is a house on the property that was built in 1954. Mr. Hawkins stated that the land is 1¼ acres and he never split the lot.

Mr. Tyndall asked the applicant who lives in the house now. Mr. Hawkins stated that it is a rent house and his daughter lives in the other mobile home on the property. Mr. Alberty asked if it was a second daughter who was moving onto the land. Mr. Hawkins answered yes.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Alberty what the hardship basis for this application would be. Mr. Alberty stated that this property could be split into three lots.

Mr. Hawkins stated that the property has never been junky.

Interested Parties:

Jerry Pitts, stated that he lives three houses to the west of Mr. Hawkins. Mr. Pitts mentioned that he moved into the house three years ago. Mr. Pitts posed the question of why can't the daughter just live in the rent house instead of moving another mobile home onto the property. Mr. Pitts does not want Mr. Hawkins to put three houses on one lot because he feels it will decrease his property values. Most of the houses in the area are stick built.

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Pitts if he objected to one mobile home being on the lot and Mr. Pitts replied that he did not object to one mobile home but if there were more than one mobile home on the lot it would look like a mobile home park. The mobile homes that are in the area are not together, they are spaced out on different properties.

John Jones, 6020 W. 21st Pl; stated that the trailer home that is currently on the property is kept very nice. Mr. Jones is worried about the people who come in next, will they keep it clean? Mr. Jones has lived in the area all of his life and does not plan on selling his home and is not worried about his property value, but the value of the neighborhood itself.

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Jones if he objected to one mobile home being on the lot and Mr. Jones replied that he would prefer that there not be any mobile homes in the area at all.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Hawkins stated that one block down from him on half of a lot, there are seven residences. He does not believe that the mobile home would be a detriment to the neighborhood.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Beach stated that this is an exceptionally large lot for an RS district and it would be quick, easy and inexpensive to do a lot split and put three lots on the property. Mr. Hawkins could deed all three lots to himself and retain full ownership and accomplish what he wants to do virtually by right. The only question then would be whether or not to allow the two mobile homes as a use in an RS district.

Mr. Alberty stated that this makes a tough case because he suspects that when the case came through in 1981, there were no objections to it. That is the reason why they put time limits on these types of things, to determine compatibility and hopefully give a neighborhood time to see what direction it is going to go. Mr. Alberty believes that there is evidence of new construction in the area. This neighborhood is seeing some resurgence.

Mr. Tyndall stated that he could not support two mobile homes on one lot. Mr. Walker stated that he agreed with Mr. Tyndall. Mr. Walker is struggling on whether or not to support the one that has been there since 1981. Mr. Walker is concerned about the five year time limit and why the applicant never came back before the Board to renew it.

Mr. Alberty mentioned that the Board might consider giving a reasonable period of time to remove the mobile home if they are inclined to deny. Mr. Alberty stated that he is not in support of the two mobile homes either.

Mr. Looney stated that he is perplexed by the same thing that everyone else has mentioned. The neighborhood is moving upward. Mr. Looney asked Mr. Alberty how many mobile homes are in the area. Mr. Alberty stated that there are a few to the northeast of this property that back up to the commercial area along 21st St. Mr. Alberty mentioned that he would be less concerned if it were in that area than south of 22nd.

Mr. Alberty stated that this is a situation where the mobile home has been existing for 12 years without any approval.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, Board voted 4-0-1 (Alberty, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", Eller "abstentions"; no "absent") to **DENY** Special Exception to allow two mobile homes in a RS zoned district. **SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS – Use Unit 9** and a Variance to allow three dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF REOCD** on the following described property:

Lot 1, Block 7, Second West Tulsa View Acres, Tulsa County State of Oklahoma.

Case No. 1577

Action Requested:

Variance of average lot width from 200' to 173' to permit a lot split in an AG district. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6**, located 7791 W. 61st St.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Dale L. Bass**, 7791 W. 61st St., submitted a site plan (Exhibit E-1) and stated that he needs a variance so he can give the front part of the property (4.2 acres) to his daughter and son-in-law to build a home. Mr. Bass stated that he has had the property perked and everything is in order.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked the applicant if he is proposing to create a flag lot with 35' of access to his home. The applicant agreed.

Mr. Alberty stated that he is trouble finding the variance on the site plan. Mr. Beach mentioned that the variance request applies to the back panhandle lot. The average lot width is calculated as the total lot area divided by the longest side. Because of the length of the panhandle and the 35' width of the panhandle results in the amount of relief that he is requesting. Mr. Beach also stated the effective area where the house would be built is over 300' wide.

Interested Parties:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance of average lot width from 200' to 173' to permit a lot split in an AG district. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS – Use Unit 6** finding that the square footage would allow the request on the following described property:

W/2, SE/4, SW/4, SW/4, Section 31, T-19-N, R-12-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1578

Action Requested:

Variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD – Use Unit 9**, located E of SE/c E. 181st St. & S. Elwood.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Jennifer Harvie**, was represented by her father **Tom Byford**, 12 W. 181st St., submitted a site plan (Exhibit F-1) and stated that he owns three acres and wants to let his daughter put a mobile home on the southeast corner of the property.

Interested Parties:

Kris Waylon, represents **David Tracy**, who owns the adjoining property. Ms. Waylon submitted a statement from Mr. Tracy (Exhibit F-2) stating that there is a sewage problem in the area and that the present house there has lateral lines. Mr. Tracy has had the land tested about three times and it failed. Ms. Waylon submitted copies of the failed perk tests (Exhibit F-3). Mr. Tracy does not believe the land is large enough to build an oxidation pond to serve two residences.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Byford stated that his land was perked several years ago. Mr. Byford mentioned that at one time he did have a problem with the lateral lines but they were fixed 7 or 8 months ago.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked the applicant if there will be a separate system for the mobile home. Mr. Byford answered yes.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Byford if there are any other tracts this size with two dwelling units on it in the immediate area. Mr. Byford answered not in his immediate area. He lives in a farm area without much development. Mr. Byford stated that most of the land owners in the area own 100-150 acres and he is the only small land owner in the area.

Mr. Beach showed the Board the notice map indicating one lot that is about the size of lot that would be created if this property is split in two.

Mr. Walker asked the Board about a hardship. Mr. Alberty answered that this is a typical hardship that the Board has looked at in the past when it is for a family member. In that instance, the Board has shown some leniency and conditioned it to the fact that it is for a family member and not to be used for income purposes and upon the property perking and getting proper permits.

Case No. 1578 (continued)

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TYNDALL**, Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD – Use Unit 9** subject to issuance of a building permit; health department permit; tie down; skirting on the following described property:

Part Lot 4, Section 1, T-16-N, R-12-E, Beginning NE/c Lot 4, thence 450' W 290.04' N 450' E 290.0' to the point of beginning, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

On **AMENDED MOTION** of **TYNDALL**, Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD – Use Unit 9** subject to issuance of a building permit; health department permit; tie down; skirting and limited to family use only.

Case No. 1579

Action Requested:

Variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD – Use Unit 6**, located 12155 S. 185th E. Ave.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Deborah L. Neary**, submitted a site plan (Exhibit G-1) stated that she has owned the property for 11 years and wants to put a mobile home on one side of the property so that her mother can move in. Ms. Neary is trying to let her mother be as independent as possible. Ms. Neary submitted a survey and photos (Exhibit G-2) of other mobile homes in the area. The mobile home would be skirted and tied down.

Interested Parties:

Carolyn Freidberg, 12157 S. 185th E. Ave., stated that she is the person who sold the property to the Nearys. Ms. Freidberg mentioned that she owns the property to the south and the property to the east of the Neary property. The only thing that she is concerned with is when the property was sold, there was an access road that goes from the road, through their property to keep her property open on the eastern side. This was an agreed road. The Nearys recently moved the white pipe fencing closer to the road and welded the gate shut. Ms. Freidberg is worried about the integrity of the access road that leads to her property.

Case No. 1579 (continued)

Mr. Looney asked Ms. Freidberg if there was an easement filed. Ms. Freidberg answered that she thought so.

Mr. Alberty stated that if the easement was filed then it has to be honored. Ms. Freidberg stated that is the only thing she is concerned about. She has no problem with the mobile home.

Mr. Alberty stated that the easement is a private agreement and is something that this Board does not get involved in.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Walker asked if the Board should restrict the Variance to only family living in the mobile home. The Board said yes.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** Variance to allow two dwelling units on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD – Use Unit 6** on the following described property:

The W 350' of the N/2 of the NW/4 of the SW/4 of the NE/4 of Section 1, T-17-N, R-14-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **ELECT** John Tyndall – Chairman.

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **ELECT** Ron Looney – Vice Chairman.

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker "aye"; no "nays", no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **ELECT** Ronald Walker – Secretary.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Date approved: July 21, 1998

John N. Fyndal
Chair