

**Tulsa County Board of Adjustment
MINUTES of Meeting No. 552
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Tuesday April 21, 2026, 1 :30 p.m.
Williams Tower I
I West 3rd Street, St. Francis Room**

Meeting No.553

Consider, Discuss and/or Take Action On:

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Charney		S. Tauber	County Inspector -
Hicks		K. Davis	Kerrick Edenborough
Houston		J. Rojas	
Tisdale		D. Wilkerson	
Bonebrake			

The notice and agenda of the said meeting were posted at the County Clerk's office, County Administration Building, March 9, 2026, at 1:48 p.m. as well as in the Office of INCOG, 2 West Second Street, Suite 800.

After declaring a quorum present, Chairperson Charney called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Mr. Davis read the rules and regulations.

On **MOTION** of **TISDALE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all "ayes"; no "nays"; no "abstinence", to **APPROVE** the Minutes of February 17, 2026 (Meeting No. 551).

On **MOTION** of **TISDALE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all "ayes"; no "nays"; no "abstinence to **APPROVE** the Minutes of March 17, 2026 (Meeting No. 552).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

CBOA – 3331 Jody Blood – Continued from CBOA Meeting of 3-17-2026

Action Requested:

Variance of the Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling Unit in an AG district (Section 2.050, Table 2-3) and a Variance of the Minimum Lot Area in an AG district to allow 3rd Dwelling on lot. (Section 2.050, Table 2-3).

Location: 16002 E. 171st ST. S. Bixby, OK

Presentation:

Jody Blood, 14601 East Highway 64, Bixby, Oklahoma 74008, stated that they have property that has a house and ADU. They are requesting permission to build a second ADU. There is room for it on the lot. It will fit well and look nice. The utilities are fitted for it except for electricity. They have an adequate septic system to handle this additional building. He stated that the septic system will meet DEQ requirements. The ADU will be for a rental property. The feedback from his neighbors has been positive.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney confirmed that the existing driveway is for all three structures.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TISDALE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **Approve** a Variance of the Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling Unit in an AG district (Section 2.050, Table 2-3) and a Variance of the Minimum Lot Area in an AG district to allow 3rd Dwelling on lot. (Section 2.050, Table 2-3) subject to the following conditions that the standard DEQ requirements are met, this is limited to 3 dwellings units of one house and two ADU’s. This will honor all setbacks. Finding the hardship to be large shape of the lot.

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:

**BETHEL INDIAN CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY LOT 1 BLOCK 1 Section: 12 Township:
17 Range: 12 & PRT NE BEG 311.39E NWC NE TH S210 W43 S530 E197.55 N740 W
TO POB SEC 12 17 12 3.165ACS County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.**

NEW APPLICATIONS

**CBOA 3346 - Duane Bryant
Action Requested:**

Variance to allow an accessory building in the side yard in an RE district. (Sec. 8.030)
Location: 9397 N. 42nd E. Ave. Sperry, OK

Presentation:

Duane Bryant, 9397 North 42nd East Avenue, Sperry, Oklahoma 74073, stated that he wanted to build a building 45 feet by 60 feet to park cars, equipment, and storage. There are lateral fields that would prevent him from putting this building behind his home or he would have to drive over the lateral fields.

Mr. Bonebrake asked where the utilities came in. Mr. Bryant showed on the screen where the locations were.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **Approve** a Variance to allow an accessory building in the side yard in an RE district. (Sec. 8.030) with no specific conditions. The hardship being due to the shape and angle of the house and it is a larger tract of land, and it would be complimentary to the property.

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:

DAVCO ESTATES LOT 2 BLOCK 1 Section: 21 Township: 21 Range: 13 County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3347 – Michael Martin

Action Requested:

Variance from the minimum lot width requirement of 150 feet to 132 feet in the RE district (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3) & a Variance from the minimum street frontage requirement (30 feet to 0 feet) (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3)

Location: Approx. 150 ft east of North 119th East Avenue, south of 73rd Place North and north of East 72nd Street North - Parcel: 91432143225200 Owasso, OK

Presentation:

Aimee Martin, 9509 North 144th East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that they purchased this property to build a family residence and they understood that 74th Street North was County and maintained. After they closed on the property, her husband contacted the permit department and was informed that they were unable to obtain a permit because they did not have 150 feet or 30 feet of access on a County maintained road. Ultimately, they want to be able to live there. They do not own the Tract 4 on the corner.

Mr. Charney stated that obtaining an easement for their property may be complicated.

Mr. Davis stated that when the property was split, the owner should have established that easement for the tracts. Now they are in a situation where all of them individually address this problem.

Mr. Charney stated that if the Board did approve this item, it would still be important to her to get permission from all four property owners and get a real estate attorney to say what needs to be arranged for a mutual access agreement.

Ms. Martin stated that the possible easement area is complicated with storm water drainage challenges. It is not actually a viable entrance or exit for any of the properties and it does not make sense for it to be there. The County property to the north (74th Street) is 60 feet wide versus 25 feet to the south. The land to the south has buildings that are very close to the fence line. Prior to the split, the owner was given the option to have 74th Street be the legal access point or do whatever needed to be done to make that a County maintained road. The owner at that time chose to make a separate easement because it was more cost effective and unbeknownst to them as buyers. 74th Street would serve not only three lots (T-3, T-2, and T-1), it would also serve two more private residences that are east of T-1. For the purposes of driveways, the driveway would come off 74th Street.

Mr. Charney stated that they are required to say that you must access a publicly maintained roadway. That is what he is struggling with and there is a roadway there that the County must accept for maintenance.

Ms. Martin stated that they are unable to contact the owners of T-1.

Mr. Charney stated that for the County to accept the road for maintenance, they would require that improvements be made to it to bring it up to County standards first. Currently there is no mutual access agreement with the neighbors to do that and that is a hefty price tag.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that is where they always start. If you do not have access to publicly maintained roadways then they insist on having an easement and it is a public easement, but it is not a publicly maintained roadway. 74th Street is a publicly owned right-of-way, but not a publicly maintained street. There are a few problems.

Mr. Edenborough stated that it must be that County maintained road.

Mr. Edenborough stated that he would have to talk to County Engineering.

Mr. Charney stated that it is a question if the County could issue a building permit where a right-of-way sits, but there is no agreement to maintain it. Is that enough to do away with the mutual access agreement?

Mr. Wilkerson stated that the other part of that conversation is that it may not be feasible for drainage or physical obstruction there are in the 25-foot easement, cost does not really matter in that either. It is just if you have access and that is typical and you only really need that on T-4. All these things were brought up during the initial lot split process over a year ago. All that needed to happen at that time was dedicating a private easement to a single property owner. Unfortunately, that it did not happen.

Mr. Houston asked what safety would be addressed and accessed by the fire department and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that until they see some plans, there is no way of knowing. The fire code standards for pavement are much less than County standards. Those things would be considered during the building permit time.

Ms. Martin stated that 119th is the County maintained road that runs north and south. 74th Street runs into two additional homes and that is their legal access also. To the south is a Tulsa County firefighter and he says 74th is the emergency access.

Mr. Hicks asked if East 74th Street is not recognized as a road then what would stop the County deciding to close it. He wanted to know if this case was continued would there be enough time to see if the land from 119th to Ms. Martin's property if they are willing to bring it up to standard.

Mr. Charney stated that there was a nuance here that 74th Street North is publicly dedicated, it is just not maintained by the County. They are trying to find an efficient, long-term solution. Getting the street up to the County's standard for them to maintain is a very expensive endeavor. Another route would be a private maintenance agreement among the neighbors over this publicly dedicated easement. Is there language that would be satisfactory for this private maintenance agreement on a publicly right-of-way. This would have to be discussed with the County Engineer. If this Board were to condition this approval upon maintaining a mutual access easement along the southernly 25 feet of lot T-4, could the applicant obtain that?

Ms. Martin stated that she thought that on T-4 that it was already written on his deed that there is an easement on the southernly 25 feet of his property. She was happy to attempt obtaining it.

Mr. Charney stated that he was trying to get them legal access knowing that it would likely never be used. There needs to be some language that deems it a mutual access easement.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that there was a possibility of vacating the right-of-way altogether and then using that as a mutual access easement for several properties.

Interested Parties:

Mike Buchert, 2726 East 6th Place, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136, stated that he was there to represent the owner of one of the neighbors, Josephine Koennin, 7403 North 119th East Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74055. He has a degree in civil engineering, ten years of experience with the Core of Engineers, twenty years of experience with the City of Tulsa to name a few. The current driveway in the E. 74th Street, right of way, is eleven to twelve feet wide built about thirty years ago using ground up asphalt. Mr. Koennin put down this asphalt and did maintenance on it and now the sons and grandsons do the maintenance on at least a yearly basis. They have a bridge that must be maintained also. Off the driveway is grass and clay soil which when it rains causes people to get stuck. The road needs to be widened and make it maintainable or have a legal document of who is going to maintain it. The two landowners at the east have been maintaining it for several years now the other landowners are going to be building homes, use this as an access point and it brought up to good standards. Emergency vehicles need to be able to access these properties, but the key for this application is that a long-term maintenance agreement. Vacating the right-of-way being replaced with an agreement and the improvement made seems like a logical approach to him. He thought that anything less would cause problems.

Stephan Gray, 2400 West Detroit, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74012, stated that there are no shoulders and some places have three and four feet drop off. Pulling off the road is not an option in several areas. His concern was if what had been discussed was

granted, it would open the door to every future applicant. Mr. Gray said he supports the purpose of the County Zoning Code for responsible development to protect the public health, safety, and welfare. He tendered the documents that were fraudulently signed on some legal matters regarding a lot split.

Justin Rinck, 9013 North 156th East Place, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that this is his grandmother-in-law's driveway and their concern is that their will not be any improvements made to the driveway and all of the neighbors will continue to use it which degrades the road. He stated that he had been maintaining the driveway since his father passed away but feels there should be something in place so that he was not the only one doing so. The driveway floods at lease once a year.

Josephine Koeanin, 7403 North 119th East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that this was her driveway, and her husband had built and maintained it all these years.

Mark Heller, 12112 East 74th Street North, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated he lives at the end of the street, and this is the only entrance to his home. Over the last three years, he has had to purchase a dump truck, a skid steer, and they are constantly assisting Justin manage this area. He must constantly maintain the driveway to his home as well. A lot of water from the widening of 76th Street comes down through these properties. Owasso says to talk to the County, and the County says it is not their issue, and we have a mess to deal with all the time. His concern is that this situation is going to add to the water problem and maintenance issue.

Dade Rinck, 9013 North 156th East Place, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that the County does not pick up trash or deliver mail on 74th Street.

Josephine Rinck, 9013 North 156th East Place, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that she was the great granddaughter of Josephine Koeanin, and she objected to the request.

Rebuttal:

Aimee Martin stated that she and husband agree with the protestants and they want to help make the road wider and help with the maintenance. The County owns sixty feet of this road/driveway. She would like to have an agreement that they would all maintain the road.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Bonebrake stated that this is a no man's land area and that this is a unique situation.

Mr. Charney stated that sometimes the Board struggles to help people who are land locked to get an easement back to their property and perhaps a mutual access agreement that all the neighbors enter.

Mr. Hicks stated that he agreed with Mr. Charney and his point is now that if they deny this application, it will kick it back to the County.

Mr. Tisdale stated that the neighbor on the corner may not want to enter an agreement and it sounds like there are some legal issues that need to be address.

Mr. Houston stated that he wants to be compassionate with the applicant and the neighbors.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that if the Board wants to move it, it must be a date specifically. It is best to continue the request, and he would suggest thirty days. He thought they could learn more about what it would take to improve 74th Street. The whole idea of zoning is to get it right. Getting the street up to standard and how much it is going to cost is the priority. The lot size is a whole different conversation. The lot split idea is what brought all of this to the surface.

Mr. Bonebrake stated that he thought that Ms. Martin said that there was already a mutual access agreement. If that is the case, it should be a matter of public record. Continuing it would give them time to see if it is on record.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **CONTINUE** a Variance from the minimum lot width requirement of 150 feet to 132 feet in the RE district (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3) & a Variance from the minimum street frontage requirement (30 feet to 0 feet) (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3 to the May 19, 2026 Tulsa County Board of Adjustment meeting.

CBOA 3348 - Kelly & David Kennebeck

Action Requested:

Variance of the maximum number of dwellings from 2 to 3 on a single lot in the AG district (Sec. 2.030, Table 2-2)

Location: 7556 E. 106th St. N. Tulsa, OK

Presentation:

Dave Kennebeck, 8817 East 104th Street North, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that he has two dwellings on his property currently occupied and he wants to build a third home for himself. He would use the same driveway that is there. Each home has its own utilities and separate septic systems. This will be a mobile home that is a doublewide.

Mr. Charney stated that if he added any more houses it would need to be platted or subdivided.

Mr. Bonebrake asked about the dilapidated outbuildings.

Mr. Kennebeck stated that they were with the original farmhouse and he plans to remove them and clean all that.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney explained that this third home was acceptable on such a large acreage where it would not be on a small lot. If there were any more homes, it would need platting and engineering to become involved.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the maximum number of dwellings from 2 to 3 on a single lot in the AG district (Sec. 2.030, Table 2-2) subject to standard DEQ requirements and no more than three houses. Finding the hardship to be that this is an unusually large lot

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:

E/2 NW NE LESS E156 N374.75 THEREOF & LESS N16.5 THEREOF FOR RD SEC 14 21 13 18.467ACS, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3349 – Kirk & Candice Coryn

Action Requested:

Variance of minimum street frontage requirements from 30' to 0' of public maintained road in an RE district (Sec. 3.040 Table 3-3)

Location: Approx. 420 ft east of North 119th East Avenue, south of 73rd Place North and north of East 72nd Street North – Parcel: 91432143225400 Owasso, OK

Presentation:

Kirk Coryn, 11016 North 160th East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that he bought this property under false pretenses. He has a law suite pending the owner of Tract 2 and 4. It was divided under false pretense, and he wants his money back.

Mr. Charney stated that since this is the same problem and that it is associated with the previous case of CBOA 3347. He would like to continue it as well.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **CONTINUE** a Variance of minimum street frontage requirements from 30' to 0' of public maintained road in an RE district (Sec. 3.040 Table 3-3) to the May 19, 2026 Tulsa County Board of Adjustment meeting.

CBOA 3350 – Nathan Coyle

Action Requested:

Variance of minimum street frontage requirements from 30' to 0' of public maintained road (Sec. 3.040 Table 3-3)

Location: 10091 N Wheeling Ave, Skiatook, OK

Presentation:

Nathan Coyle, 12182 Pacific Circle, Sperry, Oklahoma 74073, stated that this homeowner of eighty acres has been working overseas and wants to build his dream home on family land. They have an unwritten agreement to use a road to access this property. Wheeling is publicly maintained to this road, and three other properties have used this as access to their properties. There is currently a driveway that goes along there.

Mr. Charney asked if it would be a simple matter for him to get an access agreement. There are two points of access that are never going to be used.

Mr. Coyle stated that the owners are going to put an 8,000 square foot home on the land along with a 5,500 square foot metal shop and two-and-a-half-acre pond.

Mr. Charney stated that he thought that they needed the proper documentation that gave an actual legal access, actual true access. They need to obtain an easement across the appropriate landowner's land. There needs to be a legal record that speaks to joint maintenance that is the one that is used to get to the property.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that access to a public road is available but would require a bridge over Bird Creek, flood plain consideration that is part of the concept of reasonable development. He may say that he meets the letter of the law, but there are a lot of other things that are going to have to evolve as part of the building permit process.

Mr. Charney stated that another way to handle it would be to say they granted the request depending upon their getting an easement that speaks to perpetuity and maintenance from the publicly maintained road to the subject site.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated that the intent of this is to provide actual physical access to make certain anyone can get to the property, including emergency vehicles.

Mr. Hicks stated that it looks like they must build a bridge.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **APPROVE** a Variance of minimum street frontage requirements from 30' to 0' of public maintained road (Sec. 3.040 Table 3-3) subject to obtaining a permanent legally enforceable ingress and egress access easement provided to the forty acre tract from the nearest point of publicly maintained road. That easement must speak to maintenance in perpetuity and filed of record and only with this easement.

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:

NE SE SEC 18-21-13 County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma

CBOA 3351 – Tony Joseph

Action Requested:

Special Exception for Religious Assembly use in an AG district (Sec. 6.010, Table 6-1) and Special Exception for Day Care use (Sec. 6.010, Table 6-1; Sec.6.040-C)

Location: 522 F 131 St S, Jenks & 420 E 131 St S, Jenks

Presentation:

Meenakshi Krisanksamy, 11524 South 32nd West Avenue, Jenks, Oklahoma 74037, stated that he represented Bethel India Christian Church Assembly stated that they have a growing congregation and they want to offer a day care facility for the members and then to the community. The church had a neighborhood meeting, and the neighbors were in support of what they were doing. They are currently designing the schematic design for the 8,000 square feet and they are going to start fund raising. The design will hopefully be finished by the end of May 2026, raise the funds, so by the end of this year it should be ready for permitting and groundbreaking.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that he would like to add that in a Special Exception use, the Zoning Code does require a conceptual site plan. The applicant provided in the Agenda packet.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **APPROVE** a Special Exception for Religious Assembly use in an AG district (Sec. 6.010, Table 6-1) and Special Exception for Day Care use (Sec. 6.010, Table 6-1; Sec.6.040-C) subject to the conceptual site plan in the 2nd Amendment of the Agenda packet.

The Board finds that the requested 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, for the following property:

BETHEL INDIAN CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY LOT 1 BLOCK 1 Section: 12 Township: 17 Range: 12 & PRT NE BEG 311.39E NWC NE TH S210 W43 S530 E197.55 N740 W TO POB SEC 12 17 12 3.165ACS County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3352 – Patty Million

Action Requested:

Request for Special Exception to allow two households on a single lot in an RS-3 district (Sec.6.010, Table 6-1) and a Special Exception to allow a single-section manufactured housing unit in an RS-3 district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2)

Location: 2324 S 61st W Ave, Tulsa

Presentation:

Patty Million, 2332 South 61st West Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74107, stated that they want to add a mobile home behind their house.

Eric Cole, 8928 East 105th Street North, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that this is a large lot that is .87 acres and it will be on a separate septic. DEQ came out and stated that they will be able to add another system. The neighbors are supportive.

Mr. Charney stated that if the Board were to approve this request, besides the DEQ regulations there are other things like an all-weather hard surface parking space, tie downs, and skirting.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated that this being such a large property of almost an acre. He feels comfortable with the second unit.

Mr. Hicks commented that he drove by this place and there are other single-wide mobile homes in the neighborhood. It is a deep lot and would not be an eye sore.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **BONEBRAKE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **APPROVE** for Request for Special Exception to allow two households on a single lot in an RS-3 district (Sec.6.010, Table 6-1) and a Special Exception to allow a single-section manufactured housing unit in an RS-3 district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2) subject to meeting the DEQ requirements and other standard requirements for a mobile home.

The Board finds that the requested 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, for the following property:

WEST TULSA VIEW ACRES LT 18 BLK 4 Section: 17 Township: 19 Range: 12

County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3353 – Pam Bearden

Action Requested:

Variance to allow a swimming pool in a side yard in an RS-3 district. (Sec.18.080 Table 18-1)

Location: 8441 E 111th St N Owasso, OK 74055

Presentation:

Gentry Wyatt, 3808 West Vicksburg Street, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74011, stated that he represents the Perez family and they want to build a swimming pool. The backyard is limited by a utility easement, so they want to put the pool in the side yard. This maintains the setbacks from the house and fence line.

Selena Perez, 8441 East 111th Street North, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that they do not have any neighbor at this present time. There are houses being built around them, but they have not been sold. There is fencing all the way around the house. It is not a privacy fence, but they have plans to put landscaping in to cover that side of the house and pool on the south and west side of the property. This is a rural area, and they have an aerobic system.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated that the nature of the deep house and the utility easement, he can understand the hardship and the landscape screening would be important on the north and the west side for privacy.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **BONEBRAKE**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **APPROVE** a Variance to allow a swimming pool in a side yard in an RS-3 district. (Sec.18.080 Table 18-1) subject to the conditions that landscape screening the North and West side of the pool yard. The hardship is that they are unable to put the pool in the rear yard.

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:

THE MEADOWS II, LOT 5 BLOCK 2 Section: 12 Township: 21 Range: 13, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS

Vote for new Vice-Chairperson

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY** the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **APPROVE** Hicks as Vice Chairperson.

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY** the Board voted 5-0-0 (Bonebrake, Charney, Hicks, Houston, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”) to **APPROVE** Tisdale as Secretary.

NEW BUSINESS

Director’s report.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that the Tulsa Metropolitan Planning Commission is contemplating no longer doing a joint TMAPC and separating the City and County. The result of that is District Attorney’s office and the Legislation is preparing for to move forward with this. If that happens it puts the rules under a different statute at the State level. That will affect the structure of the County Board of Commissioners. After July 1, 2026, there may be a new County Board of Adjustment and a lot of changes. Currently, we do not know what the Planning Commission is going to look like. The notices are different, the make up of the Board of Adjustment is different and there will have to be a new Planning Commission.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that next month he would give another update on the situation.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4: 25 p.m.

Date approved: 5/19/26

Chair: David E. Charney