

**Tulsa County Board of Adjustment
MINUTES of Meeting No. 554
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Tuesday May 19, 2026, 1:30 p.m.
Williams Tower I
1 West 3rd Street, St. Francis Room**

Meeting No.554

Consider, Discuss and/or Take Action On:

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

The notice and agenda of the said meeting were posted at the County Clerk's office, County Administration Building, May 12, 2026, at 4:27 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 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale) all "ayes"; no "nays"; no "abstinence to **APPROVE** the Minutes of April 21, 2026 (Meeting No. 553).

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3347 - Michael Martin

Action Requested: (Continued from 4-21-2026)

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

Presentation:

Michael Martin, 9509 North 144th East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma, 74055, stated that he spoke with a representative of the Tulsa County Engineering Department the day before wherein the representative said they had made the decision to make 74th Street

a publicly maintained road up to the bridge. This will eliminate the need for the 2nd Variance.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that INCOG staff learned that before the lot splits could be approved there needed to be some alternative access arrangement since this was not a publicly maintained road. Tulsa County has now decided to maintain a portion of this 74th Street shown in the exhibit. They would continue maintenance of it thirty feet ease of the west line of tract one as outlined in the zoning code. With the County Engineer decision, there is no need for a Variance from that requirement because we now have a publicly maintained road. The County is not willing to accept maintenance of the creek crossing bridge and any of the road east of that.

Mr. Charney stated that the Board had the data that they needed along with comments from Interested Parties to decide on that Variance. The other item before the Board is the lot that is 132 feet wide and is required to have 150 feet in width. That was predetermined prior to Mr. Martin buying the property.

Mr. Martin stated that they would honor all necessary setbacks from the boundaries, and other regulatory items required by the building permit office.

Interested Parties:

Justin Rinke, 9013 North 156th East Place, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that with the information that the County has accepted publicly maintaining up to the bridge on 74th North most of his family's objection to this Variance would be satisfied. The problem is that he hears about it verbally here and not from the County. They are still objecting to granting the Variance unless the County does maintain the bridge and if they are, then the Variance is not necessary. The County must maintain this road. With regards to the other Variance from 150 feet wide to 132 feet wide, his family does not have any objections to that issue. Mr. Rinke asked if the document from the County speaks to whether they are going to upgrade the road to meet the County standards or are they going to maintain it as is.

Mr. Charney stated that the document does not speak to that. There are many County roads throughout the region and not all of them meet the current standards. The document does not speak to those current standards.

Mark Heller, 12112 East 74th Street North, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that from his understanding the County is willing to maintain a portion of East 74th St. N. back to 119th St. There are still flooding issues in this area which is an issue for all the neighbors up to Tract 3.

Mr. Charney wanted him to know that it is important to let the elected officials know about the flooding because this is not in the Board's directive. The City of Owasso has not annexed this area so it will take a proactive continual effort on your part to go the County with other citizens to respectfully request help with getting the flooding addressed if it can be addressed.

Mr. Heller stated that the road is currently twelve feet wide He asked if the County would widen and upgrade it or will they maintain it as is.

Mr. Charney stated that the document does not speak to that issue. Not all County maintained roads meet the current standards.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Hicks stated that he was glad that the County decided to maintain this portion of 74th Street North.

Mr. Charney stated that he would want to make it conditioned upon the actual resolution by the County accepting that piece of the roadway for maintenance.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that he did not know what the documentation from the County may look like. It would be helpful to put it in the minutes as part of the Motion and the condition of the road itself. Our office received clarification just before today's meeting that the County accepted the road as is and are not making plans for improvements to that road, but it will be on their radar in the future.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION of CHARNEY**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Bonebrake, and Houston "absent") to **APPROVE a Variance** from the minimum lot width requirement of 150 feet to 132 feet in the RE district (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3) finding that this lot had said configuration at time of purchase and conditioned upon an honoring of all required setbacks be upheld, and a Variance from the minimum street frontage requirement (30 feet to 0 feet) (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3) conditioned upon that there be an action taken by Tulsa County consistent with the email received from the County Engineer on May 18, 2026, describing the portion of the road that will be accepted for maintenance by Tulsa County. This document must be formalized in the standard and customary manner prior to the Variance being permitted. This is depicted on the email that the County will maintain 74th Street North from west of the bridge to 119th Street North. There is no commitment to making improvements on day one.

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:

Approx. 150 ft east of North 119th East Avenue, south of 73rd Place North and north of East 72nd Street North - Parcel: 91432143225200 County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma

3349 – Kirk & Candice Coryn

Action Requested: : (Continued from 4-21-2026)

Variance of minimum street frontage requirements from 30' to 0' of public maintained road in an RE district (Sec. 3.040 Table 3-3) & a Special Exception to allow single-section manufactured home in RE district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2)

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

Presentation:

Kirk Coryn, 11016 North 160th East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that he understood the previous case and how the street frontage would be dealt with from the CBOA-3347 discussion and confirm that the County is only willing to maintain up to the bridge which does not include all this property frontage.

Mr. Charney stated that the County will maintain approximately thirty feet of street frontage of Mr. Coryn's property up to the bridge. The publicly maintained road must abut or go past the west boundary of this property, and this accomplishes that goal.

Interested Parties:

Josephine Koeanin, 7403 North 119th East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that she is opposed to having any manufactured homes in this area.

Mark Heller, 12112 East 74th North, Owasso, Oklahoma 74055, stated that he was opposed to this request because it would be injurious to the neighborhood.

Rebuttal:

Kirk Coryn agreed that a mobile home does not go with the neighborhood, but the seller misrepresented the property and committed fraud on several details.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Tisdale stated that it was clear to him that Mr. Coryn wanted to get rid of this property.

Mr. Charney stated that until the claim of fraudulent transactions is on record, the Board must go with what is of record. The title may appear clear, but there is nothing the Board can do unless the applicant decides to withdraw the request.

Mr. Wilkerson stated that there are times that the applicant would rather withdraw a request in lieu of having something on record that was denied.

Prior to taking a vote Mr. Coryn chose to **WITHDRAW** the case for the Special Exception portion of his request.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY** the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Bonebrake, and Houston "absent" to **APPROVE** a Variance

from the minimum street frontage requirement (30 feet to 0 feet) (Sec. 3.040; Table 3-3) conditioned upon that there be an action taken by Tulsa County consistent with the email received from the County Engineer on May 18, 2026, describing the portion of the road that will be accepted for maintenance by Tulsa County. This document must be formalized in the standard and customary manner prior to the Variance being permitted. This is depicted on the email that the County will maintain 74th Street North from west of the bridge to 119th Street North. There is no commitment to making improvements on day one.

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:

**BEG 1348.91S NEC NW TH S299.73 W218.21 N299.79 E218.37 POB SEC 32 21 14
1.502 ACS County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.**

Mr. Tisdale left the room @ 2:22 and returned at 2:24.

NEW APPLICATIONS

CBOA 3354 – Josh Atkinson – Custom Pools

Action Requested:

Variance of the rear yard requirement to permit a swimming pool in an RS-3 district.
(Sec.18.080 Table 18-1)

Location: 3002 W 118th Pl S Jenks, OK 74037

Presentation:

Pat Kinnison, 6324 South 105th East Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133, stated that he is an employee of Custom Pools and they filed a permit application to install a swimming pool. Typically, the pool would be installed in the back yard, however, the back yard is narrow and there is more room for a pool in the side yard of their house on the east side.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated that due to the unique configuration of this property he saw no issues with this request.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Bonebrake, and Houston “absent” to **APPROVE** a Variance of the rear yard requirement to permit a swimming pool in an RS-3 district. (Sec.18.080 Table 18-1) subject to the pool following setbacks required by the Zoning Code. The hardship being the layout of the lot and the utility easement taking most of the backyard and it has a large side yard that the pool fits in easily.

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:

Lot 7 Block 2, TIMBER CREEK County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3355– Audra Rowe

Action Requested:

Use Variance to permit the establishment of an accessory structure on a lot without an existing principal structure (Section 8.010, Section 8.030, Table 8-1 Accessory Uses and Structures) (pursuant to Section 3.040, 3.050A)

Location: 702 N Willow Rd, Sand Springs, OK, 74063, USA

Presentation:

Max Watkins, 2336 South 102nd East Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74125, stated that he was there to represent Audra Rowe. Ms. Rowe wants a shop on a lot without an additional dwelling. This will be for storage only.

Mr. Charney asked if Ms. Rowe lived in the house on the adjacent lot and there are no lots owned by other parties between these two lots. This request does not conform to the rules in the zoning code and that is that a property owner must have a dwelling unit on the lot before they build an accessory building on the lot.

Mr. Wilkerson explained that staff proposed a lot combination to the applicant.

Mr. Davis stated that the applicant had previously split the lots with plans to do something with the lot. The applicant did not want to combine the lots because there is a tax lien on the property and combining the lots it could complicate the tax lien.

Interested Parties:

Randy Bryant, 1701 West 4th Street, Sand Springs, Oklahoma 74063, stated this is not the only shop in the neighborhood. The man next door has two machine shops. Ms. Rowe was going to put a bed and breakfast on the lot but found out that there was not enough room to put a separate septic system there. The neighbors are all okay with this request.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney asked staff if there was a commercial use would it then be a violation of the County Zoning Code.

Mr. Davis stated that the use would be a violation and confirmed that the code limits the maximum combined coverage of all accessory buildings to a maximum of 25% of the lot area.

Mr. Charney asked the applicant to come back to the podium and explained that the only way to pass this request is to combine the lots because an accessory building must be tied to a residence.

Mr. Hicks asked Mr. Bryant if he was associated with the Lico Property Group. In the agenda packet there is a warranty deed between Ms. Rowe and Lico Property Group for that parcel. It looks like the property group would be using the storage unit/accessory building.

Mr. Bryant stated that he is a plumber for that group.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Bonebrake, and Houston “absent” to **DENY** the Use Variance to permit the establishment of an accessory structure on a lot without an existing principal structure (Section 8.010 Accessory Uses and Structures) (pursuant to Section 3.040, 3.050-A).

702 N. Willow Rd, Sand Springs, OK, 74063, USA County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma

CBOA 3356 - Valentina Matyuk

Action Requested:

Variance to allow an accessory building in the side yard in an RE district. (Sec. 8.030)

Location: 14953 W 17th St S, Sand Springs, OK

Presentation:

Maxim Matyuk, 14953 West 17th Street South, Sand Springs, Oklahoma 74063, stated they are going through a lot combination and want to have an accessory building in the side yard. This is for personal use only and not for any commercial uses.

Mr. Charney stated that the Board can analysis with the understanding that the lot combination is being processed and not allowed until after completion of the lot split.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** by **TISDALE**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Bonebrake, and Houston "absent" to **APPROVE** the Variance to allow an accessory building in the side yard in an RE district. (Sec. 8.030), subject to the lot combination be completed and that this is for storage only. Finding the hardship to be the lot areas that need to be combined.

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:

Lot One (1) Block One (1), RIVERSIDE WEST III, an Addition in Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof and Lot Four (4), Block Two (2), RIVERSIDE WEST II, an Addition in Tulsa County, State of Oklahoma, according to the recorded Plat thereof.

CBOA 3357 – James Redyke

Action Requested:

Variance of the minimum street frontage requirement from 30' to 0' of maintained public road in an AG district (Sec. 2.040 Table 2-3), Variance of the Minimum Lot Area and Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling Unit in an AG district (Section 2.040, Table 2-3), and Special Exception for Type 2 Home Occupation (Sec. 8.120-C).

Location: 3900 East 161st, Bixby, Ok.

Presentation:

James Redyke, 8713 East 110th Court, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74133, stated that he owns five acres with a thirty-foot-wide easement that runs parallel to the OG&E line. He is proposing to sell to a contractor for his use. This contractor is going to build a barn dominium. The contractor is going to rent office and storage space from Mr. Redyke until the structure is built.

Mr. Charney asked about the lot area, which is currently 1.38 from two acres.

Mr. Redyke stated that he did not know that there was a 2-acre requirement by code, but in terms of the contractor's needs, the 1.3 acres is sufficient for his needs. The additional acreage would just be additional expenses that he does not need. In the application Mr. Redyke filed a mutual access agreement to put a driveway. It is a gravel road currently.

Mr. Hicks asked about building a barn dominium but there is a document on the agenda that this is for non-residential use.

Mr. Redyke stated that they have changed the plans so they could meet that requirement.

Mr. Charney asked what the plan for a Type 2 Home Occupation in an AG district is.

Mr. Redyke stated that the contractor wants to move from his existing shop for storage and then build a barn dominium with a residential component to meet that home occupation requirement and a shop to go along with it. He has workers that would like to live there. Mr. Redyke is selling the 1.38 acres to the contractor.

Marcelo Hernandez, 3454 East 155th Street South, Bixby, Oklahoma 74008, stated that one or two employees who live in the barn dominium. This is a plumbing operation and masonry work. The name of the company is H&Z Outdoor Living.

Mr. Charney stated that he has a connection to H&Z Outdoor Living and was not aware what the company name was. Mr. Charney must recuse himself from this case and that will mean that there is not a quorum for voting. That means that this case needs to be continued until next month and I hope there is a quorum to vote on it.

Mr. Hicks stated that since there is no quorum on this day that it will have to be continued until 6-16-2026. If there are parties that want to speak today, they may do so or wait until the next meeting.

Interested Parties:

Joseph A. McCormick, 6440 South Lewis, Suite 100, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136, stated that the attorney advised them to wait until the continued meeting to make their statements.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Bonebrake, and Houston "absent" to **CONTINUE Variance** of the minimum street frontage requirement from 30' to 0' of maintained public road in an AG district (Sec. 2.040 Table 2-3), Variance of the Minimum Lot Area and Minimum Lot Area per Dwelling Unit in an AG district (Section 2.040, Table 2-3), and Special Exception for Type 2 Home Occupation (Sec. 8.120-C) to the June 16, 2026 CBOA Meeting.

CBOA 3358 – Jose Soto

Action Requested:

Variance of fence height requirement (Sec. 8.100-A) from 4ft to 6 ft for front yard maximum and Appeal of Tulsa County's requirement that the property owner obtain a Special Exception and/or Variance for a pre-existing carport (Sec.14.110)

Location: 3139 S. 59th W. Ave. Tulsa, OK

Presentation:

Jose Soto, 3139 South 59th West Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74107, stated that the 6-foot fence does not look like a 6-foot fence. The hardship is that there are two entrances to the property and the gradient difference from the street to the fence which is lower. He has been working through a lot of issues trying to get an electrical permit to start work on the house due to the flood plain requirement. The house sits above the base flood plain elevation. He has been living there with no power. There is storage in the RV and switches between living in the RV and the house. He does have a business that is at another address. This is his personal home not for business use.

Mr. Davis stated that this is two lots, but they are not combined.

Interested Parties:

Randy Martin, 3114 South 59th West Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74107, stated that he was at the last case for Mr. Soto and his concern in the fencing and the flood plain. The way the creek floods, the fence would be swept away or cause more flooding for the street and nearby properties to the West.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Soto stated that he is there to improve the neighborhood.

Mr. Charney stated that he thought there were rules about impeding the flow of water in a flood plain.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Tisdale stated that he had driven by the property and the fence looked like it was screening what was inside the yard.

Mr. Hicks stated that this was the second time he had driven by the property and a 6-foot fence in a neighborhood blocks the entire front of the house and that is why the zoning code states that you can have a 4-foot fence. He would be open to leaving the gates at 6-foot but then tapering off to a 4-foot fence. The flood is not in our scope of purview.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Bonebrake, and Houston "absent") to **APPROVE** the Variance of fence height requirement (Sec. 8.100-A) from 4ft to 6 ft for front yard maximum subject to the condition that the six foot fence may remain but only within ten feet of the

gate on either side. The remainder of the fence must be modified to the Zoning Code requirements. Finding that the entire six is not consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and the Zoning Code.

The Variance for the gate height and small portion of the fence will not cause substantial detriment to the public good or impair the purposes, spirit, and intent of the Code, or the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion about a Special Exception and stop work order:

Mr. Soto stated that a "Stop Work Order" was issued to stop work on an accessory building however this is a carport, and he was not aware it was viewed as an accessory building. Accessory buildings are not allowed in the front or side yards. When Mr. Soto contacted Jeffrey Webster with the County Inspector and he stated that this is an accessory building. The zoning code with flood plain information and made the determination that the carport was on the flood plain. The house is above the flood plain area. The carport was pre-existing and he is replacing it. He is appealing the "Stop Work Order" or to declare the structure non-conforming.

Mr. Charney asked Mr. Edenborough what he knew about this situation.

Mr. Edenborough stated that is what happens in situations like this when the Inspector does not have the full information. This structure was being built without a permit and that is why he issued the Stop Work Order. Whether it is a carport or not, it still must have a permit and whether he is replacing it or not. If the carport were in a flood plain it could be the reason for denial. There has been no permit applied for in the case.

Mr. Soto stated that he demolished the old carport and planned to put a new carport next to the house.

Mr. Charney stated that this is a much larger carport than what was demolished and needs a building permit. If the Board were to grant a Special Exception and Mr. Soto were to bring a building permit application in would there be other things that Mr. Edenborough would need to grant or deny that application?

Mr. Edenborough stated that the permit application requires a site plan so they can see where the carport is going to be sitting on the lot. That would determine whether they would grant the permit.

Mr. Charney confirmed that the applicant may not need a Special Exception if plans are provided that meet Zoning Code requirements.

Mr. Davis confirmed that the building permit office would say if they could go forward or if they needed a Special Exception.

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Bonebrake, and Houston “absent” to **CONTINUE** the Appeal of Tulsa County’s requirement that the property owner obtain a Special Exception and/or Variance for a pre-existing carport (Sec.14.110) until July 21, 2026 meeting of the Tulsa County Board of Adjustment subject to the appellant providing a Building Permit with a survey and a base flood elevation for review by the County Inspectors.

Legal Description:

LT 5 BLK B, BERRY HILL GARDENS County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3359 – Micah Burdge

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a duplex use in an RS-3 district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2)

Location: 7217 W 7th Street, Tulsa, OK

Presentation:

Micah Burdge, 7215 West 7th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74127, stated that they have two lots side by side but there is an ONG gas line easement that is offset into one of the lots which makes one of the lots unusable. The lots have been combined, and he wants to build one duplex on top of the other and they need a Special Exception to do so. The lots are each fifty feet wide.

Mr. Charney asked if the applicant would agree to honor all setbacks and all other matters required by the county and DEQ requirements would be satisfied.

Mr. Burdge agreed to all the requirements.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Bonebrake, and Houston “absent” to **APPROVE** the Special Exception to allow a duplex use in an RS-3 district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2) subject to honoring all setbacks and other matters required by the County and DEQ requirements.

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:

LTS 1 2 BLK 1, W R REED SUB L14-15&19 & PRT L12 B7 County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3360 – Robyn Cagle

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow temporary dwelling in RV in an AG district (Sec. 8.160)

Location: 25015 W 41st St S, Sand Springs OK

Presentation:

Robyn Cagle, 25015 West 41st Street, Sand Springs, Oklahoma 74063, stated that they are building a home and are asking for a Special Exception to live in an RV for twelve months while their home is being built. They want to go about it legally. They are in an IL zoned and are going to the Planning Commission to change it to AG and referenced CA-592 which was on the regular Planning Commission meeting of June 3, 2026.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **HICKS**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Bonebrake, and Houston “absent” to **APPROVE** the Special Exception to allow temporary dwelling in RV in a contingent upon future AG district approval (Sec. 8.160) subject to the time limit to be twelve (12) months from today’s date.

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:

E232 S495 W/2 SE SE SW SEC 20 19 10 2.64ACS County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

CBOA 3362 – Jorge de los Santos Lopez

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a single-section manufactured housing unit in an RS-3 district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2)

Location: 6655 N Norfolk Pl, Tulsa, OK

Presentation:

Jorge Lopez, 9507 East Independence Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74115 stated that he is asking for permission to move a manufactured home on to an RS-3 zoned lot.

Mr. Charney asked the applicant if there are other manufactured homes in his area.

Mr. Lopez answered that he had seen one that is next door to him.

Mr. Hicks asked how old the home is that they want to move into.

Mr. Lopez answered that it is about ten years old.

Mr. Charney stated that it was important to the Board that they keep the grass mowed and park on all weather hard surface parking and all other County regulations.

Interested Parties:

None.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Actions:

On **MOTION** of **TISDALE**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Bonebrake, and Houston “absent” to **APPROVE** a Special Exception to allow a single-section manufactured housing unit in an RS-3 district (Sec. 3.030, Table 3-2) subject to the following conditions that the County requirements and DEQ requirements be met.

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:

E232 S495 W/2 SE SE SW SEC 20 19 10 2.64ACS County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

OTHER BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

Director's update.

Mr. Wilkerson wanted to give an update on last month's New Business regarding the change of the State Statutes. The District Attorney has been working with the City of Tulsa's legal department on the transition and path forward. There has also been a bill that was approved through the State Senate, Bill #563 and that gives us direction over what will happen when the City of Tulsa separates from Tulsa County. There was a bill that was approved and had not been signed by the Governor yet. It changes the ground rules to be able to adopt our current Zoning Code without having to start over. There are some provisions in it about how many members of the Board of Adjustment are. The statutes as amended say 3, 5, or 7 members. Commissioner Dunkerly has been managing that process. As of yesterday, Commissioner Dunkerly thought that it was unlikely that we would make the transition before the end of July, so we are safe with the Continuance that we set today. Part of this is that if there are specific rules that any of you think needs to be changed, we would like to hear from you as soon as you can. We can email you the rules for you to look at. There is a chance that the County will want our department to move over to their offices.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4: 23 p.m.

Date approved: 7/21/26

Chair: David E. Cherry

