

COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES of Meeting No. 151
Tuesday, December 15, 1992, 1:30 p.m.
County Commission Room 119
County Administration Building

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT	OTHERS PRESENT
Alberty, Chairman Eller Looney Tyndall Walker		Gardner Jones Moore	Glenn, Building Insp.

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the County Clerk on Friday, December 11, 1992, at 9:40 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

MINUTES:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes** of October 20, 1992, No. 149, and November 17, 1992, No. 150.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Case No. 1116

Action Requested:

Variance of the required lot width from 200' to 135' and of the required land area from 2.2 acres to 2 acres to permit a lot split - **Section 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6, located 11812 East 121st Street North, Collinsville, Oklahoma.

Presentation:

The applicant, **John Wineland**, 11812 East 121st Street North, Collinsville, Oklahoma, requested permission to divide his property into two tracts. Mr. Wineland explained that the front tract (Lot 1) contains two acres, with 135' of street frontage, and the back lot (Lot 2) contains five acres, with a 30' strip along the front lot providing street access to the rear lot. He pointed out that the lots would comply with the Code if zoned residential.

Case No. 1116 (continued)

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty inquired as to the hardship for the request, and the applicant stated that building permits were issued for the construction of two houses on the property, one of which is completed and one approximately 95% complete. He pointed out that it will be impossible to sell one of the houses if the application is denied. A layout of the property was submitted (Exhibit A-3).

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Wineland if he is a builder, and he replied that he is a civil engineer and has constructed two houses. He informed that one is his residence and the other one will be sold.

Protestants:

Pat Mahl, 11970 East 121 Street North, Collinsville, Oklahoma, submitted a petition of protest (Exhibit A-1) signed by residents in the area. Ms. Mahl stated that a church was constructed on a portion of the property, and that she is opposed to houses being built on less than 2½ acres. Ms. Mahl pointed out that the subdivision across the street requires 2½ acres. She also voiced a concern with soil percolation on the subject property, and the possibility of the back lot being split again.

Brenda Hardesty, 10621 East 46th Street North, stated that she owns 15 acres to the west of the property in question, and is opposed to the application.

One letter of protest (Exhibit A-2) was submitted.

Additional Comments:

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Glenn if he knew that a building permit was issued for the two dwellings, and he replied that he was not aware of the permits.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Wineland informed that he started the project in the Spring, and heard that there was a change in the Subdivision Regulations since that time, which requires that lots that are 5-acres or less, instead of the previous 2 acres, require lot split approval. The applicant stated that the back lot (Lot 2) could not pass the percolation test and the Health Department has approved a lagoon for sewage disposal. He pointed out that the lot will not be split again, because it is not large enough to support two dwellings and a lagoon. Mr. Wineland stated that the proposed use is consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Looney asked if the house on Lot 1 has a septic system for sewage disposal, and the applicant answered in the affirmative.

Case No. 1116 (continued)

Mr. Tyndall noted that the area seems to be in transition from agricultural uses to residential.

Mr. Looney, Mr. Walker and Mr. Alberty were in agreement that a hardship has not been presented to warrant granting the variance request.

Board Action:

On MOTION of LOONEY, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** a Variance of the required lot width from 200' to 135' and of the required land area from 2.2 acres to 2 acres to permit a lot split - **Section 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6; finding that a hardship was not presented that would justify granting the variance request; on the following described property:

E/2, W/2, NE/4, SW/4, Section 5, T-21-N, R-14-E, less the west 165' of the north 661', Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Mr. Gardner clarified that the applicant had the option to request a variance of the lot width and land area, or seek rezoning of the property, which would be more costly and time consuming.

Case No. 1118

Action Requested:

Variance of the required 30' of frontage on a public street or dedicated right-of-way to permit a lot split - **Section 207. STREET FRONTAGE REQUIRED** - Use Unit 6, located NW/c 41st Street and 257th West Avenue.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Mike Mason**, PO Box 699, Kiefer, Oklahoma, stated that he represents Blue Stem Acres Company. He informed that they have proposed to divide an 80-acre tract into four separate parcels. Mr. Mason explained that the street curves, and 41st Street is not improved beyond the first few feet of his property. A lot layout (Exhibit B-1) was submitted.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty inquired as to the number of homes that will be built on the property, and the applicant replied that the land will be split into four tracts, with one being 2½ acres, one 5 acres, one 30 acres and one 40 acres.

Case No. No. 1118 (continued)

In response to Mr. Alberty, the applicant stated that the property is not being subdivided, because the land does not lend itself to small lots, and it is not economically feasible for development.

Mr. Alberty noted that the fact that development is not feasible could be the reason it remains an 80-acre tract.

Mr. Mason stated that a variance would not be required if 41st Street continued to the west and did not curve toward the south, away from his property.

Mr. Looney inquired as to access easements to serve the four tracts, and the applicant stated that all easements will be provided.

In response to Mr. Tyndall, Mr. Mason stated that he is requesting a variance of the required frontage and, if approved, a lot split application will be filed.

Mr. Alberty stated that it appears that the applicant is attempting to circumvent the subdivision process, and he is not inclined to support the request.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On MOTION of WALKER, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** a **Variance** of the required 30' of frontage on a public street or dedicated right-of-way to permit a lot split - **Section 207. STREET FRONTAGE REQUIRED** - Use Unit 6; finding that the applicant failed to present a hardship that would warrant development of the 80-acre tract without using the subdivision process; on the following described property;

E/2, SE/4, Section 19, T-19-N, R-10-N, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1125

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a church and customary accessory uses in an AG zoned district - **Section 310.** - **Use Unit 5**, located east of the NE/c of East 111th Street South and South 129th East Avenue.

Case No. 1125 (continued)

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty informed that the Broken Arrow Board of Adjustment has heard the application and recommended approval (Exhibit C-1).

Presentation:

The applicant, **Beverly Burgess**, was represented by **Bill Burgess**, 1420 South Chestnut, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, who requested permission for church use on the subject property. A conceptual plan (Exhibit C-2) was submitted.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to allow a church and customary accessory uses in an AG zoned district - **Section 310. - Use Unit 5;** subject to platting to determine and acknowledge the (a) 100 year flood plain conditions and its boundary, (b) existing right-of-way, utility and easement conditions; appropriate street right-of-way and utility easements on Florence; structures being a minimum of 110' from the centerline of Florence, to meet minimum building line setbacks; side building line setbacks to meet Broken Arrow zoning codes (50' from either side boundary); City/County Health Department approval of sewer system, none of which is to be located in the 100 year flood area; building to be placed minimum of 28" above the 100-year flood elevation; parking to meet the ratio of one car for every 40 sq ft of sanctuary area; subject to fire hydrant being located according to building code requirements; subject to the applicant returning to the Board for approval of a detail site plan before construction begins; finding the use to be compatible with the surrounding area; on the following described property:

W/2, SE/4, SE/4, SW/4, Section 28, T-18-N, R-14-E,
Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Case No. 1127

Action Requested:

Variance of the required 30' of frontage on a public street or dedicated right-of-way - **Section 207. STREET FRONTAGE REQUIRED**, located north and east of the northeast corner of 116th Street North and North Harvard.

Case No. 1127 (continued)

Presentation:

The applicant, **Roger McMillian**, Route 1, Box 839, Sperry, Oklahoma, requested permission to install a mobile home on his property. He submitted a letter (Exhibit D-1) from the Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT), which informed that an easement was acquired and the road is a public road.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Jones stated that it appears that the road is not maintained by Tulsa County.

Mr. Gardner stated that possibly the construction of Highway 75 cut off access to the property abutting to the east.

The applicant informed that the map depicting the location of the property is not correct, because the tract abuts to access easement provided by ODOT.

Mr. Glenn stated that the applicant did not have the letter from the Transportation Department when he visited his office and , after reading the letter, it appears that Mr. McMillian does have a mutual access to the subject tract.

Mr. Gardner informed that the mutual access easement should be filed of record at the County Clerk's office.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of the required 30' of frontage on a public street or dedicated right-of-way - Section 207. **STREET FRONTAGE REQUIRED**; subject to the ODOT mutual access agreement being filed of record; finding that the property has public access to 116th Street North via the ODOT access easement, but this street easement is not maintained by the County; and finding that the granting of the request will not be injurious to the neighborhood, or violate the spirit and intent of the Code; on the following described property:

SE/4, NE/4, SW/4, Section 4, T-21-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1128

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a mobile home in an RE zoned district and for an amended site plan approval - **Section 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9, located 14211 West 19th Street, Sand Springs.

Presentation:

The applicant, **John Palzer**, Route 4, Box 790 #1, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, requested permission to install a mobile home on his property at the above stated location. He informed that the proposed site abuts an existing mobile home park, which was approved for eight pads. He pointed out that some of the pads are vacant, and requested the new location for his son in lieu of one of the eight pads that were previously approved. Photographs (Exhibit E-2) were submitted.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked the applicant if he owns the property in question, and he replied that he is renting the land, but has the permission of the property owner to file the application.

Protestants:

Mr. Alberty informed that the Board has received several letters of protest (Exhibit E-4) and a petition of protest (Exhibit E-3) from area residents. He further noted that the Sand Springs Board of Adjustment has recommended denial (Exhibit E-1) of the application, and that the applicant be allowed 120 days to comply with Code requirements regarding the mobile unit.

Charles Laffoon, 1521 South 145th West Avenue, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, stated that the mobile home park was approved in 1972 for eight pads, and is opposed to the stacking of mobile homes at the proposed location.

Wayne Glenn, 14315 West 17th Street, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, informed that he made a substantial investment when he purchased property in the neighborhood, and suggested that the applicant utilize one of the existing 8 pads for his son's mobile home.

Larry Glenn, Building Inspection, advised that a double-wide mobile installed at the proposed location would require proper elevation above the floodplain, and the applicant has not applied for a building permit or a floodplain elevation certificate.

Case No. 1128 (continued)

Applicant's Rebuttal:

The applicant stated that he was not aware a building permit would be required, because eight mobile homes were previously approved on the property. He pointed out that the double-wide unit would confine the neighbors on either side if installed on one of the existing pads. Mr. Palzer pointed out that the mobile home park was in place before the homes in the area were built.

Additional Comments:

Mr. Gardner pointed out that the previous approval was for eight mobile homes on a designated portion of the property.

After Board discussion, Mr. Walker stated that he is familiar with the area, and approval of this application would actually be approving an expansion of the previously approved mobile home use in the area.

Board Action:

On MOTION of WALKER, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** a **Special Exception** to allow a mobile home in an RE zoned district and an amended site plan approval - **Section 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9; finding that the addition of the mobile home space would be an expansion of the original mobile home area, and would be detrimental to the conventional single-family homes in the area; on the following described property:

Commencing at a point 809.0' N of the SW/c of the NW/4 of the SW/4 of Section 9-19-11, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, thence S 89°49' E a distance of 429.83', thence S 56°28' E a distance of 10' to the POB, thence N 43°44'51" E a distance of 233.89', thence S 56°28' E a distance of 220.29', thence S 47°16' E a distance of 279.71', thence S 42°44' W a distance of 218.00', thence N 47°16' W a distance of 185.95', thence N 56°28' W a distance of 319.45' to the POB and Beg 809' N, 429.83' E, 96'SELY SW/c Lot 6, thence NE 328.89' SE 83', SW 328.89' NW83' POB, and all riparian rights and less south 50' for road on SW, Section 9m T-19-N, R-11-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1129

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a salvage operation in an IM zoned district - **Section 910. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 27, located 312 Broad Street, Sand Springs.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Joe Fisher**, Box 111, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, represented the owners of the salvage yard in question. He informed that the salvage business has been operating in Sand Springs for approximately 35 years, and it is necessary for the owner to have the proper zoning classification to acquire a license to continue operation.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked if the business is expanding, and the applicant replied that there will be no expansion; however, the legal description contains a portion of land that is not used for this operation. Mr. Fisher stated that his client is not opposed to the unused portion of land being deleted from this application .

Mr. Alberty pointed out that the aerial photograph indicates that there is salvage to the north of the subject tract, and Mr. Fisher informed that the property to the north is not owned by his client.

In regard to screening, the applicant pointed out that the property to the north is naturally screened by a 10' change in elevation and trees. He pointed out that Sand Springs has recommended screening along the east boundary. He informed that the church to the east is not opposed to the application.

Mr. Jones informed that approximately one year ago the State began to require salvage owners to acquire a zoning letter from the City to insure proper zoning.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit a salvage operation in an IM zoned district - **Section 910. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE INDUSTRIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 27, located 312 Broad Street, Sand Springs; subject to screening being installed along the east property line; finding that the salvage operation has been in operation at this location

Case No. 1129 (continued)

for many years and is not detrimental to the area; on the following described property:

That part of the SW/4 of the SE/4 of the SE/4 of Section 10, T-19-N, R-11-E of the IBM, Tulsa County, Oklahoma, described as follows: Beg. at the SE/c of said SW/4 SE/4 SE/4 of Section 10 (POB), thence N 0°11' W for a distance of 142', thence W for a distance of 115', thence N for a distance of 142', thence N 89°56' E for a distance of 115' thence N 0°11' W for a distance of 213', thence S 89° 56' W for a distance of 612.7', thence N for a distance of 100', thence W for a distance of 47.3', thence S for a distance of 597' to a point on the south line of the SW/4 SE/4 SE/4, thence E along said south line a distance of 660' to the POB; City of Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1130

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a mobile home in an RE zoned district - **Section 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9, located 3126 East 100th Street North, Sperry, Oklahoma.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Pamela Farney**, 828 South Indianapolis, Tulsa, Oklahoma, stated that the property designation on the case map is incorrect, and the correct location is across the street on the south side of the road. She requested permission to install a mobile home on the subject property, and pointed out that there are other mobile units in the area. A letter of support (Exhibit G-1) was submitted.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked if the property is vacant, and the applicant answered in the affirmative.

In reply to Mr. Alberty, Ms. Farney informed that the soil percolation test has been approved and a septic system will be installed.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **ELLER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit a mobile home in an RE zoned district

Case No. 1130 (continued)

- **Section 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9; subject to Health Department approval and a Building Permit; finding that there are other mobile homes in the area, and the proposed use will not be detrimental to the neighborhood; on the following described property:

Beginning 476.66' south and 475.2' west of NE/c, NE/4, SE/4, west 237.6', south 476.67', east 237.6', north 476.67' to the POB, less north 25' for road, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1131

Action Requested:

Special exception to permit a mobile home in an RS zoned district and a variance to permit two dwelling units per one lot of record - **Section 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING UNIT PER LOT OF RECORD AND SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9, located at 2107 East 73rd Street North.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Ray Bingham**, 2107 East 73rd Street North, explained that she cares for four disturbed individuals in her home, and is requesting a mobile home for her personal use and for relatives that visit. The applicant stated that the mobile unit will only be for family use, and the tract is large enough to accommodate two dwelling units.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty noted that the tract is large enough to divide into two lots.

Mr. Glenn advised that the mobile home must meet the floodplain elevation requirements.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TYNDALL**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit a mobile home in an RS zoned district and a variance to permit two dwelling units per one lot of record - **Section 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING UNIT PER LOT OF RECORD AND SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9; subject to the mobile home being installed in compliance with floodplain elevation requirements; subject to the occupants of the mobile home be limited to family members only; and finding that the lot is large enough to

Case No. 1131 (continued)

accommodate two dwellings; on the following described property:

W/2, SE/4, NW/4, NE/4, Section 31, T-21-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1132

Action Requested:

Use Variance to permit the storage of inoperative and dismantled automobiles in an AG zoned district - **Section 310. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 27, located 26802 West 21st Street south.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Ray Bartley**, 715 South 101st East Avenue, requested permission to continue to restore automobiles on his father's property. He informed that there are three inoperable automobiles on the property at this time. Mr. Bartley explained that the parts from the dismantled automobiles are being used in the restoration process, and the old cars will be removed when they are no longer needed. He informed that one of the automobiles is being used to store parts until a storage building is constructed. Mr. Bartley requested permission to continue his hobby at this location.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Looney asked if the storage building is nearing completion, and the applicant stated that the 15' by 15' building is almost finished.

In response to Mr. Alberty, the applicant stated that he should have the storage building completed in approximately six months.

Mr. Tyndall asked Mr. Bartley if he lives on the property, and he replied that the property belongs to his father. He added that he works on the cars on the weekend and during his spare time.

In reply to Mr. Tyndall's question concerning his occupation, the applicant stated that he is employed as a security guard.

Protestants:

I. M. Puryear, Route 3, Box 860, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, stated that he owns property to the east and to the south of the tract in question. He informed that the mini-salvage operation has been on the property for approximately one year, and is unsightly, noisy and

Case No. 1132 (continued)

incompatible with the neighborhood. He further noted that it appears that a business is being operated from the lot, since individuals drive in and load parts. Mr. Puryear asked that, if the application is approved, a screening fence be installed or the cars be moved inside.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Glenn to state the type of vehicles that would be permitted on the lot by right, and he replied that inoperative vehicles are not permitted on the lot, and the number of operable vehicles on a lot is not specified (the number should be customary and accessory to the single-family use)).

Mr. Gardner pointed out that four or five operable vehicles might be customary for a family; however, more than that may be questionable. He noted that inoperative vehicles are considered to be junk or salvage, and the Board must determine how many cars, operable and inoperative, can be parked on the lot and considered to be a part of Mr. Bartley's hobby.

Applicant's Rebuttal:

Mr. Bartley informed that parts are not sold on his father's property. He stated that his brother also works on his car and several of his friends periodically visit the property.

Mr. Alberty stated that, according to the photographs submitted, the property has the appearance of a salvage operation. He advised that the outside storage of inoperative vehicles and parts is basically a salvage yard.

Mr. Looney advised that he is in agreement with Mr. Alberty's conclusion.

There was Board discussion concerning a realistic time period for the applicant to clear the junk from the property.

Mr. Tyndall stated that a hobby of this magnitude creates problems for the neighborhood.

Mr. Walker stated that the case is further complicated by a brother also coming to the property to work on his car.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **DENY** a Use Variance to permit the storage of inoperative and dismantled automobiles in an AG zoned district - **Section 310**.

Case No. 1132 (continued)

PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS - Use Unit 27; subject to the applicant being permitted 6 months to remove all parts and inoperable vehicles stored outside; finding that the existing use is comparable to a salvage yard, and is not compatible with the area; on the following described property:

Beginning 560' west NE/c NE/4, NW/4 thence west 127.5', south 427.4', east 127.5', north 427.4' to the POB, Section 18, T-19-N, R-10-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Case No. 1133

Action Requested:

Variance to permit two dwelling units per one lot of record - **Section 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD** - Use Unit 9, located 8730 East 136th Street North, Collinsville, Oklahoma.

Presentation:

The applicant, **Robert Bauders**, 8730 East 136th Street North, stated that his property is located directly to the west of the lot depicted on the case map. He requested that a mobile home be permitted on his property to house his wife's elderly parents. Mr. Bauders explained that the soil at his residence and the proposed location has passed the percolation test and an additional septic system will be installed for the new mobile home.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Bauders if the mobile home is requested only for the lifetime of his wife's mother and father, and he answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Walker asked if there are other lots in the area with two dwellings, and the applicant answered in the affirmative.

Protestants:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **WALKER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; none "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance to permit two dwelling units per one lot of record - **Section 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD** - Use Unit 9; subject to the second dwelling (mobile home) being used during the lifetime of the applicants mother and father-in-law only; finding that there are other lots

Case No. 1133 (continued)

in the area with two dwelling units; on the following described property:

Beginning 659.45' west NE/c , NW/4, thence south 331.60', west 329.72', north 331.60', east 329.72' to POB, less east 25' and north 25' for road, Section 36, T-22-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Date Approved

Jan 5, 1993

H. Alberty
Chairman