

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES of Special Meeting No. 511
Tuesday, September 20, 2022, 1:30 p.m.
Williams Tower 1
1 West 3rd Street, St. Francis Room
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Members Present	Members Absent	Staff Present	Others Present
Charney, Chair	Hicks	S. Miller	K. Edenborough,
Hutchinson, V. Chair	Dunkerley resigned	S. Tauber	County Inspections
Tisdale		J. Hoyt	

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted at the County Clerk’s office, County Administration Building, 15th of September at 10:55 a.m., as well as in the Office of INCOG, 2 West Second Street, Suite 800.

Mr. Charney explained to the applicants and interested parties that there were only three board members present. He explained that if there happened to be only three board members, it would be necessary to receive an affirmative vote from all three board members to constitute a majority and if one board members vote not today, the application fails. Mr. Hutchinson asked if anyone would like to continue their case and if they understood. Everybody nodded in understanding, and one requested a continuance.

After declaring a quorum present, Chair Charney called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

* * * * *

Mr. Hoyt read the rules and procedures for the Board of Adjustment Public Hearing.

* * * * *

MINUTES

On **MOTION** of **Hutchinson**, the Board voted five-0-0 (Charney, Hicks, Hutchinson, Tisdale, “aye”; no “nays”; no “abstains”; no “absent”) to **CONTINUED** the Minutes of August 16, 2022 (No. 510) until October 18, 2022.

* * * * *

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

2983 – Esmeralda Duarte

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a single-wide mobile home in an RS district (Section 410). **Location:** 6706 North Victor Avenue **(CD 1)**

Presentation:

Esmeralda Duarte, 6706 North Victor Avenue, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74130, stated that her family has purchased this land to provide a home for her family.

Mr. Charney stated that it looks like there are no homes around this lot. There are sometimes certain restrictions and rules that we place on a mobile home such as a solid surface parking for the vehicles, that the mobile home be fully skirted, that all the health department approvals be obtained for the sewer or septic.

Mr. Hutchinson stated these are the pictures that you provided to us, correct? Ms. Duarte stated, yes. That is the picture like the ones that were all enclosed. We cleaned all that out. Mr. Hutchinson stated by the picture, you did a tremendous job. How many vehicles did you get rid of? Ms. Duarte answered around twenty. We called everyone when they came in, they got everything else. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he just wanted to commend you for doing an excellent job and doing what you said you would do. Ms. Duarte stated that it means a lot, and that is why she came and wanted to get an opportunity. Mr. Hutchinson stated that we appreciate it, Tulsa County appreciated the fact that you went through and did what you said you would do you got rid of all the vehicles. The only other question I have is, if we were to approve this, will you keep the upkeep up. Ms. Duarte stated that they would.

Mr. Charney stated once again, thanks for your efforts and cleaning it up. We know that that was no small effort and no small expense. Ms. Duarte stated that it took about a week or two weeks to get the work done. Good people came and got all those vehicles out.

Mr. Charney stated given what we have heard, is there any other discussion just amongst our members of the board or does anyone care to make a motion regarding this matter. He would make a motion to approve a special exemption to permit a single wide mobile home artists district approved per the conceptual plan in our agenda packet.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HUTCHINSON**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Hicks “absent”) to **APPROVE** the Special Exception to permit a single-wide mobile home in an RS district (Section 410) per the conceptual plan in our agenda packet and the conditions that she has a hard surface parking for the car tie downs, the EPA, and the skirting, and that it is kept clean.

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.

LT 6 BLK 3, TIBBS ADDN in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

2987 – CRB Companies

Action Requested:

Special Exception to permit a 140 ft. Wireless Communications Tower (Use Unit 4 - Public Protection and Utility Facilities) in an AG district (Section 1204.3)

Location: 7847 N 71st E Ave (**CD 1**)

Presentation:

Interested Parties:

Robert Sark stated that he presents some of the local landowners. He wanted to point out that at the last hearing Mr. Charney recused from himself this matter because of your relationship. Mr. Charney asked if it was on this matter. Mr. Sark confirmed with yes. He wondered if it would be appropriate this time as well. Mr. Charney asked him to help me with the precise situation as we get hundreds of these and he does not always recall precisely because if he did, then that was for good reason. He does not always know exactly where they sit regarding any holding he may have. So please forgive him. Mr. Sark stated his understand is you have an attorney client relationship with Brad Williams, and that this is property that either belongs to him or to his mother. Mr. Charney stated that he recalled that. He had a past attorney-client relationship with Mr. McWilliams. He recalled that case and it was some time ago.

Ms. Miller stated that she remembered that it was more about your location, and his holdings or your previous holdings. She did not know what the status is on the south side of 76th. Mr. Charney asked to let him speak to that. Ms. Miller referred him to page 3.5 of the Agenda packet. Mr. Charney stated that there are intervening landowners, he does not own any of the land adjacent to it. He thought in the past where he let Staff help me here. He does not own anything adjacent to it. He appreciated Ms. Miller bringing it to his attention to that one point, we had the Macy's facility but no longer. He stated that they sold it to Macy's do not have anything across the street from it, or adjacent to it. He did not think he would feel compelled to there being a proximity to holding. He had to give some thought to the fact of a former client. He was trying to go through my past codes of ethics. Could Mr. Sark help me a little bit? Do you understand the nature of his question? If it was 15 years ago on a matter unrelated to this, he wanted to always avoid the appearance of impropriety. He did want to do what is right. It was out of an abundance of caution last time that he did so. He asked if it the exact same case on this exact same location. Mr. Sark stated it is the exact same case. He thought that the rules for conflict would not rise to the level that you hit on the head just a moment ago, it is the appearance that is what forms the big guys. Mr. Charney stated that was fair enough, and maybe that with the fact that he had association with what is across the street. Let us talk about this for a moment amongst us. This is exactly what they had to do every now and then things pop up in the discovery that. So, if he recused me, we cannot hear the matter. Then it is likely that next month, we would have our necessary quorum to do so. Is there any objection from either applicant or counsel of other parties in the room? If he went ahead and recused me, because he thought it

might be best if he did. So, before he wanted to appear to be consistent. Mr. Sark could only speak on behalf of my clients, but and he was not here at the last hearing. He did think that if you recuse last time, it would be funny not to this time, he tended to agree. Mr. Charney stated that he tended to agree. Mr. Hoyt stated that was last year, on November, 2021.

Comments and Questions:

None.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HUTHINSON**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Hicks “absent”) to **CONTINUE** the Special Exception to permit a 140 ft. Wireless Communications Tower (Use Unit 4 - Public Protection and Utility Facilities) in an AG district (Section 1204.3) until October 18, 2022.

S/2 SE NE SW SEC 26 21 13 5ACS, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

* * * * *

NEW APPLICATIONS

2996 – Dustin Cripe

Action Requested:

Variance to permit structure inside yard. Variance to permit a second dwelling unit on single lot. **Location:** 8250 N 72 Ave E. **(CD 1)**

Presentation:

Dustin Cripe, 8250 North 72 East Avenue, Owasso, Oklahoma stated that there is a pool in his rear yard and the side yard is where it would need to be located.

Mr. Charney stated that it was a broad lot. It appeared to him having platted a few lots that this is quite unusual with the amount of frontage on the street itself. It is a long, broad not too deep block. The only place that this would physically be located because of this unusual configuration of a lot is not a side yard. You are also seeking permission to create a second dwelling unit on a single lot is that in this outbuilding correct. Sometimes it is important to this committee know whether that is for a family member or for lease. Sometimes that can sometimes this Board historically has cared about it. Can you tell us the purpose of the of the additional dwelling unit Mr. Cripe stated that it is extra storage, but with HVAC and to be able to control temperature and humidity of the of the storage, it will not be a living place designated for any family member, at least at this time. And down the road, a place to put up the bathroom as well. Mr. Charney stated you are seeking permission to do it. But right now, there will be you are not outfitting it as a dwelling unit. And if so, you think it would be for family purposes not for commercial purpose? Mr. Cripe stated that it is more of a garage with the storage area above and maybe an overflow here and there somebody could spend Thanksgiving or holiday.

Mr. Charney stated that sometimes it is important to our board to know if it will be conforming to the dwelling. Do you understand what I am saying? Will it be architecturally conforming. Mr. Cripe stated that it will have the same exterior. It will match the current house exterior siding, roofing materials.

Interested Parties:

No interested parties were present.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated that it was classic case, we have an unusual like configuration, that it has no depth. And it is a long, broad law, which makes sense. He stated that he was comfortable for its location in that regard. And given it will conform to the dwelling. He did not think it would be a problem. And there are no other neighbors present here. They have the right to put a dwelling unit in it, he thought, although it is a separate request, it is reasonable to is my feeling.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Hicks “absent”) to **APPROVE** a Variance to permit structure in side yard. Variance to permit a second dwelling unit on single lot per the Conceptual Plans shown on page 4.8, the hardship being the unique configuration of this lot will not really permit a rear yard storage building, but only a side yard with the condition that it that it be in conformity to the dwelling and honor all necessary setbacks for non-commercial uses.

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 2 BLOCK 3, CROSSING AT 86TH STREET PHASE IV, in the County of Tulsa, in the State of Oklahoma.

2997 – Eric & Kimberly Loffer

Action Requested: Variance of the minimum lot area and land area required in an AG district to permit a lot split (Sec 330) **Location:** 12802 N. 143rd E. Ave
(CD 1)

Presentation:

The applicant requested to have the case Continued until 10-18-2022.

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HUTCHINSON**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Hicks “absent”) to **CONTINUE** a Variance of the minimum lot area and land area required in an AG district to permit a lot split (Sec 330) to 10-18-2022.

**N330.5 E/2 W/2 SE SE LESS E25 THEREOF FOR RD SEC 33 22 14 2.314ACS,
County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.**

2998 - Robert E. Parker

Action Requested:

Variance to reduce the required street yard in the RS District (Sec. 430.1)

Location: 7301 E. 89th Pl. N. **(CD 1)**

Presentation:

Applicant wished to Continue the case until 10-18-2022

Interested Parties:

None

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HUTCHINSON**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Hicks "absent") to **CONTINUE** the Variance to reduce the required street yard in the RS District (Sec. 430.1) until October 18, 2022.

LOT 1 BLOCK 2, MAGNOLIA RIDGE PHASE II County of Tulsa, Stated of Oklahoma.

2999 - Roberta Noonkester

Action Requested:

Variance of the minimum lot area and land area required in an AG district to permit a lot split (Sec 330) **Location:** 12307 N Sheridan Rd. **(CD 1)**

Presentation:

Roberta Noonkester, 12307 North Sheridan Road, Collinsville, Oklahoma, 74021, stated that she would like to sell her land and keep one acre for her house where it is supposed to be on two acres.

Mr. Charney stated that it looks like from the figures. He saw that it squares up here to track your one acre in line with the north south boundary. Will they be accessing that property, ma'am? And adjacent to your property? Ms. Noonkester stated that it will be strictly to the straight to the north. Mr. Charney stated is sixty feet in width. And then you have this piece that is about sixty feet in width that goes on the north side of your home, it looks like to me into the remaining twenty-seven or so acres. It looks to me as though he home that you are in will still have its separate dedicated driveway. Ms. Noonkester stated that it is included with part of that is still on the South.

Mr. Charney stated that we have before us a request to the actual legal requirement or legal request is a variance of the minimum lot area and land area required to permit a lot split. And just to double check with Staff. Normally, it would be a two-and-a-half-acre minimum. Mr. Hoyt answered 2.1

Interested Parties:

Michael Dainty, 6804 East 126th North, Collinsville, Oklahoma, 74021, stated that they have bordered this lady's land over the north and have for 11 years. He had one question. Yes, sir. If we approve this, will this have any impact on our tax status?

Mr. Charney stated that the Board does not give the financial or tax advice, but he could tell you this, we have never seen that we do this a great deal, and he is never seen that have an impact whatsoever. So, the tax status of your parcel was based on the fair market value of your parcel independent of this or it I see no nexus between the granting of this and how an assessor would view your track.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Hutchinson stated that with this split it still leaves 235 feet of frontage.

Mr. Charney stated that it is not like she just shows it to me that it is that that was the that was the track that that she has had forever. And it is a logical way to split it out.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HUTCHINSON**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstention", Hicks "absent") to **APPROVE** a Variance of the minimum lot area and land area required in an AG district to permit a lot split (Sec 330)

per the Conceptual Plan shown on page 7.6, finding the hardship to be that is a very large tract of land.

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

N1180 S2106 E950 W/2 NW SEC 2 21 13 25.735ACS; W370 N295 S1811 W/2 NW LESS W16.5 THEREOF FOR RD SEC 2 21 13 2.394ACS, City of Collinsville, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

3000 - AAB Engineering, LLC

Action Requested:

Variance of the parking required from 48 to 35 (Section 1214.4) **Location:** 8550 N Whirlpool Dr. **(CD 1)**

Presentation:

Allen Betchan, two hundred North McKinley, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, 74063, stated this is a parking request for a proposed Dollar General sign. The site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection. In our process, one of the things that was required by county engineering was an offset from the intersection that he is not saying it is atypical, but it is a good standoff from where we would normally do for a drive separation. This normally would not be an issue; however, we had already gone through the lot split process and the property is bordered on the north and the east by rural Water District water line, which is where we can place our septic from a separation standpoint. When we went through the code requirements, there is a high parking requirement that is certainly in line with the code. But it is not in conformance with what the parking standards that are necessary for this user. They find that thirty parks are more than adequate for what their needs are just from an operational standpoint. When we start configuring the site, and we looked at the reward, we needed all the space that we had west and south of the store to get the septic tank in, which precludes us shifting into that area to create the additional parks that would be required by the code. And that is why we are requesting a variance.

Mr. Charney stated that you had a couple of significant constraints and sounds like both the access point into the site, the existence of a Washington three line. Mr. Betchan stated it is two Washington three lines so that the size of the septic field, or the that is the basket of factors that require you to request it. You can tell us, Mr. Betchan that the stores you are familiar with so can you I think it would be helpful for our board to hear and Staff to hear that you have experience with our operations. They do not park when you plant here.

Mr. Betchan stated that from a traffic and engineering standpoint, this unit for this square footage would generate thirty-two vehicles peak hour and the entirety of peak hour 32 to 34, depending on how you calculated exactly. At 35 parks, which is assuming they were all there at the same time and dwell for an entire hour at the peak hour. This is close to my two hundred store and the reality is they just not it is not a high-volume high store. It is extremely low trip generation. It does not even meet what the what most of the IT traffic standards are. Anecdotally, how many times have you ever driven by Dollar General store and seeing the parking lot completely full and not had a place to park? It is just not a frequent problem. And that is even with thirty parks, and this is this is five over what they require operationally, they are good at operating their stores. He would say that the county's code has not been updated in some time and is in process and the parking standards are more onerous than what is starting to come out and the new codes as that generates. We do not need them operationally.

Mr. Hutchinson asked, "if you need more parking, what would you do?"

Mr. Betchan stated that on the north end, so the Hammerheads now parks that are north of the store, we could extend those a little to the left without impinging on to the proposed area that we have. He could not get all the way to forty-eight without shifting the entire side West and then starting to stack on that east side. There are a few places that we can use if it was an issue, start adding in if we had to, he did not see it practically getting to forty-eight. That is the variance request, just logistically. But if it was seen as a significant problem, then we could look at how we can minimize that and alleviate in the future. He has yet to his knowledge had someone complained about the parking necessity, for parks on any site that we have done. Historically, it is just not that is not an issue that we normally run into. Not saying it does not, has not ever happened that he has ever seen yet. And again, this is part more almost 20% 18% more than what operational they would require. So, it is not we are not pushing the limits here. And we have done them as low as twenty. Parks, in some in some areas.

Interested Parties:

No interested parties were present.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated that given the constraints of the site, he thought it was a reasonable approach to it and did not think it would be out of line with either their historical understanding of what is necessary.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he did not either, or if needed extra, they can always add a few extra. We have done this before. He thought they know their market very well. He could easily support it. He has been by a lot of Dollar Generals and though they were busy, there were never a lot of cars.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TISDALE**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Hicks “absent”) to **APPROVE** a Variance of the parking required from 48 to 35 (Section 1214.4) per Conceptual Plan 8.6 in the Agenda packet, the hardship to be the limited space with the requirements to put a septic tank in.

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 NE LESS 14.25ACS TO STATE FOR HWY SEC 28 21 13 25.75AC, City of Sperry, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma.

3002 - T Briggs Construction

Action Requested:

Variance of the street frontage requirement in an RE district from 30 ft to 0 ft (Section 207) **Location:** 7309 N 140th PI E (**CD 1**)

Presentation:

Todd Briggs, 5428 East 101st Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 74146, stated that they are requesting a variance to go from thirty feet to zero feet on 140th Street. The paved part of 140 Street ends right at the property that he bought to build a new construction home on that 2.42 acres to the east. The recommendation was that he would get a variance to stop it that right there and then just build gravel from there to where the driveway ends and start 25 to 30 feet past where the end of 140th Street ends.

Mr. Charney asked if North 140th Place East is a public dedicated road, correct Staff at that point? It is just that the dedication stops prior to this or what? Mr. Hoyt stated that no road has been constructed. Mr. Charney asked the right-of-way is in place. Mr. Hoyt stated that according to our maps, yes, that is in place.

Mr. Charney asked if the property he owns then a bunch right of ways, but just not paved driveway. Mr. Hoyt stated that was correct. Typically, the front of just is required to be on a constructed road.

Mr. Charney stated that he thought that he understood the nature of the request and he thought it was a reasonable request. We like to remind folks that the maintenance of your gravel drive from the from where the further improvement stops today, all the way to your house is yours and only yours. Should someone buy some land that be to the west or the south of you, then they would likely have the ability they might dedicated that they might have the same right to do something and at some point, it may be wise to have a mutual access easement that speaks to maintenance speaks to the longevity so you can make certain that it's financeable and saleable in the future. He wanted to alert Mr. Briggs to that and make certain that your construction lender does not have any issues with it. Any other thoughts or questions for this applicant.

Interested Parties:

No interested parties were present.

Comments and Questions:

The Chair would like to entertain a motion.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **HUTCHINSON**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Hicks absent) to **APPROVE** a Variance of the street frontage requirement in an RE district from 30 ft to 0 ft (Section 207) per the Conceptual Plan shown on page 4.8 of the Agenda packet, subject to the following condition that the applicant is responsible for the maintenance. Finding that the hardship is that this is on a public dedicated right-of-way 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”

**BEG 990S NEC E/2 NW NE TH W319 S330 E319 N330 TO BEG SEC 33 21 14,
County of Tulsa, Stated of Oklahoma.**

3003 - Jennifer Osborn

Action Requested:

Variance to permit a detached accessory building in the RS district to be greater than 750 sf of floor area (Section 240.2.E) **Location:** 5311 S 107th W Ave. **(CD 2)**

Presentation:

Jennifer Osborn, 5311 South 107th West Avenue, Sand Springs, Oklahoma, 74063, stated that they are hoping to build a metal building with living quarters on it to allow our in laws to live in as they get older.

Mr. Charney asked what the total square footage of that would be. Ms. Osborn stated that the living space is one thousand square feet, and the garage is about thirty by fifty.

Mr. Charney stated that he was wondering if what is permitted as a matter of right is 750 and he thought that our packet indicated that may be 1,750 over the Code allowance.

Ms. Miller stated that at least she and Jay thought that the intent to put a second dwelling unit, and that is a new thing to us. So that would be an additional request.

Mr. Charney stated that have we separate the issue of whether someone can build one larger than would normally be permitted from whether they can put another dwelling unit in it. What Staff has apprised us of is really all that we have on our agenda today, correctly, is regarding the size. We can address today that request and would be willing to, we just want you to know that we cannot commit right now, because it was not noticed in that manner. It was not brought up in that manner. It would have to be re-noticed and if you choose to have dwelling in it. From your perspective, you must go through the time delay again, of doing it, and we must give notice again.

Mr. Charney stated that he understood the nature of what you are after with regarding the size. And if you will sit tight for a moment, we might talk amongst ourselves on that issue that is before us, given the size of the mother track, that is one eight a five acres we have seen. It is such a large mother track that this is overwhelming by enemy who have done this many times on us on city size, lots of just a little bit larger than normal. He had no desire, no discomfort.

Interested Parties:

No interested parties were present

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all “ayes”, no “nays”, no “abstentions”, Hicks absent) to **APPROVE** a Variance to permit a detached accessory building in the RS district to be greater than 750 sf of floor area (Section 240.2.E) per Conceptual Plan 10.7 and 10.8 as shown in the Agenda packet, indicating to us that it would be about 1750 feet over the code for a total of 2500 square feet, subject to the condition that this construction effort be done in a manner that is consistent with the drawings that were submitted to us, finding the hardship to be or the irregularity to be this is a 5.85 plus acre piece of ground. And the 730-foot requirement that we see as the base case, is often the case on a quarter acre lot. And this is so much larger than that unusual configuration of the land compels us to grant the variance.

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 6 BLK 1; LOT 5 BLK 1; N100 LT 7 BLK 1, BUFORD COLONY SECOND ADDN,
COUNTY OF TULSA, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.**

3004 - Stan Kent

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow a mini storage in a CS district (Section 710) **Location:**
4885 E 86th St N (CD 1)

Presentation:

Stan Kent, 4335 East 96th Street North, Sperry, Oklahoma, 74073, stated that he had been in business for about 22 years in the area. We purchased a piece of property 4885 East 86th Street North, approximately one mile from my other facility to grow. And this property had originally had a variance for many storage on CS. But over the years due to non-construction, the variance has passed. We are requesting for that same variance to build storage in the CS zoning.

Mr. Charney asked if your ingress and egress into this property servers and off Yale or is it off 86th Street. Mr. Kent stated that by design, originally engineered, there were two access points, one for, and that is set up to design based off as the intersection grows, because it is four lanes. It is it is a two way stop now, but it is expected to go to four lane lights. We are we are planning for that adjustment. That way the construction allows for access from either Yale or 86th Street North.

Mr. Charney stated that the only reason he was asking you is there are some limits of no access. He just encouraged Mr. Kent to be careful you and your engineer on when you can head back to the north of 86th Street into your property. They are strong, long limits of no access, he thought. Mr. Kent agreed and there is Tico transportation, which is a trucking company, they hold the property that is just as a very narrow piece of property between our property and the highway. There is an access for that individual trucking company, that there is a blacktop road that goes to his property there, just West of where it was noted, our entrance would be here. We have given plenty of access for that individual to be able to get through his without blocking access his company there.

Mr. Charney asked if he had heard from any of the neighbors surrounding your proposed facility with any objections, or have you had any discussions with any of the neighbors at all. Mr. Kent stated that there is another facility on the east side, which again, a lot of other companies are pushing to get into our area, and have trying to get into the Sperry, Owasso, Collinsville, and Skiatook area for a long time. There also so in other Dollar Generals across the street and there is a large church on the other corner.

Mr. Charney stated that he understood what they are wanting to do.

Mr. Hutchinson asked what the exterior was going to look like. Mr. Kent stated that with the other construction, we have gone specific with the standard storage facility facing with the design frame it is going to have some exterior awning and lighting. Then with some type of greenery, just to give it something more of a dressed-up look.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that because, Mr. Chairman, you recall your statement before you care about not just the front door in the back also the side doors. That is why he was asking. Mr. Charney stated that sometimes when we have had these off this sometimes a landscape plan might be important to us, a lighting plan might be important to us. We care that it be done nicely and well. He did not see it as part of the packet.

Mr. Charney asked if it is a metal building. Mr. Kent stated that their plans are to put lighting, which now facing lighting down, down the side of the building. In this business, if you do not make your facility look good, you are going to draw attention to another facility. In Sperry, we were always the higher end facility. That was something that he really pushed to make sure that we had the nice wrought iron fence. And so just to reassure you on this, that this is top priority, this has my name. We support the schools in the area, and we want we do not want anyone from that area to be frustrated with us because we're putting this in, and we want we want people to come in say that reminds me of xx facility that just came in. The way the design works now with lighting and new color schemes, and it really did not make it not look industrial,

Interested Parties:

No interested parties were present.

Comments and Questions:

None

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **TISDALE**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Charney, Hutchinson, Tisdale all "ayes", no "nays", no "abstentions", Hicks absent) to **APPROVE** a Special Exception to allow a mini storage in a CS district (Section 710), per Conceptual Plan 11.7 as shown in the Agenda package, subject to the following condition that landscaping, the exterior and the lighting needs to be quality standard. Finding that special exception will be in harmony with the spirit and intent of the code and will not be injurious to the neighborhood otherwise detrimental or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

TR IN E/2 SE BEG 50N SECR SE TH WLY138.67 NWLY305.94 WLY199.05 N239.10 E640.87 S283.73 POB SEC 21 21 13 3.817ACS, COUNTY OF TULSA, STATED OF OKLAHOMA.

3005 – Applicant Name Redacted

Action Requested:

Special Exception to allow Use Unit 2 to permit a Heliport in AG district (Section 310) & a Use Variance for Trades and Services in AG zoned district (Section 310). **Location:** 9601 N. 89th Ave E (CD 1)

Presentation:

Applicant Name Redacted, 9601 North 89th Ave. East, Owasso, Oklahoma, 74055, stated that she and her husband are looking to starting helicopter flight school. We have a single helicopter. We have a commercial contract with Western Media. Our permanent location will be in Tulsa. Due to COVID, the building has been pushed back and is not ready yet. We would like to ask that we be able to run our business out of the side building that has already established on the property. It is a two-seat helicopter. All our flying will be done at Gundy, we will just be taking off and landing. The biggest problem is where we could get storage space for the helicopter would be at Riverside which is our direct competition works out of Riverside and we undercut their prices a lot and we do not want to cause bad blood with them by being on top of them at their location, even for just a year or so. The other thing is, is that the heliport we are going to work with high end clients. They will occasionally be down for maintenance with repainting the building. They want to keep it looking nice. We do not want to be down for that time, so we want to make sure we are just able to work out of our house on occasion if we need to. The flying will be done at Gundy's, this will be for storage and our first student of the day will meet us there. And we do not just let people get in the helicopter, they must go through short Ground School, which is why we call it the classroom. They will just be in there for about 30 minutes to an hour or think a little bit more, but they will just be sitting in there will be like this is a helicopter explaining what goes on with the helicopter and then we will get in the helicopter take off all the flying and Gundy's. We really do not want to be on top of our competition at Riverside, for example, their discovery flight is \$450 while ours is \$175 on sale and \$195 regularly. We feel like that would create a lot of bad blood. We would like to until our permanent heliport in Tulsa is done and for the occasional maintenance have the option of working out of our side building rather than being on top of our competition during those times.

Mr. Charney stated that he appreciated their comments.

Mr. Hutchinson asked are you wanting this facility for six months or a year or more. The Applicant stated that they would like it to in perpetuity for now just because we do not know when this building is going to be finished. Western Media is building it. It is scheduled and she believed it is broken ground already. It was supposed to be done at the beginning of the year. They will also be occasionally down for maintenance of the building because they do like to keep their buildings looking super nice for the type of clientele that come in. We just want to be able to on occasion, if we need to store the helicopter at the house, we would like to be able to do that.

Mr. Hutchinson asked if they had seen the letter from Mr. Bancroft, who's retired Air Traffic Controller. The Applicant stated that they had not been shown any letters or something letters he had. Mr. Hutchinson stated that Mr. Bancroft had brought up something. Do you have to get with the FAA? The Applicant stated that they are already registered with the FAA, and we will show up soon on their official maps as the Forbidden Forest. They have approved everything. FAA wise, we needed four hundred feet of landing area and for that specific area, it is 628. We are well within FAA requirements. It is a tiny helicopter, two-seater as well. It is small size.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that in Mr. Bancroft's letter, he had asked about approval from the FAA as the proposed facility will be located within the class C airspace of the Tulsa traffic tower and approach control directly under protected airspace for the ILS 18L and the GPS 18L as it approaches. The Applicant stated that they are out here to answer that, but we are outside of it. There is a bubble where if you are within it, you must call but we are outside of that bubble.

The Applicant stated that for anyone who is worried about noise in the area, most helicopters are very noisy. For comparison, a Harley Davidson is at 80 decibels off the strip. We are at 75. So, we are even quieter than a Harley Davidson with no modifications which, with modifications, a Harley Davidson tends to be somewhere between 80 and 100. even just five decibels are exponentially louder. We are quieter than if we had bought a Harley.

Mr. Charney stated that part of his concern and some of the concerns that he thinks were expressed in correspondence to us is that this is a residential area. He double check that it is the Owasso comprehensive plan shows this entire area as residential in nature. Sometimes our board has an allergy or hesitation to permit a business use such as this in a residential area. He thought that folks sometimes are legitimately concerned that the flying of a helicopter over and above this is something that they do not want in their residential area. He thought that she was seeking two things here. One is the is the presence of a heliport and the other is a use variance for the school. It looks like there is two problems to your request. And you mentioned you are going to be doing a lot of operating out of Gundy's. That is another facility in and around the Owasso area on the other side of town, but it is an area it seems to one who has not studied this thoroughly that is where flying lessons and things might occur at this Air Facility and known as Gundy's and it seems, that there is a great deal of concern over the existence of a flight school in a residential area in an area that still has a lot of growth, yet to see in it. When he looked at Owasso's comprehensive plans, he wanted you to be aware that the residential nature of this area causes some concern to many folks who are here, and I want to hear from them. It causes some apparent concern to me when he looks at it. When he thinks of the nature of, he knows maybe some helicopters are quitter than others. He knows when they take off and they land they come there. In my judgment, they are loud, but he thought a Harley taking off, it is loud, but he is an old guy. And he is not a good judge of that. But he wanted her to be aware what we are forced to do is to look at this from a standpoint of the underlying land being residential in nature. And to permit a business, even though you have made you say we may fly in and out of it, not

very often, the existence of the school there would permit you to do it if we were to grant it very often. He did not know if that is consistent with the residential use, he just wanted you to hear that perspective.

The Applicant stated there was already a neighbor with a helicopter in the area just off Memorial. He has a helicopter right down the road from us. There is also already someone they have an airplane strip in their backyard. They are in the area. We would be using it as about as much of them, it would just be this would not be somewhere for us to park or helicopter. We are not doing anything on top of our competition.

Mr. Charney stated that he appreciated the amendment. The request before us is for something broader than that the request before us is for an actual school to be permitted to occur there. He would allow my fellow colleagues to ask questions.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he had a question for Staff. Can they still fly it and land there on their own without a school, or do they have to get special permit for that to land a helicopter there.

Ms. Miller stated that there is a Special Exception to allow that.

Mr. Tisdale stated that he had an issue with it in perpetuity. He understood not have a date.

Mr. Charney stated that he appreciated it. He appreciated her perspective. He wanted her to know that he thought that our Board is respectful of the desire to grow a business, there may be some hesitancy on some of us or maybe not, we'll see, on the location of it being an area that has so many residences in it known that is within that area that Owasso's designated in its Comprehensive Planning as residential. He would like to hear from some of our neighbors and he appreciated her input. What we do is when we hear from neighbors, we allow you to come back to the podium, hear what we hear, from them and give you an opportunity to speak with us again. He wanted her to know we welcome her and want to her to have every chance to tell us or issue rebuttal to anything you hear today.

Interested Parties:

Danny Henrie, 8106 East 96th Street North, Owasso, Oklahoma, 74055 stated that we want to be good neighbors. Our concerns are just common-sense concerns. Anytime you hear about a helicopter that is going to fly over your house, it raises concerns, especially if they are not expert fliers, and to be honest, he did not know, there was a timeline involved, as far as not being ready. The other thing, the noise is a concern. He did not know about the Harley Davidson. He would not want one driving through his front yard. 96th Street is not in particularly decent shape to start with. Any type of business down there that was more traffic is obviously concern. But again, we want to be good neighbors, and we want to get along. If you do decide to allow a date would be a good thing to have.

Mr. Charney asked Mr. Henrie if 96th Street North dead end. Mr. Henrie stated that it does. It does not go through to Walmart, thank goodness. Mr. Charney stated that this proposed business would be right at the dead end. It would have to go back and forth to Memorial to get in and out. Mr. Henrie wanted to know about property value with that. Would that bring it down? And if so, would it be lower our taxes?

Mr. Charney stated that there was a question as a neighbor. Are you bothered by any air traffic today from local airports. Mr. Henrie stated that they were in the flight path of Tulsa International, so we have a bunch of anyway of the of the large jetliners.

Mike Fimmel, 8818 East 96th Street North, Owasso, 74055, stated that where they want to do this, he could take a rock, throw it, and hit this barn there. It is not a promising idea. You would not want a Harley Davidson riding through your front yard. You would not want a helicopter flying over your house. That is just the way it is. It is a quiet place. And yes, there is a heliport down the road. Well, we did not know it was coming in. Or we tried to stop it too. They snuck that one in on us. The road is very narrow. Anytime people go down and you must pull over and slow down let the car go by it is an old road. He has lived there since 1964. It is quiet place, and he just cannot see ruining it with this. Another thing is, there are some federally protected birds on the creek. It is the herons. They want to cut down a grove of trees. And a lot of those trees have those nests in it. We have already contacted the wildlife department and he think they are going to investigate it.

Mr. Charney stated that he appreciated his comments.

Kelly Walker, 2732 East 126th Street North, Skiatook, Oklahoma, 74070, stated that he owns some adjoining land of this property. He is hoping someday to be able to build out there on that property. He is not interested in having a helicopter fly over my property. Seeing what he has going on. Every day, day in and day out. How often are you all expecting him to have flights? In and out of there, sir. Mr. Charney stated that, we must have you speak to us, and we are going to ask that question. It is a fair question. We will make certain that that question is properly asked, so that we can hear it and you can as well. yes. If he understood you correctly, Mr. Walker, you said that you have property right adjacent to this? Correct. Mr. Walker stated that as far as the other two helipads, one of them is way off with no surrounding houses in the vicinity. The other one has just a couple right across the road. This one has many houses right here in the vicinity.

James Lavendusky, 6808 North Mingo Road, Skiatook, Oklahoma, 74055, stated that He did not know what would happen if somebody had an emergency down there the way it is now. These people's business shows to be at 5610 170 East Avenue. It looks to me like that buildings empty. It must be more fence around it. He is assuming they lease it to somebody else. That is your understanding of where the current business is located. That is what the website shows.

Applicant Name Redacted, 9601 North 89th Street, Owasso, Oklahoma, 74055 stated that there have been a couple of things that have been talked about. For the FAA, the far 91-point 1059 mandates that I can only fly eight hours per day. A typical flight lesson is one and a half to two hours. So that mandates that he can only take off four times. that addresses one of those concerns with mandates that he can only take off about four times a day. The same regulation mandates that he must have nine hours of rest every duty day. In that nine hours he cannot do anything related to flight instruction, which includes ground instruction. Every time he does a lesson, you do 30 minutes to an hour pre and post flight. So, there will be at least 10 or 11 hours every night when he is not legally allowed to be flying. So that alleviates that concern. There is an EPA regulation that states the required noise level, anything, any vehicle must be less than 80 decibels. The required decibel is only the required decibel is you must be less than 80. And again, the certification of the aircraft is seventy-five. We are less than even the requirement for any vehicles. Our flight path is on the far east side of the property. That being the case we do not fly over any houses; all the houses are on our property butts up on the on the road is on the west side of our property. The barn that is there currently 450 feet from the from the road. And we are going to do an additional 100 and 150 feet from the road where we are going to do our takeoff area. We are going to be five hundred feet from the road whenever we take off. The FAA and then as far as the aim says that it is three rotor discs, for any wind and that is seventy-five feet. The FAA says that you must be that you need to be seventy-five feet away from anything, we are going to be 551 when he is on the ground.

He agreed that the road is in terrible shape. My car is a little older, and it is struggles getting down that road, but our property taxes and the sales taxes would be helpful to fix the roads. He agrees he wants it to be fixed, but our taxes are going to help fix the road as well.

The building on where our permanent location is going to be is it is currently empty. But it is currently empty because Western Media, who we have a commercial contract with to be it permanently is renovating it, they are in the permitting process to get the renovation started. He helped them with the process as well. So that is that is what he had to say. He wanted to reiterate; we are trying to be nice. We are just trying to be trying to get our business up and running when we had a problem with our permanent location. He sees the desire to have a date. So that is something that can be discussed further. But that is all he had to say.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Applicant if he said the helicopter is less than 80 decibels. Applicant stated that yes, sir. Mr. Hutchinson asked what the decibels for small airplane are. Applicant stated that they are around seventy decibels. Sound is vibration, right. Most of the sound from a helicopter comes from the tail rotor. The tail rotor being exposed and the tip being able to hit the wind is what causes most helicopter noise. If you look at the picture of our helicopter, it has what is called a fence drawn tail. The tail rotor is completely enclosed, which is one of the reasons that it is it is so quiet because the tail rotor spins six times faster than the main rotor. That means the speed of is astronomically, the tip speed is astronomically faster. It being enclosed, reduces that

noise because the air cannot go around to the tip of the blade to create the noise that most helicopters do. Whereas an airplane that is going around the tip of the propeller and so that is that is something additionally we have some other paperwork that shows the average decibel level of the aircraft that fly overhead. In this brochure, the first page is just an explanation of what we were looking at. Each one of those airplanes has eighty-five or, or better decimal range, and like we are on the flight path, we are just below GPS waypoint for the approach to into the International Airport. There are 218 commercial flights a day, they come in and out of there. There's already commercial traffic, which is going to be producing more noise at the five at the five nautical mile mark.

When they are overhead, they are two thousand feet above us, which is a mile and a half. You can look at the mile and a half mark on that, to talk about the decibels for that. And then there is also the eight F-16 that are at the airbase, and they produce, at minimum, they produce ninety-five decibels. The helicopter with a fenced-on tail is significantly quieter than most. He thought it was a letter that was brought up, that we are inside the class Charlie, we are inside what is considered the veil of the class Charlie, so we must have a transponder in the area that we are in. But the class Charlie airspace, looks like an upside-down wedding cake. We are underneath what is called the shelf. But we are not inside the class, Charlie airspace. But we are we are about a mile to the side of the actual approach path, and it is it is not a concern. He got a call from the FAA yesterday. That said, the FAA had approved our order heliport site. Of course, there is comes with the caveat that we would have to get approval from the local authorities. But that is what we are here to do today.

He stated that he had been flying Blackhawks for the last eight years and just wanted to come and do it. Come and instruct people and show them enthusiastic flying. He would love to take any of you all up flying to regardless of if we are doing it out of here somewhere else flying. It is always fun. He likes to share that with anybody. So let us know.

Jill Lavendusky, 310 North Birch, Owasso, Oklahoma, 74055, stated that she did not like it and she did not approve of it. This land has been in our family since the early 1900s and that was the intention was to keep it in the family and continue. When our younger brother passed, our sister-in-law said she would stay there, she changed her mind and left. We had no clue that this was going on. So now we still want to keep it in the family for as long as you can. She has not been introduced to the applicants and wishes them well. But my concern is when we got the letter about this, and she looked up their business, and it showed a completely different address. She went over there, and it is not there. There is nothing there. And there were hours of operations like from seven to eleven, seven days a week. She plans to build a home, just like her nephew. It is just getting close to our property. Jimmy's property butts up to it and then our other brother butts up to that. This has been in our family forever, other than a section that our sister-in-law sold, and we want to keep the family, what we have left.

Rebuttal:

Applicant stated that she did want to add there was concerns about the trees. We do want to keep it forested. We were comfortable building a tree house over in our section for the children. If we do not want to do it in perpetuity, we could put a pin on it and put it a finish date when the heliport is finished. Because yes, our hours of operation will be significantly more when we are at that teleport, and we are able to be there all the time, they have the lighting systems there for night flights, we are not going to be adding a lighting system. This is our personal home in residence. She does not want to have to worry about anything with the kids running around. This is temporary. This is so we are not on top of our competition. We are not cutting down a grove of trees. We want to we want to build a playhouse out there for the children and we want to build a tree house at this is our home. But this is us trying to make an opportunity where we are not killing our competition. They have been here longer; we really do not want to be on top of them. And we do not have to. And again, we are fine with putting an end date on it if we must, at some point work on top of them on occasion that's kind of something we will deal with at that point that will be will have been here long enough. Hopefully, it will not cause too much bad blood. But this is temporary, our heliport is not finished, it was supposed to be done. We cannot help that they told us it would be done in January, we bought the helicopter knowing it would be done in January, we were only supposed to be unable to pay the loan for two months. We just do not want to be on top of our competition we really do not want to work out of right on top of that they are going to be very mad. We are significantly cheaper than that. We know that the heliport does not look done yet. But if you want to look online, if you look at our Instagram, we have all the pictures of what it is going to look like

Applicant stated that without the lighting system the FAA will not let us fly between an hour before sunset and an hour after sunrise. Yes, so there is a considerable time with the FAA does not legally allow to fly because the heliport does not have the appropriate lighting system there.

The Applicant stated that the helicopter is tiny, the space we have is it is fine. If anything is cut down, it will be because it is dead. It was it is not going to be we are not going to I do not want my pretty view of my backyard ruined for something that is only going to be up for a year. This this is a temporary, so we do not annoy the people that already are here. With our low prices we just really do not want to cause that kind of bad.

Comments and Questions:

Mr. Charney stated he was personally very respectful of business idea behind this. He stated that this gives him an allergy or heartburn to the location of it and what I know is there is not that area has not been long standing residential in nature and they mentioned taking off to the east but there is a lot of land over there that has not yet developed into the comprehensive plan for being residential. There are a bunch of existing houses and there is lots of room for future houses to the east, but he respected their business, he just had a bit of trouble with it being in a in a residential area to conduct the business out of, but he was just one thought and happy to the other Board members thoughts.

Ms. Tisdale stated that he agrees with them for a certain amount of time, a brief period. But he has just a little bit of concern on you know, it is already in the flight pattern. It is a proximity to the population density, that is, it does cause a little heartburn there.

Mr. Charney stated that he gets this, this unit might be quieter, and this pilot might just do a limited number. But that is not built into the limitations of branding the use.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he lives next to a private airfield, and he personally loves it wherever he takes off and lands because he watches him. It does not bother me. He is in the exact same flight pattern as everybody else. The Air National Guard coming over. That is the sound freedom. Love it. Absolutely love it. He does not have a problem with the helicopter landing there. The only issue he had is the flight school being there. But he is comfortable with the flight school being there for one year at sunset. But that is what whenever he looks at these, he looks at it as though he is next-door. He butts up to the property where the airstrip is my at his place. He has been there for 32 years, and he has loved it for 32 years. He looks at it a little bit differently. He does not have a problem with the landing there. He would prefer on the school a one-year sunset. That that is him.

Mr. Charney stated that there are two matters before us procedurally. The first matter is to construct a heliport, the permit that, and a second matter is to is a Use Variance to permit the school.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that there was another one, the trades and services and to allow a helicopter training facility. Is that correct Mr. Hoyt? Mr. Hoyt stated that would fall into the trade surplus.

Mr. Tisdale stated that he thought though, he understands kind of what you are saying just a little bit. He also has lived close to an airfield for 32 years.

Mr. Charney stated that he loved the idea of the business and respected this couple that wants to do it. He just had a little heartburn in this location.

Mr. Tisdale stated he thought there should be a time limit on it. Now you created a whole new talk problem, you get extended.

Mr. Charney stated that some of us have different perspectives, some similar perspectives depending on the nuanced part of it. So prepared to if he were to make a motion, he would not be in support of it. He wanted to help this great couple find a location to do their business in a place that is zoned for it. So that is my perspective, he would go ahead and let us see if it if it fails for lack of second, we can go another route.

Mr. Tisdale asked if the only areas to the east of your home is built already correct. Mr. Charney stated it is to the west where homes are built, and to the east is a vacant field and some of it is flood zone. Mr. Tisdale stated that the reclamation of the area to the

east, I guess would be the future zone and that is the comprehensive plan has it shaded yellow residential.

Board Action:

On **MOTION** of **CHARNEY**, the Board voted 2-1-0 (Charney, Tisdale all “ayes”, Hutchinson “nay”, no “abstentions”, Hicks “absent”) to **DENY** the Special Exception to allow Use Unit 2 to permit a Heliport in AG district (Section 310) & a Use Variance for Trades and Services in AG zoned district (Section 310).

In closing, Mr. Charney just want to state what he said in the very beginning that he respected the mission here and our community needs this, and he is a fan of aviation. He just feels that this would not be the location where he personally could support it, but he wishes you the best as you continue to derive the business plan that he hopes will let your business thrive.

BEG 30E & 16.5N SWC W/2 SW SE TH N642.42 E242.87 S442.34 E364.41 S200 W606.45 POB LESS S8.5 THEREOF FOR RD SEC 13 21 13 5.054 ACS, CITY OF OWASSO, COUNTY OF TULSA, STATE OF OKLAHOMA.

.....

OTHER BUSINESS

None

.....

NEW BUSINESS

None.

.....

BOARD COMMENTS

None.

.....

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Date approved: 11-15-2022


_____ Chair