**TULSA COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**
**MINUTES of Meeting No. 447**
Tuesday, August 15, 2017, 1:30 p.m.
Ray Jordan Tulsa County Administration Building
500 South Denver, Room 119
Tulsa, Oklahoma

| MEMBERS PRESENT | MEMBERS ABSENT | STAFF PRESENT | OTHERS PRESENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hutchinson, V.Chair | Charney, Chair | Miller | West Co. Inspector |
| Crall, Secretary | | Moye | |
| Dillard | | Sparger | |
| Johnston | | | |

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted at the County Clerk's office, County Administration Building, 10th day of August, 2017 at 11:19 a.m., as well as in the Office of INCOG, 2 West Second Street, Suite 800.

After declaring a quorum present, Vice Chair Hutchinson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

************

**MINUTES**

On **MOTION** of **DILLARD,** the Board voted 4-0-0 (Crall, Dillard, Hutchinson, Johnston "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Charney "absent") to **APPROVE** the Minutes of July 18, 2017 (No. 446).

*************

Mr. Hutchinson explained to the applicants and interested parties that there were only four board members present at this meeting. If an applicant or an interested party would like to postpone his or her hearing until the next meeting he or she could do so. If the applicant wanted to proceed with the hearing today it would be necessary for him to receive an affirmative vote from three board members to constitute a majority and if two board members voted no today the application would be denied. Mr. Hutchinson asked the applicants and the interested parties if they understood and asked the applicants or interested parties what they would like to do. The audience nodded their understanding and no one requested a continuance.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that agenda item #5, CBOA-2642, has an interested party that has requested a continuance. Mr. David Davis, Attorney, stood up and stated that he

represents Dr. Durham and he objects to the continuance request. Mr. Hutchinson stated that the meeting will continue in agenda order.

*************

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
None.

*************

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

**2639—Barbara Lorenzen**

**Action Requested:**
Variance of the minimum frontage requirement on a public street/dedicated right-of-way from 30 feet to 0 feet to permit a lot-split in the AG District (Section 207).
**LOCATION:** 19430 South 43rd East Avenue, Bixby

**Presentation:**
**Barbara Lorenzen,** 19430 South 43rd East Avenue, Bixby, OK; stated she has owned the subject 15 acres for 40 years. She wants to do a lot split to divide the land among her family upon her death. The survey provided by White Survey Company shows the proposed division of the land.

Mr. Dillard asked Ms. Lorenzen if she was going to divide the property into two sections. Ms. Lorenzen stated that she wants to divide it into four sections of which two would be 2 ½ acres each and the other two would be five acres each.

Mr. Dillard asked Mr. West if this would be considered a wild cat subdivision. Mr. West stated that it could be considered a wild cat subdivision because she wants to divide the property into four separate lots, but since the property is under one ownership that makes it a judgment call. Ms. Miller stated that four lots is the maximum allowed for a lot split before a plat is required.

**Interested Parties:**
There were no interested parties present.

**Comments and Questions:**
None.

**Board Action:**
On **MOTION** of **HUTCHINSON,** the Board voted 4-0-0 (Crall, Dillard, Hutchinson, Johnston "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Charney "absent") to **APPROVE** the request for a Variance of the minimum frontage requirement on a public street/dedicated right-of-way from 30 feet to 0 feet to permit a lot-split in the AG District

(Section 207) subject to conceptual plan 2.7 and 2.8. The Board has found the hardship to the unusually large tract of land. The easements are to be filed of record with the County; for the following property:

**SW SW NE & S/2 NW SW NE LESS E25 SEC 9 16 13, OF TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**2640—Darran & Jennifer Harger**

**Action Requested:**
Variance to reduce the side yard (street) setback to 5 feet to permit a garage (Section 430); Variance to increase the maximum permitted size of a detached accessory building from 750 square feet to 1,200 square feet (Section 240.2-E).
**LOCATION:** 15404 West 18th Street South, Sand Springs

**Presentation:**
**Jennifer Harger,** 15404 West 18th Street South, Sand Springs, OK; stated she and her husband would like to build a garage for their personal use and place it within five feet of the property line.

Mr. Dillard asked Ms. Harger what she planned to do with the existing little building. Ms. Harger stated that the building will be taken down.

Mr. Johnston asked Ms. Harger why she wanted to place the building so close to the property line. Ms. Harger stated it is because of the lateral lines. If the building were to be anywhere else on the property it would interfere with the lateral lines and she does not want to move the laterial ines.

Mr. Johnston asked Ms. Harger how far outside of the Sand Springs corporate limits is the subject property. Ms. Harger stated it is about three miles outside the city limits.

Mr. Johnston asked Ms. Harger what type of building materials are going to be used for the construction of the proposed garage. Ms. Harger stated that it will be post frame construction covered with metal, similar to a pole barn. Ms. Harger stated there are several of these type buildings in the neighborhood so it will fit into the neighborhood.

**Interested Parties:**
There were no interested parties present.

**Comments and Questions:**
None.

**Board Action:**
On **MOTION** of **JOHNSTON,** the Board voted 4-0-0 (Crall, Dillard, Hutchinson, Johnston "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Charney "absent") to **APPROVE** the

request for a Variance to reduce the side yard (street) setback from 25 feet to 5 feet to permit a garage (Section 430); Variance to increase the maximum permitted size of a detached accessory building from 750 square feet to 1,200 square feet (Section 240.2-E). The Board has found the hardship to be the location of the lateral lines and the location of the street; for the following property:

**LT 5 BLK 5, TOWN & COUNTRY ACRES NO 2 SUB, OF TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**2641—Connie Blizzard & Kelly Schiavo**

**Action Requested:**
Special Exception to allow a wedding/event venue with accessory lodging (Use Unit 2) in the AG District (Section 310); Variance to reduce the required side yard setback to 10 feet in the AG District (Section 330). **LOCATION:** 7845 East 86th Street North, Owasso

**Presentation:**
**Kelly Schiavo,** 14013 East 90th Street North, Owasso, OK; stated this request is to allow wedding and event venue with accessory lodging. There is an existing shop that she would like to remodel to use for offices, storage and as part of the buffet area and it is too close to the side yard setback thus the need for the Variance request.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Schiavo if she was purchasing the property. Ms. Schiavo answered affirmatively. Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Schiavo if someone else had built the accessory building that close to the property line. Ms. Schiavo answered affirmatively.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Schiavo what the hours of operation would be. Ms. Schiavo stated that during the week the hours of operation would be 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. during the week to show the venue to potential clients. On Friday, Saturday and Sundays there would be indoor and outdoor weddings with the hours of operation being from 9:00 A.M. until midnight. All music will be shut down by 11:00 P.M.

Mr. Dillard asked Ms. Schiavo if she had spoken with any of the neighbors. Ms. Schiavo stated that she has spoken with the neighbors on the east side and on the west side because she wants a harmonious relationship with them.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Schiavo if she has done anything about noise control. Ms. Schiavo stated she will be using off-duty police officers for security and all the music will be cut off at 11:00 P.M. on the weekends. Ms. Schiavo stated that all receptions will be held inside.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Schiavo what kind of sound proofing she had inside the building where the receptions will be held. Ms. Schiavo stated that the way the building is constructed there will actually be two layers so it will be quiet.

Mr. Dillard asked Ms. Schiavo if there would be alcohol served. Ms. Schiavo stated that it would be served if requested, but it will be served only by a licensed and insured bartender which will probably come through the catering company.

Mr. Crall asked Ms. Schiavo about a screening fence. Ms. Schiavo stated there will be a six foot screening fence located to the east and to the west.

**Interested Parties:**
There were no interested parties present.

**Comments and Questions:**
None.

**Board Action:**
On **MOTION** of **CRALL,** the Board voted 4-0-0 (Crall, Dillard, Hutchinson, Johnston "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Charney "absent") to **APPROVE** the request for a Special Exception to allow a wedding/event venue with accessory lodging (Use Unit 2) in the AG District (Section 310); Variance to reduce the required side yard setback to 10 feet in the AG District (Section 330), subject to conceptual plan 4.9. The hours of operation will be as shown on page 4.10. There is to be a 6'-0" screening fence of the east side and the west side of the subject property. The Board has found the hardship to be that existing building was in compliance prior to the lot changing. This is approval is for a period of three years, August 2020; for the following property:

**E/2 SW SE SE LESS .12 AC F0R RDS SEC 23 21 13 4.88 ACS, OF TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**2642—Marcus Durham**

**Action Requested:**
Special Exception to permit a wedding/event venue (Use Unit 2) on an AG zoned property (Section 310); Variance of the all-weather surface material requirement for parking (Section 1340.D). **LOCATION:** East of the SE/c of East 171st Street South and South 161st East Avenue, Bixby

Mr. Hutchinson stated that there is a letter for a request of continuance on this case, and he asked if anyone would like to challenge the request.

**David W. Davis,** 406 South Boulder, Suite 400, Tulsa, OK; stated the request for continuance came from L. Williams via e-mail this morning but there is no L. Williams on the notification mailing list. A cotinuation would place a hardship on his client. A September hearing his client will be in Canada attending a conference with flight and hotel reservations paid for. The request is untimely and there are misrepresentations in the letter.

Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Davis if there would be an objection if the case were continued to the October meeting. Mr. Davis stated that would create a hardship on his client because it is too far in the future.

**John Moody,** 6004 South Marion Avenue, Tulsa, OK; stated he was only hired yesterday thus the reason for late e-mail. Primary reason for the request of continuance is because his client has not had an opportunity to meet with the applicant. Mr. Moody stated that L. Williams is his client and she owns property and a house adjacent to the subject property. His client would like to meet with the applicant because in discussing the application with his client it is apparent there are a number of things that his client may not be objectionable to providing there were reasonable conditions placed on the request. There are also things that are unclear in the application that need to be cleared up. Mr. Moody stated that he challenges the Use Unit 2 classification in this request because wedding event center is not included in that section. This request should be classified under Use Unit 5 and advertised as such, because Use Unit 5 talks about community centers. Mr. Moody does not believe the application was properly noticed nor classified properly so the Board does not have jurisdiction.

Mr. Dillard asked Ms. Miller if the request was properly noticed and properly classified. Ms. Miller stated that staff is certain that the request was properly classified and noticed. An event center's function and use is more closely related to Use Unit 2 than Use Unit 5.

Mr. Davis stated that he does not know who L. Williams is because the name is not on the mailing list and what interest this party has in the application.

Mr. Moody stated that L. Williams is a property owner that has property just outside the 300 foot radius and is very near the subject property. Mr. Moody stated that his client would not have know about the application except another property owner received a notice.

Mr. Crall stated that the Board, in the past, has always suggested that an applicant speak with the neighbors because the Board does not like disharmony. The Board will highly suggest the applicant speak to the neighbors and it looks like that is what the suggestion will in this case. He would like to continue this case.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he would like proceed but he believes it will come down to disagreements amongst the neighbors and be continued anyway, so he would like to continue the case to September or October.

Mr. Johnston stated that he could go either way but the history is that cases such as this are always continued. Though the Board could hear the applicant and the interested parties to lay some ground work that way everyone will know what is proposed if the case should be continued.

Mr. Dillard does not understand why the interested party waited until the last day to raise any issues. That is not the Board's problem, that is their problem. If one party has done all their work and another party waited until the last minute to hire an attorney that is not the Board's problem. The Board determines land use. Period. Mr. Dillard thinks the case should be heard today.

**Board Action:**
On **MOTION** of **DILLARD,** the Board voted 4-0-0 (Crall, Dillard, Hutchinson, Johnston "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Charney "absent") to **HEAR** the request for a Special Exception to permit a wedding/event venue (Use Unit 2) on an AG zoned property (Section 310); Variance of the all-weather surface material requirement for parking (Section 1340.D); for the following property:

**N/2 NE LESS S150 W2051.99 & LESS S220 E580.09 THEREOF SEC 35 17 14 69.772ACS, OF TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**Presentation:**
**Marcus Durham,** 17350 East Highway 64, Bixby, OK; stated he would like to build a pole barn to fit into the agricultural environment. He has operated a guest ranch for a number of years with people coming in for hay rides and other things. He has retired and his daughter is taking over the operations of the ranch and she had the idea of holding wedding events at the ranch. The property consists of 180 acres and he works with the Oklahoma Wildlife Department and Biologist to develop the property in a reasonable way, keeping it as rural as possible. He is in the process of planting more trees on the subject property to help make the property a desireable place. There are no public roads within a mile of the subject property but there is a ranch road that comes from Highway 64. The ranch road is a mile long laid with white rock and he owns the property on both sides of the road. He has located the proposed wedding center as far back as possible without falling off the edge of the hilltop. There is a neighbor's house about a half mile away that is located to the northwest of the proposed location and there is an airport located about ¼ mile south. The proposed wedding barn is well within the tree barrier and totally contained on the subject property. His daughter developed restrictions for the wedding center and the plan is to have off-duty police officers and Tulsa County Sheriff Deputies. The barn will be foam insulated inside and that should create a noise barrier along with the tree barrier that is between the barn and the neighbors. In the packet given to the Board there are pictures showing horseback riding, hay rides, etc., and the ranch has been doing all these things for 15 years with the exception of the wedding events. He has worked with Oklahoma Agri-

Tourism in regards to the guest ranch in the agricultural setting. Mr. Durham stated that he is in the process of separating the subject five acres for the wedding barn.

Mr. Johnston asked Mr. Durham what type of building is proposed for the wedding center. Mr. Durham stated that it will be a pole barn with two extensions, one on each side. Mr. Johnston asked if the pole barn would be fully enclosed. Mr. Durham answered affirmatively.

**Sarah Coffin,** 17300 East Highway 64, Bixby, OK; stated she is the daughter and she will be taking over the operations of the guest ranch and the proposed wedding center. To maintain 180 acres is not cheap so she would like to expand what has been provided to the public for years. The guest ranch is open by appointment only for guests to ride and fish and enjoy the rural experience. The property is not open to the public so there will not be people wandering around the property all the time.

**Jason Coffin,** 17300 East Highway 64, Bixby, OK; stated he would like to talk about the proposed pole barn. The barn will be built with 26 gauge steel with sheet rock over the steel siding on the inside.

Mr. Johnston asked Ms. Coffin if she has ever received any complaints from the neighbors about the operation of the guest ranch. Ms. Coffin stated that she has not. Ms. Coffin stated that she actually had the support of the neighbors for the trail riding that is shown in the picture.

Mr. .Crall asked Ms. Coffin if there would be any shooting of any sort. Ms. Coffin stated there would not be any shooting. There are no shooting ranges or archery ranges on the subject property and they will not be available.

Mr. Johnston asked Ms. Coffin what was the largest event they have had on the property. Ms. Coffin stated they had a family wedding but she is not sure of the number of guests.

**Interested Parties:**

**John Moody,** 6004 South Marion, Tulsa, OK; stated that wedding events can only be held in Use Unit 2 in a bed and breakfast facility which has no more than 12 bedrooms. There are very specific conditions regarding that. The application does not say they are applying for a bed and breakfast, it says the applicant is asking for a wedding event center and that they are going to build a 6,100 square foot barn. That is not a definition in the County Zoning Code, because under Use Unit 2 wedding events can only be held in conjunction with a bed and breakfast. The wedding event is completely reliant upon the approval of a bed and breakfast. If the Board does not approve that then they cannot approve any of the other conditions because that is the way the Zoning Code is written. Mr. Moody believes this request was not advertised properly. A bed and breakfast is classified as a residential structure that provides 12 guest rooms and meals for overnight guests who pay a fee for services. Such structures may also be rented for events such as weddings, receptions, anniversaries, private dinner parties, business

seminars, etc. as approved by the Board of Adjustment. The applicant shows an airport on his site plan that has not been used for approximately 20 years and it is not operable. The subject property does not have a public street to the propsoed area but the road is an unpaved private road that leads to the ranch and to the proposed area for the event center. The Variance request is to allow the applicant not to install a hard surface parking area which may be alright but under these circumstances there is a 6,100 square foot building. Under the terms of the Zoning Code there are special parking requirements under the bed and breakfast section of the Code. So the applicant has to provide enough off-street parking to accommodate 600 people. Mr. Moody believes that is a stretch for the applicant to ask the Board to approve the parking lot of that size that is not an all weather hard surface. Mr. Moody stated the applicant must also have a hardship for the Variance to be approved that is related to the shape and configuration of the property. Mr. Moody stated that because the request is advertised as a Use Unit 2 it may include any type of a number of activity that his client would be opposed to; for example, if the applicant wants to use the venue for motorcycles or all terrain vehicles or anything that makes noise close to the houses along the south border. His client is not necessarily objecting to a reasonably well run limited wedding type center nor are they objecting to a limited number of hay rides or horse back riding. Mr. Moody stated that his client has questions about the hours of operation, about noise levels, about staying on site, where will the other activities be taking place, how many events will be held, etc. Unregulated activities could be a problem. There are also concerns about the number of automobiles that will be using the gravel road because the applicant's own web page references 600 people. Mr. Moody stated there are concerns about bands playing music. The proposed barn is set on the edge of the property high on a hill and noise does travel so it needs to be discussed. The Zoning Code does not permit what the applicant has asked for. Mr. Moody thinks the application is too broad and too general without very specific conditions. Mr. Moody stated that if the Board does approve today's requests he would ask that the Board limits the area where the activities are conducted, i.e., the northeast corner of the tract not the entire tract.

**Bill Westmoreland,** 16527 East 171st Street, Bixby, OK; stated he is concerned about his investment because he has spent about $800,000 on his property. He moved to the area for the peace and quiet and he does not want to hear noise. Mr. Westmoreland is a minister and he is all about weddings but his concern are the lighting, sounds, and traffic. He is concerned about the noise level of the bands that will show up. He would like for the applicant to set the stage up for the bands so that any noise that escapes from the building is not going over the pond and down the hill to the fantastic view it would be away from his house. He is also concerned about the hours of operation for the wedding venues, If this is done well he believes everybody's property value will go up. He is concerned about how the traffic will be handled because he has heard that Highway 64 is going to be widened with a bridge added over the Arkansas River.

**George Shafer,** 17023 East 171st Street, Bixby, OK; stated he has lived here for 27 years and he has a ministry named Eagle Mountain Ranch Ministry. He works with children and adults and he is not upset by the proposed use of the subject property. He

has heard noise coming from the subject property more than once but it does not bother him because he is in a ministry that takes care of kids. He recently moved in a double wide mobile on the southeast corner of his property which is about a 100 feet from the subject property. He does like the peace and quiet of the area but the applicant has not been a disturbance to him or his ministry. He would like to build more cabins on his property in the future and have a pond as well. His concerns are the traffic and as long as the traffic is not going to be on his property he is fine with the request.

**R. C. Morrison,** 17025 East 174th Street South, Bixby, OK; stated his house is located on 13 acres on the south border of the subject property. His concern is the impact the requested venue is going to have on his way of life. If this request is approved is there any way he can protect himself from the ATVs or the horse back riding. He does not want to be an obstructionist but he does want to protect his property.

**Vicki Morrison,** 17025 East 174th Street South, Bixby, OK; stated she can hear voices at her house from the subject property's barn. That is voices, not music. She is concerned about sharing a border with the subject property. Ms. Morrison is concerned about how they will provide bathroom facilities for all the people.

**Laura Williams,** 17533 South 174th Avenue East, Bixby, OK; stated that she is the party that lives just outside the 300 foot radius. Ms. Williams stated that the runway is owned by the association so as an association member she owns a piece of the property, all members own a piece of the runway even if they are beyond the 300 foot radius. Who wants to guess what will be done on the subject property and what the future is going to be. She is absolutely agreeable that the applicant, she and the neighbors get together to discuss the proposal. The applicant has presented specifics about the subject area but there are no specifics about the remainder of the property. A discussion is absolutely paramount and there should be no reason why we cannot get together and talk about everything to make this a successful operation for everyone. Ms. Williams stated that eveyone's happiness is the end goal and there should be no reason why that could not be reached. Ms. Williams stated that she would like to see restrictions placed on the camping if it does proceed because this looks like it will only get bigger and better.

**Lori Szymanski,** 17219 East 174th Street South, Bixby, OK; stated this whole thing with the entire neighborhood is the fear of the unknown. The neighbors do not know what it will be like to have 600 people on the subject property because that will change the whole dynamic of the area. Fear of the unknown is not knowing whether we can trust the applicant. Will the applicant be able to change what they are doing? It is the fear of the unknown.

Mr. Dillard stated that he did not want the Board to go forward with this case if something is wrong, and he asked Ms. Miller if she was comfortable with the Use Unit 2 classification. Ms. Miller stated that Use Unit 2 has been consistently been used for an event center. The Code does not specifically say anywhere within the Code "event

center" but that group of uses under Use Unit 2 is related to that. The meaning of Use Unit 5 is more institutional.

**Ms. Miller left the meeting at 3:30 P.M.**

**Rebuttal:**

**Sarah Coffin** came forward and stated the original purpose she is before the Board today is to have a Special Exception under Use Unit 2 approved for the wedding venue and to have a Variance approved for all-weather surface material for parking. She is not here for the activities that are currently happening on the subject property. The other activities are something that they do on their property and it was preented as a background showing that the wedding venue would tie into the activities. In response to the comment about wanting to work together, there were notices sent out of this meeting and no one approached them about their concerns.

**Marcus Durham** came forward and stated the request is reflected on the entire 180 acres because it is one piece of property, but the wedding venue would only be on a portion of the property.

Sarah Coffin stated that in order to maintain the agricultural status for the subject property and keep it in the family is to be able to have the proposed events and the events that are currently happening. Otherwise, they will have to sell the property to development and there will be houses on the property. She has already presented proposed self-induced restrictions for the proposal and lighting will not be an issue because those lights will be pointed toward the rear of the property. Everything that she can think of to maintain the agricultural setting is explicit in her guest agreement.

Mr. Crall asked Ms. Coffin if she has campers where on the property do they stay. Ms. Coffin stated that it will be around the pond area on the property. Mr. Crall asked Ms. Coffin about ATV riders. Ms. Coffin stated that she does not provide ATVs. Mr. Crall asked about motorcycles. Ms. Coffin stated she does not provide motorcycles to the public. Ms. Coffin stated that the guests also have to provide their own horses as well. Ms. Coffin stated that she is not providing the activities she is simply providing the location.

Mr. Hutchinson asked Ms. Coffin and Mr. Durham if they would have any objections if the Board were to approve the request with a three or five year time limit. Mr. Durham stated that he has over a quarter million dollars invested in the building and he does not think he would be able to recoup that investment.

Ms. Coffin stated that she has never had a complaint on anything that has been done on the subject property.

Mr. Johnston asked Ms. Coffin about the 600 anticipated guests or cars. Ms. Coffin stated that 600 would be the maximum allowable for an event. Mr. Durham stated that if all the guests were in the barn and they were standing that 600 is the number of people that could fit in the barn. Mr. Johnston stated that the parking area will only support about 40 cars. Mr. Durham stated that there is an overflow area that he had not intended to pave and he estimated the parking area to hold 50 cars. Mr. West stated that parking is calculated based on the square footage of the building.

**Comments and Questions:**
Mr. Crall stated that he could support the request if the applicant were to come back in three years. Three years will let the neighbors know whether the applicant is doing as he says he will do.

Mr. Johnston stated that he has not heard the "continuance" mentioned. Is there any reason why the applicant shouldn't or can't visit with the neighbors.

Mr. Hutchinson stated that he does not think there needs to be a continuance. Most everything has been brought forth by the neighbors and the applicant in his opinion. Mr. Hutchinson stated that he would like to see a five year condition placed on the approval if the Board is inclined to approve the request.

Mr. Dillard asked if there can be a condition that there is no commercial use of motorcycles. Mr. Johnston stated that has nothing to do with the requested wedding chapel. Mr. Dillard stated that he can support the request if it is given the condition of five years.

**Board Action:**
On **MOTION** of **CRALL,** the Board voted 4-0-0 (Crall, Dillard, Hutchinson, Johnston "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Charney "absent") to **APPROVE** the request for a Special Exception to permit a wedding/event venue (Use Unit 2) on an AG zoned property (Section 310); Variance of the all-weather surface material requirement for parking (Section 1340.D), subject to conceptual plan 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8. This approval is for five years, August 2022, when the applicant is to appear before the Board for a review of the project. The Board has found the hardship to be the size of the property; for the following property:

**N/2 NE LESS S150 W2051.99 & LESS S220 E580.09 THEREOF SEC 35 17 14 69.772ACS, OF TULSA COUNTY, STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**********

**OTHER BUSINESS**
None.

**********

**NEW BUSINESS**
None.

**********

**BOARD COMMENTS**
None.

**********

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

Date approved: 9-19-17

Chair