

**COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**  
MINUTES of Meeting No. 198  
Tuesday, November 19, 1996, 1:30 p.m.  
County Commission Room  
Room 119  
County Administration Building

**MEMBERS PRESENT      MEMBERS ABSENT      STAFF PRESENT      OTHERS PRESENT**

Alberty  
Eller  
Looney  
Tyndall  
Walker, Chairman

Gardner  
Beach  
Huntsinger

Glenn, Building  
Inspection  
Fields, Building  
Inspection

The notice and agenda of said meeting were posted in the Office of the County Clerk on Friday, November 15, 1996, at 10:33 a.m., as well as in the Reception Area of the INCOG offices.

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

**MINUTES:**

On **MOTION** of **ELLER**, the Board voted 3-0-0 (Eller, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; Looney, Alberty "absent") to **APPROVE** the **Minutes** of October 15, 1996 (No. 197).

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**Looney & Alberty in at 1:40 p.m.**

**Case No. 1455**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to allow a 150' telecommunications tower in an AG district. **SECTION 220. HEIGHT EXCEPTIONS** and a Variance of the required all-weather surface on parking areas. **SECTION 1340.D.DESIGN STANDARDS FOR OFF-STREET PARKING AREAS** - Use Unit 4, located North of 166th Street North & East Yale Avenue, Collinsville.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Earl Higgins/John Kirby/SW Bell Services**, represented by Vicky Hale, 100 West 5th Street, Suite 1000, submitted a petition (Exhibit A-1) and photographs (Exhibit A-2). Ms. Hale stated the application is for a PCS (Personal Communication Services) tower, which will be 150' in height. She further stated the tower will be self-supported and will provide PCS. Ms. Hale indicated the proposed site is in an area that is zoned AG and 60' towers are allowed by right, however SW Bell Services will need a 150' tower to complete their plans. Ms. Hale detailed the services that a PCS will provide. She explained that the FCC has granted a license in the last year to SW Bell Services to provide this service. Ms. Hale stated that 150' tower would eliminate having to have towers closer to each other. She further stated the site is north of the junction of Highway 75 and Highway 20. She explained the site is a part of a systematic, well thought out grid for which SW Bell Services will be constructing. Ms. Hale reminded the Board that they had already approved a variance for a tower to the south of this proposed site and the company has another tower to the north of the proposed site. She explained that SW Bell Services needs this location in the center to complete the grid or plan. She further explained that the proposed site is bordered on the west by Highway 75 and all the land around the proposed site is zoned AG.

**Mr. Earl Higgins/SW Bell Services**, 11529 East Pine, stated the proposed site is approximately, from the right-of-way line, 120' from the fence. He further stated that the land is owned by Mr. Smith and he owns 320 acres. Mr. Higgins indicated the location of neighbors and the surrounding terrain. He stated he visited with the property owners surrounding the proposed site and received signatures on a petition (See Exhibit A-1). Mr. Higgins informed the Board that the next closest tower to the proposed site is 5 miles, which the Board granted for SW Bell Services. He indicated that the next tower is 3 miles south and is owned by a competitor, which would not fit into SW Bell Services grid if they co-located with the competitor. Mr. Higgins explained that if SW Bell Services built a 60' tower, which is allowed, the company would have to build towers every mile or less to complete their coverage.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Higgins what area of coverage he can achieve with a 60' tower? He stated very little because he cannot get above the tree line or over the hill. He further stated the coverage would only be about 3/4 mile to the north and about 1/2 mile to the south.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Higgins why he didn't locate on top of the hill? He stated then he would be too close to the next tower that is 4 miles away. He explained that 1/2 mile is about the range to keep in with the RF.

Case No. 1455 (continued)

In response to Mr. Walker, Mr. Higgins stated the RF Engineers lay out a grid and it is scientifically thought out. He further stated the sites are laid out on a map on how the towers can be located.

In response to Mr. Walker, Mr. Higgins stated he cannot show the proposed plan because it is confidential information and the competitors would like to see the proposed plan or map as well. Mr. Higgins further stated the grids/plans or maps are a five year plan that will be developed in phases.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Higgins if he could co-locate on towers? He stated SW Bell Services are co-locating with other competitors when it is possible.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Higgins to provide a map indicating existing locations that wouldn't be proprietary or confidential? Mr. Higgins stated he did not have a map with him, but he could make that available.

Mr. Higgins indicated, on an aerial map, the locations of surrounding neighbors of the proposed site.

**Interested Parties:**

**Mr. Franklin Smith**, 17001 North Highway 75, Skiatook, property owner of the proposed site, stated he visited with neighbors indicated on the aerial photograph with red dots (Mr. Higgins did not submit this aerial photograph as an Exhibit). He explained that the numbers on the petition correspond with the aerial map. Mr. Smith commented he is aware that there is some concern with a couple of the residents in the area. He stated he is not doing anything that would de-value their property and he hopes that this tower does not disrupt the community. Mr. Smith commented that he found it distasteful to have to canvass the area and ask the neighbors to take sides on this issue.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Looney asked Mr. Smith what percentage of the owners are represented by the red dots on the aerial map? He stated 65% to 75%.

**Protestants:**

**Sarah Field and Susan Field**, 16001 Highway 75 North, Skiatook, expressed the following concerns:

PCS towers are not a public utility and should not be treated as one; The visual impact that a 150' tower will have on the area; The development planned in the area, which will be residential; The Property directly across the street from proposed tower has a sweeping view of the tall grass prairie; Star Lake Estates directly north of the proposed site was left off the aerial map and it is a housing development, which has buried their utility lines in order to keep the view open; The aerial map is not accurate; The possibility of a 150' tower de-valuing the surrounding property; The possibility of lights being on the tower and the fact that there is a proposed airport that will be built north of this proposed site; Wildlife surrounding the creek and wooded area; The tower may be in a 100 year flood zone; Dry creek bed, which flows along Mr. Smith's property line onto the Field's property; Requested a detailed study of the flood zone provided by the Corp. of Engineers and an environmental assessment; Ms. Field read Sec. 704, 1996 Telecommunications Act regarding co-locations of towers; Ms. Field indicated other sites where the applicant could possibly co-locate the proposed tower; Both protestants object to the tower being placed on the Smith's land.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**

Robert Vitanza, an attorney for SW Bell Mobile Systems, 17330 Preston Road, Suite 100-A, Dallas, Texas, stated he would like to answer the issues that Sarah and Susan Field raised. Mr. Vitanza explained that the FCC determined that AT&T and U.S. Cellular could not provide all of the services that are available on a competitive basis. He further explained that the FCC opened up more frequency bands for other providers of Cellular and PCS services. He indicated that the community will benefit from SW Bell Services, because the prices should lower. Mr. Vitanza stated one of the services will be health care to homes. He explained that a private nurse visiting a home can key into a data base in the hospital with the PCS. He further explained that if the towers are not available then they cannot provide this service. He stated that FCC requires and mandates that the providers of PCS's have to provide extensive 911 service. Mr. Vitanza explained that the company will need a 150' tower to complete their grid and provide services. He further explained that if SW Bell Services is only allowed to build a 60' tower, then other companies will not co-locate with SW Bell Services because they would not be able to have the coverage needed. Mr. Vitanza stated that SW Bell Services cannot make other companies co-locate, but a 150' tower would allow the opportunity for co-location if they desire to. He explained that SW Bell Services is co-locating with a number of carriers throughout Tulsa when possible. He indicated that 45% of the antennas are co-located. He explained that if SW Bell Services is not allowed the 150' tower, then there will be a hole in the grid and the coverage cannot be completed. Mr. Vitanza stated that lights are not required to be installed on this tower, but if there is an airport going in they will have to comply.

Case No. 1455 (continued)

He explained that typically if a tower is over 200' in height or within a direct path within a certain number of feet of an airport, then you have to comply with the lights requirement and file an approval with the FAA. Mr. Vitanza stated that the wildlife and 100 year flood issue is covered under one FCC rule. He explained that the FCC rule is No. 1.1307-1319, which states that if the area is in a 100 year floodplain or an area within a critical habitat for wildlife, endangered species, etc., then the company will have to file a request for approval with the FCC before beginning construction or turning the site on. He further explained that one of the company's officers will have to sign a statement under the penalty of perjury that the site will not adversely effect the area. He indicated that if the tower does adversely effect the area, then the company has to request specific approval from the FCC. He stated that SW Bell Services hires a firm that checks to see if the site is within a floodplain or any critical species in the area. Mr. Vitanza disclosed that he is not aware that the site is in a flood zone or that there are any designated or critical species. Mr. Vitanza addressed the issue of Sec. 704, which Ms. Field mentioned. He explained that Sec. 704 does mandate that the FCC provide technical support to make right-of-ways available, but that doesn't mean the company has to locate on them. He further explained that because there is a right-of-way within a few miles, it does not mean that it fits within the grid or where SW Bell Services can provide their service. He commented that neither the City of Tulsa nor Tulsa County has come up with a right-of-way plan at this time.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Alberty asked Mr. Vitanza if the proposed tower is a monopole? He stated the tower will be a self-supporting tower, which is the lattice tower.

Mr. Walker asked Mr. Higgins to address the issue regarding PSO providing power for this tower? Mr. Higgins stated that power companies have certain areas that they can serve just like different telephone companies. He explained that SW Bell Services checks with which power company is available and PSO indicated that the site is within their area. He further explained that Mr. Smith had to get his power from Verdigras Valley for over a 1/4 mile from the east, but if they extended over into the proposed site, they would be extending into PSO's serving area. Mr. Higgins stated he checked with both companies, because SW Bell Services does not try to leverage one power company against another power company. He further stated that they do not have condemnation powers and therefore must negotiate sites.

**Applicant's Rebuttal:**

Vicky Hale stated that SW Bell Services does not have to be a public utility to fall under the use zone. She explained that a Use 4 under a public protection utility facilities specifically lists a transmitting tower as a use under that classification. Ms. Hale reminded the Board of their standards for granting special exceptions.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Walker requested Staff's comments or input regarding telecommunication towers.

Mr. Gardner stated the City of Tulsa has a Communications Committee. They are in the process of inventorying all towers in the City of Tulsa. He further stated that the INTEC Consortium Committee, which is made up of surrounding Cities and Towns, are trying to market their own sites to the industry. Mr. Gardner explained he has done some research and there is basically five areas for consideration: 1.) Tower setback standards, City of Tulsa has a one to one setback from abutting residential property and maybe should be a rule from any abutting property; 2.) Regarding designs, the Board needs to take into consideration the types of towers because they are monopoles vs. the lattice towers plus the height of towers. 3.) The location of the tower in an industrial or commercial area, if so the use is permitted by right and there would not be any height limitation other than, one to one setback; 4.) Undeveloped vs. developed, when the site is in a highly developed area vs. rural area the conditions for approval would be different. In a rural area there are lot of structures that wouldn't be found in the City. 5.) What will become of the towers once technology changes and the towers are no longer needed? There has been talk that in 20 to 25 years or less the need for these towers will no longer be necessary. Mr. Gardner concluded that he does not know all of the FCC regulations, but there is obviously a movement to provide these services. He further concluded that the services have to be provided in areas where it will work, but that doesn't limit the various Boards and jurisdictions from looking at land use issues.

Mr. Beach stated he attended a presentation regarding telecommunications towers, which was given by an Engineer from AT&T Wireless. He further stated the presentation dealt with the locational requirements and talked about issues the applicant has brought up today. He indicated that the Staff is looking at other City's ordinances regarding telecommunication towers and working toward an ordinance for the Tulsa area, but will not be in the immediate future. Mr. Beach stated particularly regarding removal of towers, the Board might consider requiring removal of the tower if it is abandoned for some period of time (90 days). He further stated the Board may need to consider the issue of lights on towers (if required by FAA and the Board has restricted lights, then the tower will have to come down).

Mr. Looney asked the applicant what the contractual responsibility for removal for non-utilization? Mr. Vitanza stated that SW Bell Services has two provisions that would apply with abandoned towers. He explained that in most of their leases it states that if the premises is abandoned for a year then the lease is terminated. He further explained that all of the leases say that if SW Bell Services moves off the property (or stop using the tower) the tower has to be removed and restore the site to its original surface.

Case No. 1455 (continued)

Mr. Looney asked the applicant why a company needs a monopole vs. a lattice tower? Mr. Lowell Jones, Architect for SW Bell Services, stated that monopoles are considered more esthetic and we try to use monopoles within cities, but the limiting factor with monopoles is that you have to know in advance who is locating on the tower. He explained that SW Bell Services is now trying to build their monopoles and lattice towers for future co-locating, however it is a guessing game at this point. He stated that lattice towers are more economical to erect and are more flexible. He indicated the lattice towers are easier to obtain, because the monopole industry is overloaded with request for monopoles, since most City Councils and Boards prefer the monopole. Mr. Jones explained that the more companies that locate on one pole the base becomes much larger and they do become very unattractive when you load more than two companies. He further explained that monopoles have to be pre-cut for the coaxial cable to run through the middle of the tower and if you cut future holes after the tower is erected, then you destroy the structural integrity of the tower. He indicated that when you use a cutting torch to cut future holes, then you are cutting up all of the existing coaxial cable that is inside the pole. He stated that you have to know in advance on monopoles who will be locating on it. Mr. Jones indicated that when the company can, they prefer the lattice tower because co-locating is easier.

Mr. Beach asked the applicant how it is determined where the antennas will be spaced with co-location? Mr. Jones stated that when two cellular companies are on the same tower, then you will have to have a 20' separation. He explained that if you have a 100' pole and your co-applicant wanted to locate with you and he cannot go beneath the 100' due to coverage access, then he will be inclined to locate individually because the tower is too low for his coverage. Mr. Jones stated that with a PCS and cellular co-location you will need a 10' vertical separation. He explained that a cellular antenna requires a horizontal separation with a 10' to 11' separation. He further explained that PCS antennas are 5' long and 8" wide, which can be mounted one on top of the other. He stated they can mount six antennas on PCS towers, which can be close together. He explained that some antenna manufactures put all six antennas inside a 2' diameter plastic radon, which covers all of the antennas and cables.

Mr. Alberty stated that with regard to this specific location, it meets all of the criteria that has been mentioned earlier. Mr. Alberty further stated he would like to see the criteria reduced to writing so that in the future when the applications are made the Board can look at the criteria as an addendum to the Staff recommendations.

Case No. 1455 (continued)

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **TYNDALL**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE Special Exception** to allow a 150' telecommunications tower in an AG district. **SECTION 220. HEIGHT EXCEPTIONS** - Use Unit 4; per plan submitted; finding that the approval of this application will not be injurious to the neighborhood, nor harmful to the spirit and intent of the Code, on the following described property:

SW/4, Sec. 10, T-22-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Additional Comments:**

Mr. Walker stated he would like to direct Staff not to accept any more applications for towers unless the applicant provides a map showing all of their existing towers that are in use. He explained that by receiving the map, the people working on trying to locate towers will have that information. Mr. Walker further explained that that will help determine what might be a reasonable grid system to allow.

Mr. Gardner stated he would make it part of the formal policy and it will be brought to the next meeting to make a formal procedure.

**Case No. 1458**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit a 150' cellular telephone antenna tower in an IL zoned district. **SECTION 220. HEIGHT EXCEPTIONS** - Use Unit 4, located 6409 North 114th East Avenue.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Lee Ann Fager/SW Bell Services**, represented by Vicky Hale, 100 West 5th, submitted a site plan (Exhibit B-2) and photographs (Exhibit B-1). Ms. Hale stated that this site is a 150' self-supporting tower in an IL zoned district. She explained that the industrial location is located off Highway 169, which is the Mingo Valley Expressway at approximately 36th Street North. Ms. Hale further explained that the area is in a flood zone and will not likely be developed with any residential or commercial development. She indicated that a commercial enterprise has already made arrangements to erect at least, and perhaps as many as three, 60' parking signs (billboards) on the front of the subject property.



**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Looney asked the applicant if there are any residences south or east of the subject property? Ms. Hale stated that there is a residence that is owned by the owner of the subject property and it is a rental property. She indicated the house is located quite some distance to the south.

Mr. Walker stated that the one to one ratio will not be met on this particular application. Mr. Earl Higgins, SW Bell Services, 11529 East Pine, stated that the ratio is met with the home and tower separation, but not on the property. He explained that the area is all floodplain and there cannot be any residential houses built in this area. He stated that SW Bell Services has met all FEMA applications and met with Mr. Glenn. He further stated that there will be three 60' billboards built on the subject property, which will be in front of the tower.

Mr. Walker asked if this will be a monopole or lattice tower? Ms. Hale stated it will be a lattice tower, which is also known as a self-supporting tower.

Mr. Alberty stated that this property does abut an RMH district, but it is actually a floodplain and will not be developed.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE Special Exception** to permit a 150' cellular telephone antenna tower in an IL zoned district. **SECTION 220. HEIGHT EXCEPTIONS** - Use Unit 4; per plan submitted; finding that the approval of this application will not be injurious to the neighborhood and in harmony with the spirit and intent of the Code, on the following described property:

Part of the SW/4, NW/4, Sec. 5, T-20-N, R-14-E, I.B.M., Tulsa County, Oklahoma, Beg. 1118.4' E of the NW/c said SW/4, NW/4; thence S for 1320' to S line said SW/4, NW/4; thence E along said S line to SE/c said SW/4, NW/4; thence N along E line said SW/4, NW/4 to NE/c said SW/4, NW/4; thence W to POB.

**Additional Comments:**

Mr. Walker requested that the applicant provide pictures of the various towers and a map showing the existing towers.

Ms. Hale asked if the map is required with the next application or as soon as it is available? Mr. Walker stated the map is required as soon as it can be provided.

Mr. Beach stated the map will be needed with all future applications.

Case No. 1458 (continued)

Mr. Walker stated the map will need to include the whole county that shows the existing towers in use. He further stated that from that point the applicant can supply a map showing the additions or update the map and submit to the Board. Mr. Walker clarified that the applicant only has to indicate their own towers on the map.

## **NEW APPLICATIONS**

### **Case No. 1464**

#### **Action Requested:**

Variance to allow 2 dwelling units (one mobile home & one existing house) on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD** and a Special Exception to allow a mobile home in an RS district. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9, located 14315 East 58th Street North.

#### **Presentation:**

The applicant, **James A. Traywick & Barbara Traywick**, 14315 East 58th Street North, Owasso, submitted photographs (Exhibit B-1) and site plan (Exhibit B-2). Mr. Traywick stated the trailer is being moved in for his son's family. He explained that there has been a trailer on the proposed site before and everything is setup for a trailer. Mr. Traywick indicated that there are several trailers in the area.

#### **Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Walker asked the applicant if he had a time frame on how long the trailer will be located on the subject property? Mr. Traywick stated that hopefully his son will be able to move the trailer somewhere else in the near future.

Mr. Looney asked the applicant if he did have a time limitation in mind? Mr. Traywick stated he hoped it will be within two years.

Mr. Eller asked the applicant if he was on septic or sewer? He stated the trailer will be on septic, which was setup for two trailers previously. He further stated the trailer will be hooked up to the City of Collinsville water.

Case No. 1464 (continued)

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** to allow 2 dwelling units (one mobile home & one existing house) on one lot of record. **SECTION 208. ONE SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING PER LOT OF RECORD** and a **Special Exception** to allow a mobile home in an RS district. **SECTION 401. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9; per plan submitted; subject to a limitation of 2 years; subject to tie downs and skirting; subject to the Health Department approval; finding that the applicant is helping his son out during financial difficulty; finding that the subject property is a large lot and that there are double units elsewhere; finding that the approval of this application will not be injurious to the neighborhood, nor harmful to the spirit and intent of the Code, on the following described property:

A tract of land in the SE/4, Sec. 4, T-20-N, R-14-E, I.B.M., Tulsa, Oklahoma, more particularly described as follows, to wit: Beginning at a point 986' N of the S Line and 330.83' W of the E line and parallel to E line for 330' to a point, thence W and parallel to the S line for 330.83' to a point; thence S and parallel to the E line for 330 to a point; thence E and parallel to S line for 330.83' to POB, containing 2.506 acres more or less-less the S 25' for a roadway according to the U.S. Survey thereof, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Case No. 1466**

**Action Requested:**

Special Exception to permit a mobile home in an RS district. **SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9, located 6022 South 57th West Avenue.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Wynona Graves Vasseur**, 6103 South 58th West Avenue, submitted a plot plan (Exhibit C-1), application for a building permit (Exhibit C-2) and stated that the subject property is a rental property. Ms. Vasseur explained that there was an old house, but she had it torn down. She stated she would like to install a mobile home on the subject property for her son and his family.

**Comments and Questions:**

Mr. Walker asked the applicant if the mobile home will be going into the same location where the house previously existed? She indicated the mobile home will be in the same location where the house previously existed.

Case No. 1466 (continued)

Mr. Looney asked the applicant if the mobile home will be on city sewer and water? She answered affirmatively.

Mr. Gardner asked the applicant if there were other mobile homes in the area? She stated that there are six trailers within a six to seven block radius.

Mr. Beach informed the Board that there has been 26 mobile homes approved in the area since 1980.

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **ELLER**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Special Exception** to permit a mobile home in an RS district. **SECTION 410. PRINCIPAL USES PERMITTED IN THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 9; per plan submitted; subject to skirting and tie downs; subject to Health Department approval; finding that the area is a mixed use area; finding that the approval of this application will not be injurious to the neighborhood, nor harmful to the spirit and intent of the Code, on the following described property:

Lots 25 & 26, Block 15, East Addition, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**Case No. 1467**

**Action Requested:**

Variance of minimum lot width requirement for AG district from 200', down to 165'. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6, located 129th Street North & Sheridan.

**Presentation:**

The applicant, **Kim Shott**, 198 South Sandusky, stated that 6 1/2 years ago an approval was granted on the subject property, however he was not aware that he only had three years to file the lot split deed. He explained that two months ago he went to file the lot split deed and was informed that it was too late to file. He requested that the Board reaffirm the approval from 6 1/2 years ago. Mr. Shott affirmed that he will get the lot split as soon as possible if this request is granted.

Case No. 1467 (continued)

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** a **Variance** of minimum lot width requirement for AG district from 200', down to 165'. **SECTION 330. BULK AND AREA REQUIREMENTS IN THE AGRICULTURE DISTRICTS** - Use Unit 6; finding that the Board approved the request in 1990, however the applicant failed to file before the three year limitation; finding that the approval of this application will not be injurious to the neighborhood, nor harmful to the spirit and intent of the Code, on the following described property:

S/2, S/2, NW, SW, Sec. 35, T-22-N, R-13-E, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**Consider Approval of 1997 Meeting Schedule**

**Board Action:**

On **MOTION** of **LOONEY**, the Board voted 5-0-0 (Alberty, Eller, Looney, Tyndall, Walker, "aye"; no "nays"; no "abstentions"; no "absent") to **APPROVE** 1997 meeting schedule as presented.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Date approved: Dec. 17, 1996

Robert L Walker  
Chair