

Board of Adjustment

Minutes

City Council Chambers

March 6, 2019

Boardmembers Present:

Wade Swanson-Chair
Chris Jones- Vice-Chair
Trent Montague
Ken Rembold
Steve Curran
Kathy Tolman
Adam Gunderson

Board Members Absent:

None

Staff Present:

Nana Appiah
Lisa Davis
Wahid Alam
Charlotte Bridges
Veronica Gonzalez
Cassidy Welch
Erik Hansen
Margaret Robertson
Mike Gildenstern

Others Present:

Steven Bailey
EJ Hughes
Andrea Bailey
Rogelio Pena
Andrea Privett
Grace Howard
(Others Present)

The study session began at 4:32 p.m. and concluded at 5:15 p.m. The Public Hearing began at 5:30 p.m., before adjournment at 6:53 p.m., the following items were considered and recorded.

Board of Adjustment Study Session

1. Call meeting to order

Study Session began at 4:32 p.m.

2. Zoning Administrator's Report

2-a. Zoning Administrator Appiah informed the Board that new Board of Adjustment formats for staff reports will be presented and discussed at the April 3, 2019 Board of Adjustment Study Session.

3. Review and discuss items listed on the Public Hearing agenda for March 6, 2019.

The items scheduled for the Board's Public Hearing were discussed.

4. Adjournment

Study Session adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Board of Adjustment Public Hearing

Call meeting to order

Public Hearing began at 5:30 p.m.

1. Take action on all consent agenda items.

Items on the Consent Agenda

2. Consider the Minutes from the February 6, 2019 meeting

On a motion by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson, the Board unanimously approved the February 6, 2019 minutes and Consent Agenda as read by Vice-Chair Jones.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

3. Take action on the following cases:

A motion to approve the following cases on the consent agenda as read by Vice-Chair Jones was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

***3-a Case No.: BOA18-00768 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

Location: Within the 800 block of North Country Club Drive (east side) (District 1)

Subject: *Requesting a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) to allow modifications to development standards in the LC and OC Districts.*

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: A motion to approve case BOA18-00768 as read by Vice-Chair Jones with the acceptance of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson to approve with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the final site plan and landscape plan submitted, except as modified by the conditions below;
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department regarding the issuance of building permits.
3. Compliance with the conditions of case ZON18-01014.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

The Board's decision is based upon the following Findings of Fact:

FINDINGS:

- A. The development site is zoned OC and LC and includes existing improvements for First Christian Church and Child Crisis Arizona.
- B. The proposed improvements to the ±0.39-acre parcel include increasing the setbacks along the north property line and Country Club Drive, installation of new landscape islands within the parking field and installation of new landscape material.
- C. Full compliance with current development standards would require demolition of existing improvements including removal of parking and circulation.
- D. The modifications requested constitute the greatest degree of compliance with the MZO.
- E. The proposed improvements will result in a development that is not detrimental to the adjacent properties or neighborhood.

***3-b Case No.: BOA18-00837 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

Location: Within the 1700 through the 1800 blocks of North Country Club Drive (west side) (District 1)

Subject: *Requesting a Substantial Conformance Improvement Permit (SCIP) to allow modifications to development standards in the LC District.*

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: A motion to approve case BOA18-00837 as read by Vice-Chair Jones with the acceptance of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson to approve with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the site plan submitted, except as modified by the conditions below;
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department regarding the issuance of building permits.
3. Compliance with the conditions of case ZON18-00827.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

The Board's decision is based upon the following Findings of Fact:

FINDINGS:

- A. The site is zoned Limited Commercial (LC) and is part of an existing storage facility that was constructed in the 1980's.
- B. Proposed improvements to the site include construction of a new 12, 320 SF building on the newly acquired property, as well as enhanced building elevations to the existing storage facility, installation of sidewalk and landscape for the entire frontage of the property along Country Club Drive.
- C. The proposed improvements will not create any new non-conformities.
- D. The modifications requested constitute the greatest degree of compliance with the MZO.
- E. The proposed improvements will result in a development that is not detrimental to the adjacent properties or neighborhood.

3-c Case No.: BOA18-00916 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Location: 733 North Longmore (District 3)

Subject: *Requesting in the RS-6 District: 1) a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow a wireless communications facility in the RS-6 District; and 2) a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow a wireless communications facility to exceed the maximum height allowed.*

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: Chair Swanson reviewed the criteria used for hearing a Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) case, what evidence can be admitted, and restated that Federal Law preempts local law.

Grace Howard, 738 N. Standage, was opposed to the case, but did not wish to speak. Chair Swanson noted that Ms. Howard mentioned a health concern on her speaker card which would be entered into the record, but asked the Board not to consider that as evidence.

Andrea Privett, 1511 W. 7th Place, was opposed to the case, but did not wish to speak.

Chair Swanson also noted that Steven Bailey, 1530 W. 7th Street, was opposed to the case, and had submitted some documents to the Board. These documents included a petition that was distributed to the neighbors to reject the proposed Wireless Communication Facility (WCF), and a tally of which neighbors received communication from the applicant. Chair Swanson stated that this would be made part of the record.

Steven Bailey explained to the Board that he had submitted to the Board for their review, an excerpt from The Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 addressing WCFs, as well as a document from the League of California Cities, specifically Sections 6409 and 6409A, which implement Federal Communications Commission (FCC) WCF rules, which specify that a WCF could be raised 20' without public opinion or public process.

The applicant, Darren Snodgrass, Velocitel, 222 S. 52nd St., Tempe, AZ presented the case to the Board.

The applicant explained to Boardmember Jones that the WCF was proposed to address primarily a capacity issue.

The applicant explained to Boardmember Rembold that a lack of capacity is determined primarily through complaints, and an analysis of data stream in the area.

The applicant explained to Boardmember Curran that the proposed WCF will help offload the demand from existing facilities.

Rogelio Pena, 1511 W. 7th Place, was opposed to the case, and stated that he didn't like the design choice and location of the WCF, and that he was concerned that people that have issues with being closely located to a WCF would lose interest in buying his home.

Andrea Bailey, 1530 W. 7th St., was opposed to the case, and was disappointed that Velocitel was slow to comply with neighborhood notification requirements and communication regarding neighborhood meetings.

Steven Bailey, 1530 W. 7th St., was opposed to the case, and stated that he believed that a majority of the neighborhood is opposed to it as well. Mr. Bailey went on to say that he had collected a petition of 15 names against the WCF. Mr. Bailey felt that there are emotional and legitimate concerns regarding the WCF, and that he didn't feel that it was compatible with the area, and it would create an eyesore.

Mr. Bailey went on to reference studies that show that property values decline 15-20% after a WCF is constructed in an area.

Mr. Bailey cited excerpts from the Middle Class Tax Relief and Jobs Creation Act of 2012 document, specifically the FCC's implementation of WCF expansion in section 6409A, regarding the height, and how it can be extended an additional 20' without public notification or input.

Mr. Bailey continued by saying that the neighborhood meeting was poorly attended. He went on to cite Chapter 35 in the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, saying that it's the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that other locations were not technically more feasible when siting a WCF, but that he has not heard any convincing evidence that other locations were less feasible than the one chosen at Whittier Elementary.

Mr. Bailey explained to the Board that the information regarding the average percentage loss of property value when a WCF is constructed in a location, was taken from a report using thousands of samples as evidence. Mr. Bailey also noted that according to United States Department of Housing and Urban Development guidelines, a WCF must be noted and commented on by an appraiser, along with other observable site hazards and nuisances, in evaluating the marketability of a site.

City Attorney Robertson stated that it's within the rights of the Board to ask an applicant about other sites that were reviewed, why they were rejected, and why this one was selected. She added that because it's a Special Use Permit, the case would be guided by SUP requirements, and not variance requirements.

Staffmember Davis stated that the applicant was in compliance with Chapter 35 in the Mesa Zoning Ordinance, regarding Antennas and Wireless Communications Facilities, specifically meeting the required "height of the pole + 1' setback to residential districts and right of way, the "stealth" design requirement, and that the project is located more

than 1000' from existing WCFs. Staffmember Davis stated that the project is meeting or exceeding requirements, as the WCF is landscaped, the applicant has worked with Whittier Elementary, the project is compliant with the General Plan, the project isn't deemed detrimental/injurious, and there is infrastructure available to the site.

City Attorney Robertson confirmed for Boardmember Curran that the tower could be raised 20' and the width increased to sustain the use of the cell tower without providing public notification, and without coming back to Board for approval, per Section 6409 in the Middle Class Tax Act of 2012.

Mr. Bailey stated that he was confused as to why this review was approached as a "gap in coverage" application, even though the applicant has mentioned multiple times that it was to remedy a capacity issue.

The applicant stated that according to the United States Chamber of Commerce, cell communication coverage is listed as necessary infrastructure, as the country is now 51% wireless and the capacity needs effect the coverage. The applicant went on to say that at Staff's request, the neighborhood notification distance was expanded from 500' to 1000', 390 notices went out, and 40 different neighborhood groups within 1 mile of the site were notified. The applicant concluded by saying that the placement of the shade trees to complement the WCF was dictated by the school, for the benefit of the children on the playground.

Chair Swanson confirmed with the applicant that the proposed WCF meets the setback from a residential use, that there wasn't an available WCF to co-locate on, that there wasn't a suitable Industrial or Commercial Zoning District location, and that the applicant is employing the most favored siting and design approach. Chair Swanson closed by confirming with Staffmember Davis that the WCF application was for capacity and coverage purposes.

The applicant stated that generally speaking there is data coverage, however it is inadequate for the area.

The applicant confirmed for Boardmember Rembold that property appraisals vary from appraiser to appraiser.

Chair Swanson confirmed the mailing range, and the dates and the details of the neighborhood notifications that were sent out to the neighborhood.

The applicant explained to Boardmember Jones that a WCF location within the Riverview Shopping Center to the northwest of the current site would not be viable, as there is already a WCF located on the site, and if a new WCF were to be constructed in that location, it would cause interference.

Boardmember Rembold stated that he is not sure that the proposed WCF will diminish property values, and that he thinks that the applicant has followed the proper procedure in obtaining the proper site.

Chair Swanson stated that arguments have been made that the WCF is an eyesore and that it will decrease property value, but if it were to be placed somewhere else, the alternate neighborhood would have the same arguments. Chair Swanson concluded that WCFs have got to be placed somewhere, as they are a reality of the modern world.

Boardmember Tolman stated that she sympathized with the neighbors, and that she agreed that it's an eyesore, but since the applicant has satisfied the requirements, the applicant's request must be approved.

Motion: A motion to approve case BOA18-00916 with Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Curran to approve with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the plans dated February 18, 2019, except as modified by the following conditions:
2. The wireless communication facility shall utilize a mono-elm design with a maximum height of sixty-five feet (65') to the top of the steel tower. The artificial tree branches used for stealth design shall be allowed to be at a maximum height of seventy feet (70').
3. The stealth design of the wireless communication facility shall conform to the following standards:
 - (a) Provide (3) branches per linear foot of tree height.
 - (b) Provide curved antenna branches to better conceal antenna panels.
 - (c) All antennas, mounting hardware, and other equipment near the antennas shall be painted to match the color of the faux elm branches.
 - (d) Provide bark color and texture cladding along the entire length of the pole to match the bark of a natural elm tree. This shall include multiple colors to better simulate the bark of a tree.
 - (e) Antenna socks with leaves and branches shall be installed to match the tree foliage to assist in the concealment.
 - (f) The faux elm branches shall start at 15' from the ground level. (This height may be adjusted depending on the overall tree height to ensure it is proportional.)
 - (g) The faux elm branch density shall not be reduced near the antenna arrays.
 - (h) The faux branches shall extend past the antennas a minimum of 12".
4. The antenna array stand-off shall not exceed 2'-6" maximum from the pole.
5. The antenna array for each sector shall not exceed an overall length of 4'.
6. Any future co-location carrier antennas shall be fully screened and concealed with branches and antenna socks.
7. The area containing the equipment shelter and generator shall be screened by a minimum 8' tall masonry wall, or a wall equivalent to the height of the equipment being screened. This screening wall shall be finished with stucco and painted to match the color of the adjacent school buildings. The access gate shall be a solid metal gate painted to be compatible with the structure.
8. Provide a permanent, weather-proof identification sign, approximately 16-inches by 32-inches in size on the gate of the fence identifying the facility operator(s), operator's address, and 24-hour telephone number for reaching the operator or an agent authorized to provide 24/7 response to emergency situations.
9. Provide and maintain four natural living Majestic Ash trees minimum height of 35' tall, as shown on the friends plan to camouflage the proposed wireless communication facility.
10. Provide and maintain a 5'-wide landscape area around the masonry wall enclosure of the facility, with decomposed granite, and shrubs planted at 6' on center.
11. Maintenance of the facility shall conform to the requirements of Zoning Ordinance Section 11-35-5.1.

12. The operator of the WCF shall respond to and complete all identified maintenance and repair of the facility within 30-days of receiving written notice of the problem.
13. No later than 90 days from the date the use is discontinued or from the cessation of operations, the owner of the abandoned tower or the owner of the property on which the facilities are sited shall remove all equipment and improvements associated with the use and shall restore the site to its original condition as shown on the plans submitted with the original approved application. The owner or his agent shall provide written verification of the removal of the wireless communications facility within 30 days of the date the removal is completed.
14. Future modifications must be approved by the Planning Director to ensure the modifications remain in compliance with the stealth elements, outlined in condition number 3, for the mono-elm or base station as approved with the subject request (case# BOA18-00916) and the Mesa Zoning Ordinance as amended.
15. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department regarding the issuance of building permits.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

The Board's decision is based upon the following Findings of Fact:

FINDINGS:

- A. The proposed location is a residentially zoned site that is within the Whittier Elementary School property.
- B. The proposed mono-elm design is considered a stealth design.
- C. The proposed mono-elm is designed principally to address a significant gap in coverage, and a capacity shortfall.
- D. The mono-elm design and the proposed planting of four Majestic Ash trees on the school site will enhance the ability for the tower to blend with its surroundings.
- E. The proposed mono-elm will include a minimum 8' CMU enclosure and 5' of landscape area for screening of the base of the tower and associated equipment.
- F. The stealth design mono-elm is proposed to be setback more than the proposed height of 65, and plus one foot from all residential uses and the nearest Right-of-Way.
- G. The proposed mono-elm is located more than 186± feet from the nearest residential properties, specifically on the south side of 7th Place.
- H. The proposed mono-elm conform with the applicable requirements of MZO 11-35-5 and MZO11-35-6.
- I. The proposed mono-elm is compatible with the Neighborhood Suburban character type of the General Plan.
- J. The proposed mono-elm, masonry wall, and landscape material will be compatible and not detrimental to the surrounding neighborhood.
- K. The location of the tower in a residential district is necessary for the provision of personal wireless services to surrounding residents.

***3-d Case No.: BOA18-00926 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

Location: Within the 4400 block of East University Drive (north side) (District 2)

Subject: *Requesting in the LC District: 1) a Development Incentive Permit (DIP) to allow modifications to development standards; and 2) a Variance to allow a monument sign to be placed in the future width line of the right of way.*

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: A motion to approve case BOA18-00926 as read by Vice-Chair Jones with the acceptance of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson to approve with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the site plan submitted, except as modified by the conditions below.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department in the issuance of building permits.
3. Compliance with all requirements of case ZON18-00925
4. Compliance with all requirements of Design Review.
5. All signs shall comply with the approved Comprehensive Sign Plan (BA88-008), or any future modifications to the Comprehensive Sign Plan.
6. As required by Mesa Zoning Ordinance Section 11-47-7, prior to the issuance of a sign permit:
 - a. The sign owner must enter into the City's sign agreement indicating that the sign owner is responsible for the cost of relocating the sign, at the owner's expense, to an authorized location outside the right-of-way when the right-of-way is widened or when required by the City.
 - b. The sign owner must submit a Certificate of Insurance that complies with the City's current insurance requirements.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

The Board's decision is based upon the following Findings of Fact:

FINDINGS for DIP:

- A. The site is ±0.38 acres and has been in its current configuration for more than 10 years.
- B. The site is served by, or has direct access to, existing utility systems.
- C. The total developable land area within 1,200' of the site is not more than 25% vacant.
- D. Greater than 50% of lots within 1,200' of the site have been developed for more than 15 years.
- E. This request for a DIP will allow for the development of a bypassed parcel.
- F. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan designation in this area, which is "Neighborhood Village".

- G. The requested modifications are necessary to accommodate the proposal and will result in a development that is commensurate with existing development in the vicinity.
- H. Compliance with Site Plan Review approval (Case# ZON18-00925) and Design Review approval (Case# DRB18-00927) to ensure the level of site improvements, architectural detailing and design elements on the building will meet the intent of the Design Standards of the MZO.

FINDINGS for VARIANCE:

- A. The variance is required to allow a monument sign to be placed within the future width line of the right-of-way.
- B. The parcel was created in 1989 when the required right-of-way width was 55’.
- C. After the creation of the lot, the required future right-of-way width was increased to 65’.
- D. Placing the monument sign outside of the future right-of-way, would impose an unfair restriction on the applicant by not permitting detached signage.
- E. The existing monument sign for the group commercial center surrounding the site is placed within the future right-of-way.
- F. The proposed size, height and setback from existing detached signs will meet current MZO requirements.

***3-e Case No.: BOA18-00989 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

Location: 1951 & 1955 West Baseline Road; and 2051 South Dobson Road (District 3)

Subject: *Requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow modifications to an existing Comprehensive Sign Plan (CSP) in the LC-PAD District.*

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: A motion to approve case BOA18-00989 as read by Vice-Chair Jones with the acceptance of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson to approve with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the site plan, sign plan details, and project narrative submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department in the issuance of sign permits.
3. The detached sign proposed at Dobson Road shall be reduced in height from the proposed 12' to a maximum of 8' in height.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

The Board's decision is based upon the following Findings of Fact:

FINDINGS:

- A. The existing commercial center was constructed in the 1970's.
- B. The proposed CSP does not modify attached sign allowances.
- C. The proposed CSP modifications with staff recommended conditions of approval meets the criteria of Section 11-70-3 of the MZO. It is consistent with the goals of the General Plan, the development is consistent with the district, the detached signs will not be injurious or detrimental to the adjacent or surrounding properties, and adequate public services are provided to the project.
- D. The proposed CSP modifications with staff recommended conditions of approval meets the criteria outlined in Section 11-46-3 of the MZO. The commercial buildings are setback from 271' from Baseline Road and 142' from Dobson Road and limits visibility. The existing bank at the northwest corner of the site restricts visibility to the commercial center.
- E. The sign criteria within the CSP is tailored to this specific development. The design of the signs, with the staff recommended conditions of approval, is consistent with the architectural style of the center.

***3-f Case No.: BOA19-00044 APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**

Location: 524 South Barkley (District 4)

Subject: *Requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow an alteration or enlargement of a structure to extend into an existing nonconforming yard in the RS-6 District.*

Decision: Approved with Conditions

Summary: This item was on the consent agenda and not discussed on an individual basis.

Motion: A motion to approve case BOA19-00044 as read by Vice-Chair Jones with the acceptance of Findings of Fact and Conditions of Approval, was made by Boardmember Rembold and seconded by Boardmember Gunderson to approve with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the site plan submitted.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services Department in the issuance of a building permit.

Vote: 7-0

Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:

AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson

NAYS – None

The Board's decision is based upon the following Findings of Fact:

FINDINGS:

- A. The home was constructed in 1966.
- B. The south side of the existing home (carport and storage room) encroaches 5' into the required 10' side yard and the aggregate of both yards is only 10', whereas the current MZO requires an aggregate of 15' for both side yards.
- C. The existing home is considered "existing, nonconforming."
- D. The proposed additions are in-line with the south of the existing home, and do not further reduce the existing nonconforming side yard.
- E. The proposed addition meets the MZO 11-36.7.B criteria to request a SUP to allow alterations and enlargements that extend into a nonconforming yard because the enlargement would not further reduce the nonconforming yard.

- F. This request conforms with the criteria for the granting of a SUP as outlined in Section 11-70-5 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance by providing the following findings:
1. This single residence is located in the Suburban Neighborhood character type of the Mesa 2040 General Plan. The proposed addition is consistent with the policies of the General Plan for single residential neighborhoods.
 2. The project is consistent with the standards of the RS-6 District (with a SUP) and conforms with the General Plan.
 - C. The proposed project is consistent with the scale of development of the surrounding neighborhood and will not be detrimental or injurious to the surrounding properties, the neighborhood or the City.
 - D. The proposed project is served by existing City of Mesa utilities and public infrastructure.

Items not on the Consent Agenda

4. Take action on the following cases:

Item 3-c Case No.: BOA18-00916 733 North Longmore (District 3)

Subject: *Requesting in the RS-6 District: 1) a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow a wireless communications facility in the RS-6 District; and 2) a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow a wireless communications facility to exceed the maximum height allowed.*

Vote: 7-0
Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:
AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson
NAYS – None

5. Other business

None.

6. Items from citizens present

None.

7. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Boardmember Jones and seconded by Boardmember Rembold.

Vote: 7-0
Upon tabulation of vote, it showed:
AYES – Swanson, Jones, Montague, Rembold, Curran, Tolman, Gunderson
NAYS – None

Public Hearing adjourned at 6:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Davis,
On behalf of Zoning Administrator (Nana Appiah)