

CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
NOVEMBER 24, 2009
9:00 A.M. – 2:03 P.M.

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>2/2009 through 1/2010</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Sam Mitchell, Chair	P	10	0
Genia Ellis, Vice Chair	P	10	0
Howard Elfman	P	4	3
Joan Hinton	P	4	2
Howard Nelson [9:10]	P	7	0
Jan Sheppard	P	10	0
Chad Thilborger [Alternate]	P	4	1
Paul Dooley [Alternate]	P	2	0

Staff Present

Bruce Jolly, Board Attorney
Brian McKelligett, Clerk /Code Enforcement Board Supervisor
Ginger Wald, Assistant City Attorney
Skip Margerum, Code Enforcement Supervisor
Dee Paris, Administrative Aide
Deb Maxey, Clerk III
Lori Grossfeld, Clerk III
Yvette Ketor, Secretary, Code Enforcement Board
Burt Ford, Building Inspector
George Oliva, Building Inspector
Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector
Tammy Arana, Fire Inspector
Ron Tetreault, Fire Inspector
Robert Kisarewich, Fire Inspector
J. Opperee, Recording Secretary

Communication to the City Commission

- 1) By consensus, the Board requested that the City Commission complete appointments for the Board.
- 2) By consensus, the Board requested that Mr. Thilborger replace Mr. Perkins as a full member of the Board

Respondents and Witnesses

CE08041358: Mary Lee, owner
CE08071153: Monique Eames, owner's wife
CE07081409: Caryn Deri, owner
CE08050944: Scott Mello, contractor
CE07031444: Michael Madfis, architect
CE07030178: Arturo Bengochea, architect; Devendra Singh, owner
CE06110950: Daniel Sieloff, agent
CE07110290: Jennifer Manzo, owner's daughter; Ovidio Benitez, owner
CE08031527: Ramon Estevez, prospective owner; Oliver Abeleda, owner's husband
CE08100511: Paul Warner, owner; Rendell Diaz, partner
CE09061774: Eric Carbonell, permit runner, Eric Rodriguez, owner
CE08021545; CE07071088: Jerome Petrisko, owner
CE08101135: Anthony Provenzale, owner
CE08072031: Jo Anne Gallipault, attorney for the bank
CE08102347: J. Randolph Scott, owner; Caprice Scott, owner
CE09010920: Melissa Mazzotta, owner
CE08100204: Nino Barone, owner
CE08010621; CE07060475; CE08051038: Jose Hernandez, contractor
CE06091178: Victor Estrada, owner
CE08042519: Lisa Dumetz, owner
CE08072176: Waltraud Pawlik, owner
CE09010707: Leones Mertilus, owner
CE04120642: James Mears, owner; Orvil Wayne Denton
CE09021154: Scott Mulheron, contractor
CE08020079: James Manoli, owner
CE08061254: Glenn Lastrella, contractor
CE07110906: Jo Anne Gallipault, bank representative; Odessa Graham, owner; Johnnie McCullough, owner
CE07070394: Rene Rodriguez, bank representative
CE09051042: Maxo Sinal, owner
CE08061308: Sue Scott Richards, realtor; Beth Priest, attorney for the buyer
CE08100515: Abe Borujedi, owner's son
CE05012419: Johnnie Slaughter, owner
CE08031945: Zorinah Salaam, owner; Safiyyah Salaam, owner's mother
CE08051216: Catherine Sonaglia, owner
CE071000923: Carol Storms, owner
CE04082149: Richard Coker, attorney for the owner; Janet Lhota, attorney for the tenant; Christian Winkle, president; Kenneth Springer, operations manager
CE02080991: Stephen Goldenberg, attorney

Chair Mitchell called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m., introduced Board members and explained the procedures for the hearing.

Individuals wishing to speak on any of the cases on today's agenda were sworn in.

Case: CE08041358

Mary A Lee
413 Northwest 14 Terrace

This case was first heard on 9/23/08 to comply per stipulated agreement by 11/25/08. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Ms. Mary Lee, owner, stated she had been unable to obtain outside funding for the work. She requested 91 days to complete the work on her own. Ms. Lee informed Chair Mitchell that she had suffered some financial and health setbacks recently, and she had needed to find a job to afford to make the repairs.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said he was in favor of granting the extension.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6 - 0.

Case: CE08071153

Theon Eames
1300 Northwest 2 Avenue

This case was first heard on 9/23/08 to comply by 11/25/08. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the property complied. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/12/09.

Ms. Monique Eames, the owner's wife, stated the new drawings had been submitted to the City the previous day; it had taken two months to receive the revisions from the architect. Ms. Eames requested a 91-day extension.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said he was in favor of granting a 91-day extension. He confirmed the plans had been resubmitted the previous day.

Motion made by Ms. Sheppard, seconded by Ms. Ellis to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 6 - 0.

[Mr. Nelson arrived at 9:10]

Case: CE08031945

Deutsche Bank National Trust Company Trustee
2580 Northwest 16 Street

This case was first heard on 2/24/09 to comply by 4/28/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, the order had been recorded and fines had accrued to \$94,050.

Ms. Safiyyah Salaam, mother of the owner, explained that her daughter had purchased the house and later discovered the violations. She stated the plans had been returned for corrections.

Ms. Paris explained that unless the property was sold or taken back by the bank in a foreclosure, the case remained in the name of the owner originally cited.

Ms. Salaam stated when her daughter purchased the house in April, the seller had told her regarding violations that "there may be some, but they did not state exactly what it was."

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said the plans had been resubmitted on November 18 and he favored a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE07081409

Richard & Gloria Gold
15 Fort Royal Isle

This case was first heard on 6/24/08 to comply per stipulated agreement by 9/23/08. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, the order had been recorded and fines had accrued to \$129,300. Ms. Paris stated the property had changed hands twice since the original citation.

Ms. Caryn Deri, current owner, said she had purchased the property in May 2009. She stated she had hired an architect to draw plans for after-the-fact permits for work done by a previous owner.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, confirmed that the previous owners had done work without permits and the new owners were working to comply. He reported both permits had been approved on November 20, 2009 and when the permits were paid, the property would be complied.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Sheppard to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08050944

Patricia Ann T & Steven J Miga
3209 Northeast 36 Street # 4B

This case was first heard on 2/24/09 to comply per stipulated agreement by 4/28/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/12/09. Ms. Paris noted all violations were now complied. Fines had accrued to \$10,600 and the City was recommending no fine be imposed.

Mr. Scott Mello, contractor, confirmed that the violations were complied. He presented photos of the completed work and requested abatement of the fines.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, confirmed the property was complied.

Motion made by Ms. Sheppard, seconded by Mr. Elfman to impose no fine. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE07031444

Bill Richardson Trust
2491 State Road 84

This case was first heard on 11/25/08 to comply by 1/27/09 and 2/24/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Michael Madfis, architect, reported he had reviewed the plans with the City and said he would submit applications for the permits this week. He requested a 119-day extension to do the work. Mr. Madfis described the extent of work that must be done in the 100,000 square foot building and on the property. He believed the fire protection system would easily take three to four months.

Mr. Robert Kisarewich, Fire Inspector, confirmed he had met with Mr. Madfis to review the plans.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, stated he was in favor of granting a 119-day extension.

Motion made by Ms. Sheppard, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 119-day extension to 3/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE07030178

Devendra Singh
501 Southwest 27 Avenue

This case was first heard on 6/26/07 to comply by 9/25/07. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was

requesting imposition of a \$19,950 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property complied. Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. Art Bengochea, architect, explained that the remaining items were not threats to life/safety, and that the property was secure, unoccupied and fenced. He reminded the Board that the owner had gone through the DRC process, which had taken some time. The owner had requested to be able to erect a wood fence instead of masonry. Mr. Bengochea requested a 91-day extension. He explained to Ms. Sheppard that there was an apartment building zoned commercial to the south and a residential apartment building to the rear of the property. They intended to fence the rear property border only.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said he was in favor of granting a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE06110950

Fram Fed Five Inc
1611 North Federal Highway

This case was first heard on 10/27/09 to comply by 11/24/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. Ms. Paris noted violations that were now complied.

Mr. Daniel Sieloff, agent, requested a 61-day extension to reseal the parking lot. In the past 30 days, he stated they had complied all other violations. Mr. Sieloff said he had submitted plans the previous day.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, confirmed the paving permit application had been submitted, and said he did not object to granting an extension.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Mr. Nelson to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE07110290

Ovidio Canales
821 Southwest 26 Street

This case was first heard on 2/24/09 to comply by 3/24/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was complied, fines had accrued to \$17,800 and the City was recommending fines of \$520 for administrative costs. Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, recommended imposing a \$520 fine for administrative costs.

Ms. Jennifer Manzo, the owner's daughter, said her parents had complied with GMAC's pre-payment plan and GMAC had indicated that after this hearing, they would let her know if a permanent modification was available. She admitted they did not have anything in writing from GMAC.

Inspector Oliva recommended imposing no fine.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Ms. Sheppard to abate the fine.

Mr. Nelson noted that since no fine had been imposed, the Board could not abate a fine.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose a \$520 fine.

Ms. Ellis withdrew her motion and Ms. Sheppard agreed.

Mr. Nelson was concerned that GMAC would take advantage of the fine reduction but not offer Mr. Canales the mortgage modification. Ms. Manzo said she had let GMAC know that since they had taken care of the violations, they expected GMAC to come through with the modification. She stated the GMAC representative had led her to believe the modification would be granted.

Ms. Wald confirmed that the bank had filed a lis pendens on the property in 2008 but had not moved forward with a summary judgment. Any lien would remain against the homeowners.

Mr. Nelson modified his motion to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose no fine. Mr. Elfman agreed. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08031527

Karen Abeleda
608 Southwest 16 Avenue

This case was first heard on 8/26/08 to comply per stipulated agreement by 10/28/08. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was complied, fines had accrued to \$21,250 and the City was recommending a \$520 fine be imposed for administrative costs. Service was via posting on the property on 11/9/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. Oliver Abeleda, the owner's husband, said the property was for sale, and the prospective buyer was present. He said he had a short sale under contract.

Mr. Ron Tetreault, Fire Inspector, recommended a \$520 fine for administrative costs.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose a \$520 fine. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE02080991

Croissant Park Dry Storage
211 Southwest 15 Street

This case was first heard on 9/22/09 to comply by 11/24/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine that would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the property complied. Service was via posting on the property on 11/9/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. Stephen Goldenberg, attorney for the owner, requested an extension. He explained that the owner was a widow who lived half the year in Massachusetts. She was now here for the winter, and Mr. Goldenberg said he would be able to assist her. He noted that none of the violations was life threatening and requested an extension of 119 days.

Mr. Goldenberg explained to Ms. Ellis that the owner had trusted an agent to address the issues and he believed there were language issues that prevented this person from understanding what must be done.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, explained that the person he had spoken to as the owner's representative was basically a handyman and Inspector Smilen felt the owner had been misled by this person. Inspector Smilen stated the window permit had been denied in plan review and permit applications were never submitted for the exterior wall repairs.

Mr. Goldenberg confirmed he understood what must be done to comply.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 119-day extension.

Chair Mitchell asked if the owner had the "necessary people on the team" to address the issues. He said, "I'm not concerned with language problems; I'm not concerned with an absentee owner." Chair Mitchell noted the owner was responsible to operate a safe property.

Mr. Nelson reiterated his motion. Motion died for lack of a second.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 6 – 1 with Chair Mitchell opposed.

Case: CE08100511

Paul Warner
1211 Northwest 12 Street

This case was first heard on 1/27/09 to comply by 4/28/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Paul Warner, owner, explained he had needed to find a second contractor. His new contractor had submitted the permit applications this week. Mr. Warner requested 91 days to complete the work.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, confirmed that the original contractor had been red-flagged and Mr. Warner had hired a new one. Inspector Oliva was in favor of granting a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote, motion **failed** 3 – 4 with Mr. Nelson, Ms. Sheppard, Mr. Thilborger and Chair Mitchell opposed.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote motion **failed** 3 – 4 with Mr. Nelson, Ms. Sheppard, Mr. Thilborger and Chair Mitchell opposed.

Case: CE09061774

2G Investments LLC
408 Southwest 9 Street

This case was first heard on 7/28/09 to comply by 8/25/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Eric Carbonell, permit runner, stated the plans were complete and he had sent them to Inspector Smilen for review. He reported the property was now boarded. Mr. Carbonell requested a 91-day extension to pull the permits. Chair Mitchell recommended 119 days.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, confirmed he had received a letter from the architect indicating the plans had needed 80% revision. Inspector Smilen recommended 154-day extension to pull the permits.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 119-day extension to 3/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

The following two cases for the same owner were heard together:

Case: CE08021545

Sunrise Intracoastal Dental Center
900 Northeast 26 Avenue

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted [no date].

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS:

1. THE ENTIRE FIRST FLOOR IS BEING REMODELED.
2. INTERIOR WALLS HAVE BEEN FRAMED.
3. DRYWALL HAS BEEN INSTALLED AND TAPED.
4. NEW EXTERIOR DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC 105.2.11

THE MECHANICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. WORK HAS BEEN DONE ON THE A/C SYSTEM.

FBC 105.2.4

THE PLUMBING SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. NEW PIPING AND FIXTURES ARE BEING REPLACED IN THE REMODELED BATHROOMS AND KITCHEN.

FBC 105.2.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED DURING THE FIRST FLOOR REMODELING.

FBC 106.10.3.1

THE FOLLOWING PERMITS HAVE EXPIRED:

1. 00021729 - DEMO 800SF OF EXTERIOR WALL.
2. 05050161 - ELECTRICAL WORK AFTER FIRE.

FBC 109.6

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC 1612.1.2

THE EXTERIOR DOORS HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN TO SUFFICIENTLY WITHSTAND ESTIMATED OR ACTUAL IMPOSED DEAD, LIVE, WIND, OR ANY OTHER LOADS THROUGH THE PERMIT AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Ford submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. Inspector Ford stated he had spoken with the owner, who was experiencing problems with his insurance company.

Inspector Ford requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Jerome Petrisko, owner, explained that there had been an explosion at the dental office in 2005 and the insurance company had delayed their claim. In the meantime, he had done work on the building to make it presentable for patients. A lawsuit had been settled regarding the claim in May 2009. Mr. Petrisko confirmed that financing was now in place and requested an extension to have the work done.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 2/23/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 6 – 1 with Ms. Ellis opposed.

Case: CE07071088

Dana A. Fahey
3500 Vista Park

This case was first heard on 1/27/09 to comply per stipulated agreement by 3/24/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Jerome Petrisko, owner, explained that they had been cited for the location of the air conditioner, and he had discovered that the City had the wrong plans for the property. He had also found that the survey by McLaughlin had been incorrect and three of the air conditioners were located in the setback and must be moved toward the house. The air conditioning company was scheduled to do this the following week. Mr. Petrisko requested a 91-day extension.

Mr. Petrisko said according to Gina Rizitti, the plumbing, electrical and roof were completed. It was the air conditioners' location that had prevented them from obtaining the Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, explained that he had originally cited the property for not having a valid Certificate of Occupancy. Upon further investigation, it was determined that the property had not passed Zoning final there was an issue with the location of the air conditioning units. Inspector Smilen felt the issues should be able to be resolved within the next 63 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 119-day extension. Motion died for lack of a second

Motion made by Ms. Sheppard to grant a 91-day extension. Motion died for lack of a second.

Case: CE08101135

Anthony Provenzale & Dominic Provenzale
1826 Southwest 29 Street

This case was first heard on 10/27/09 to comply by 11/24/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Anthony Provenzale, owner, said Inspector Smilen had discovered work at the property that a previous owner had done. Mr. Provenzale had hired an architect and a general contractor and plans had been returned for corrections a couple of times. Mr. Provenzale had resubmitted the plans the previous day and he believed they would now be accepted. He requested a 91-day extension.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, confirmed that the plans covered all of the violations. He recommended a 119-day extension, since one of the floors must be raised.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to grant a 119-day extension to 3/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

The following two cases for the same owner were heard together:

Case: CE08072031

Ronald Elor
Marie Christophe Estate
1041 Indiana Avenue

This case was first heard on 6/23/09 to comply by 7/28/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, and the City was requesting imposition of a \$70,800 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property complied. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/12/09. Ms. Paris remarked that the property was in foreclosure and the respondent present represented the bank.

Ms. Jo Anne Gallipault, attorney, said the bank wanted to bring the property into compliance and requested 91 days to pull the permits. Ms. Wald stated the final summary judgment had been in May 2009 and the sale was scheduled for 12/16/09. Ms. Gallipault said they were amending their complaint and this would delay things.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, reported the property had been vacant for some time. The house was open to entrance, had been vandalized and was the subject of complaints from neighbors and the Police. Inspector Oliva recommended imposition of the fine. Ms. Wald advised the Board to include an order to board the property if they granted an extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 119-day extension, to order the respondent to secure the property from theft and vandalism, and to record the order. Mr. Nelson specified that the securing of the property should include boarding the property with a permit, to secure all openings to the property.

Ms. Ellis asked if the Board could order that the property landscaping be maintained. Ms. Wald stated the Board could choose to make this part of their order. She said this issue was not included in this case, but would be brought before the Special Magistrate.

Mr. Jolly said he was uncomfortable with Mr. Nelson's motion to require the property to be boarded up because he did not know what the enforcement component would be. He advised that the enforcement component would be to reduce the extension; if the respondent returned and progress had not been made, the Board could determine that the fines should begin to run.

Ms. Wald announced that she had been informed that the City already had a case against the property for a board-up, so she requested that this portion of Mr. Nelson's motion be withdrawn.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Sheppard to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08102347

J Randolph & Caprice Scott
2848 Southwest 4 Street

This case was first heard on 9/22/09 to comply by 11/24/9. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded. Ms. Paris noted violations that were now complied.

Mr. J. Randolph Scott, owner, reported the permit had been issued the previous Thursday and the property had failed inspection. He requested a 91-day extension to hire an electrician to run the ground wire so the property would pass inspection.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said he was in favor of a 91-day extension. He explained the electrician must pull a permit to install ground bars for the pool and screen porch.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Sheppard to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE09010920

Fort Lauderdale Learning Center LLC
1904 Southwest 4 Avenue

This case was first heard on 6/23/09 to comply by 9/22/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Ms. Melissa Mazzotta, owner, stated she had hired a contractor to install the fire equipment and to re-do the fire plans. She said they were creating a master plan to cover the violations and other issues at the property. The new fire plans had been re-submitted the previous Friday. Ms. Mazzotta informed Chair Mitchell that the facility was open and the area that was operational was up to code and was licensed by the Fire Department, Health Department and DCF. One building was not in use.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, confirmed that the plans had been resubmitted on 11/20 with corrections. He stated he would not object to a 119-day extension.

Motion made by Ms. Sheppard, seconded by Mr. Nelson to grant a 119-day extension to 3/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08100204

Nino & Sean Paul Barone
5890 Northeast 21 Drive

This case was first heard on 3/24/09 to comply per stipulated agreement by 6/23/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin on 11/25 and would continue to accrue until the property complied. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/12/09.

Mr. Nino Barone, owner, said he had waited two months for the engineers to make corrections to the plans. The plans had been re-submitted.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, confirmed it had taken 67 days for the plans to be re-submitted. Inspector Ford said he would not object to an extension if the Board saw fit. He said the plans had failed mechanical review on 11/19 and had not been routed to plumbing.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 6 – 1 with Chair Mitchell opposed.

Case: CE08010621

Minnie Brown
1023 Northwest 7 Terrace

This case was first heard on 7/27/09 to comply by 10/27/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was complied, fines had accrued to \$650 and the City was recommending abatement.

Mr. Jose Hernandez, contractor, requested abatement of the fines. He said the dog pens had been removed.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, stated he was in favor of removing the fines.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose a fine of \$650 for the time the property was out of compliance. In a roll call vote motion **failed** 3 – 4 with Mr. Elfman, Ms. Hinton, Ms. Sheppard and Chair Mitchell opposed.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose no fine for the time the property was out of compliance. In a roll call vote motion passed 5 - 2 with Ms. Sheppard and Mr. Thilborger opposed.

Case: CE07060475

Bernardo Rodriguez &
Marena Moreira
1380 Southwest 34 Avenue

This case was first heard on 7/28/09 to comply by 9/22/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Jose Hernandez, contractor, stated the engineer had determined that his plans had been drawn based upon an incorrect survey the owner had provided. The revisions were ready, and Mr. Hernandez said the owner needed to come up with the balance and plans needed to be re-submitted. He requested a 91-day extension because he would be out of the country for the holidays.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said the drawings had been picked up for corrections on 10/27/09 and Mr. Hernandez had called him regarding the survey. Since Mr. Hernandez would be out of the country, Inspector said he was in favor of a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote motion passed 5 - 2 with Ms. Ellis and Mr. Thilborger opposed.

Case: CE08051038

Carlos Benitez
1507 Northeast 15 Avenue

This case was first heard on 5/26/09 to comply by 7/28/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Jose Hernandez, contractor, informed the Board that the paperwork was now ready. He explained the shed must be demolished and he must pull permits for the windows and shutters. Chair Mitchell pointed out the other violations: the Jacuzzi, electrical work, the slab and the windows. Mr. Hernandez said the owner had hired him to address the windows, shutters and shed issues.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, said he had explained to the owner that the shed could be moved to the spot occupied by the Jacuzzi, and noted that the Jacuzzi had been removed. Inspector Oliva recommended a 91-day extension for the owner to hire an electrical and mechanical contractor to take care of the situation. He stated the shed must still be moved with a permit and the owner also needed a permit for the slabs. Alternately, the owner could choose to remove the slabs and the shed.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10. Motion died for lack of a second.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote motion **failed** 3 - 4 with Ms. Ellis, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Thilborger and Chair Mitchell opposed.

Case: CE06091178

Victor Estrada
211 Southeast 16 Avenue

This case was first heard on 3/24/09 to comply by 5/26/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Mr. Victor Estrada, owner, stated he had the plans and had hired his third contractor, who was waiting for Workman's Comp. He confirmed there were tenants in the property.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, explained some windows without permits remained and the staircase had not been permitted.

Mr. Estrada requested a 60 to 90-day extension.

Inspector Ford stated the stairs had been rebuilt without a permit and had not been inspected. He said he believed the property could be complied "well within 63 days" and would not be in favor of any additional extensions.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 6 – 1 with Ms. Sheppard opposed.

Case: CE08042519

Lisa Dumetz
2506 Northeast 30 Street

This case was first heard on 2/24/09 to comply per stipulated agreement by 5/26/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied. Ms. Paris noted violations that were now complied.

Ms. Lisa Dumetz, owner, said she had applied for all permits and requested a 63-day extension.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, confirmed the master permit had been submitted on 11/19 and said he did not oppose an extension

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08061254

Sherri Friend
1112 Southwest 20 Street

This case was first heard on 10/28/08 to comply by 1/27/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the order had been recorded.

Mr. Glenn Lastrella, contractor, said inspector Smilen had recommended requesting a 154-day extension to finish the plumbing. He stated slabs had been poured, there was partial on the sewer, electric and plumbing in the front was done and they were currently framing in the front.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, reported the slab inspection had passed in October. He had recommended a long extension because the owner was out of the country a good deal of the time.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 154-day extension to 4/27/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08072176

Waltraud Pawlik
1221 Northeast 1 Avenue

This case was first heard on 8/25/09 to comply by 10/27/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, and the order had been recorded.

Ms. Waltraud Pawlik, owner, said she had furniture left in the carport that would be removed soon. She stated her cousin would remove the carport enclosure in January.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, distributed photos of the property taken the previous day and remarked that there were still items on the front porch. Inspector Smilen said the main issue at the previous meeting was to clean up the property and Ms. Pawlik had made some progress. The other issue was the illegally enclosed carport. Ms. Pawlik had come up with a solution to remove the sides of the carport and she must then either pull a permit for the garage door or remove it. Ms. Pawlik said she intended to get a permit for the garage door, and she would apply "within a week or so."

Ms. Ellis pointed out that the Board had seen no progress since August toward removing or permitting the illegal work. Ms. Pawlik said she did not have the money to pay someone to take the carport down, and her cousin would remove it for her in January when he was here for vacation.

Mr. Thilborger wondered if the carport could support the garage door without the carport side walls. Inspector Smilen said this would be determined in plan review.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10.

Chair Mitchell said at the previous meeting, Ms. Pawlik had indicated she would address financial concerns and try to resolve the issues and return with a decision regarding the door. He did not want Ms. Pawlik to return in January and report that her cousin had experienced difficulties getting here and the problem would persist. Chair Mitchell said he was hearing from Ms. Pawlik that she had not decided whether to keep the garage door. Ms. Pawlik said, "If I'm allowed to only keep the garage door, I will get a permit, and if I'm allowed to only keep the garage door, I'd like to do that."

Mr. Nelson advised Ms. Pawlik that she must apply for a permit for the garage door to determine if she could keep it. The Board had been asking her to apply for the permit since August and she had not. Ms. Pawlik stated she had not known there was a possibility she could keep the garage door.

Mr. Mitchell referred to the previous meeting's minutes, when Ms. Pawlik indicated she might keep the garage door, but had not yet contacted an architect regarding a permit for it. Ms. Pawlik asked if she needed an architect to get the permit and Chair Mitchell advised her that the Building Department would tell her the procedure she needed to follow.

Ms. Pawlik said she was sure now about the garage door, and asked if she needed an architect's plans for the permit. Chair Mitchell urged Ms. Pawlik to speak with Inspector Smilen.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson to grant a 63-day extension to 1/26/10. Motion died for lack of a second.

Case: CE08040203

Rosana & Rooveline Theophin
208 Northwest 16 Street

This case was first heard on 6/24/08 to comply by 8/26/08. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, fines had accrued to \$75,750 and the City was recommending a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Sheppard to grant a 91-day extension to 2/23/10, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08031427

Heather Holtz & Scott Simpkins
2900 Northeast 30 Street # M-4

This case was first heard on 3/24/09 to comply per stipulated agreement by 6/23/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. Service was via posting on the property on 11/10/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of a \$1,350 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property complied.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to find the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose the \$1,350 fine, which would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08090934

Osman Daniel Navarro
2031 Southwest 35 Avenue

This case was first heard on 8/17/09 to comply by 11/24/09. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, the order had been recorded and the City was requesting imposition of the fine that would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the property complied. Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Sheppard to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and therefore the fines as stated in the Order would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08110911

Evangelos Anthony
729 West Las Olas Boulevard

This case was first heard on 4/28/09 to comply by 6/23/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was

requesting imposition of the fine that would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the property complied. Service was via posting on the property on 11/9/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and therefore the fines as stated in the Order would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE09031279

G 4 A Holdings Corp
721 Southwest 8 Terrace

This case was first heard on 6/23/09 to comply by 7/28/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied, the order had been recorded and the City was requesting imposition of the fine that would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the property complied. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/16/09.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis to find that the violations were not complied by the Order date, and therefore the fines as stated in the Order would begin on 11/25/09 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

[The Board took a break from 11:33 to 11:55]

Case: CE04082149

Schaefer Industries Inc
3355 Southwest 13 Avenue

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted [no date].

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE FOLLOWING ELECTRICAL WIRING HAS BEEN
INSTALLED WITHOUT PERMITS:
1. GENERAL LIGHTING.
2. PREMISE WIRING.
3. CONNECTIONS FOR A/C AND VENTILATION SYSTEMS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

A VENTILATION AND COOLING SYSTEM HAS BEEN
INSTALLED IN PREFABRICATED OFFICE SPACE UNITS
WITHOUT A PERMIT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.1

ENCLOSED PREFABRICATED OFFICE UNITS HAVE BEEN
INSTALLED IN A WAREHOUSE SPACE WITHOUT PERMITS.

Mr. Nelson disclosed that the respondent's attorney had performed his wedding ceremony, but this would not preclude him from being impartial in this case.

Inspector Smilen said the case had been opened in 2004 pursuant to a complaint. He explained that emails had documented that plans had been drawn, the EPG had taken air samples, and the tenant expected the owner to pay for the permits and plans, but the tenant had made plans to vacate the property. Inspector Smilen stated the pre-fabricated units had their own ventilation systems, electric and other facilities.

Inspector Smilen submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 119 days or a fine of \$30 per day, per violation.

Mr. Dick Coker, attorney for the owner, said the tenant was pursuing after-the-fact permits for the units, and had purchased a new building in Pompano Beach and intended to move out. He requested time for the tenant to move out and remove the prefabricated units. Mr. Coker said the owner had been unaware of the violations until earlier this year, but understood that the tenant was going through the process to pull the permits.

Ms. Janet Lhota, attorney for the tenant, said several of the items in the Notice of Violations had been addressed in 2004 and her client had retained an engineer to address the permitting issue. In October 2008, her client had learned that the issues they had paid the engineer to resolve had not been. Her client had then retained a new engineer and an air conditioning company. Ms. Lhota presented a copy of a contract her client had for their new facility, and noted that moving would resolve the violations. Ms. Lhota requested five months to comply. For the time being, Ms. Lhota said her client was pursuing the parallel paths of moving and permitting the current location.

Mr. Christian Winkle, president of Worldwide Superabrasives, explained that the company cleaned, qualified and added coatings to industrial diamonds. Ms. Lhota stated the company had all of the required licenses for hazardous substances. Chair Mitchell was concerned about ventilation of toxic materials. Ms. Lhota stated an indoor air quality sampling had been conducted earlier this year and Broward County had certified that there was no hazardous material issue.

Mr. Kenneth Springer, operations manager, stated they had very small quantities of hazardous chemicals, and discharged nothing to the public sewer system. Chair Mitchell expressed a desire for the company to stay in Fort Lauderdale and Mr. Springer said they would consider it.

Ms. Ellis said the issue for her was not keeping the company in the City, it was compliance.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 154 days, by 4/27/10 or a fine of \$30 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 6 – 1 with Ms. Ellis opposed.

Case: CE08061308

Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp
C/O Florida Default Law Group
1800 Northeast 20 Street

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/10/09.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED IN THE FOLLOWING
MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS:

1. NEW WINDOWS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
2. NEW EXTERIOR DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
3. AN OVERHANG ON THE EAST SIDE HAS BEEN BUILT.

FBC(2007) 105.10.3.1

WINDOW PERMIT 00050478 HAS EXPIRED AND NO
INSPECTIONS HAVE BEEN COMPLETED.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING
THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE WINDOWS, EXTERIOR DOORS, AND OVERHANG
STRUCTURE HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN TO SUFFICIENTLY
WITHSTAND ESTIMATED OR ACTUAL IMPOSED DEAD, LIVE,
WIND, OR ANY OTHER LOADS THROUGH THE PERMIT AND
INSPECTION PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 1626.1

THE NEW WINDOWS AND NEW DOORS WITH GLASS NEED TO
BE IMPACT RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED
HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Inspector Ford submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. He stated there was an expired permit from 2000 for window replacement. He was unsure if this permit could be reactivated.

Inspector Ford requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Ms. Sue Richards, realtor, stated the property had not been vacated until August. The prospective buyers were present, and Ms. Richards said she had been informed of the violations within the last couple of weeks when the lien search was done. They were in

the process of obtaining estimates for the windows and doors. Ms. Richards confirmed for Mr. Nelson that the buyers understood that they would be responsible to resolve these issues if they persisted after the closing.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Sheppard, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 119 days, by 3/23/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE05012419

Tammie D Habersham &
Johnnie Slaughter
2501 Northwest 16 Court

Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS OR INSPECTIONS:

1. WINDOWS AND ENTRANCE DOORS WERE REPLACED.
2. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS REMODELING PERMIT #05020700 HAS EXPIRED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

THE PLUMBING SYSTEM OF THE FACILITY HAS BEEN CHANGED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS WERE REMODELED AND THE FIXTURES WERE REPLACED WITH AN EXPIRED PERMIT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE FACILITY HAS BEEN CHANGED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. ELECTRICAL LOAD DEMAND WAS INCREASED BY ADDING ADDITIONAL LIGHTS AND WALL OUTLETS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED AMPERAGE LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

ALL THE WINDOWS AND DOOR INSTALLATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED WIND LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 1626.1

THE NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS WITH GLASS NEED TO BE IMPACT RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED

HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation and to record the order. Inspector Oliva said the present owner had not owned the property at the time it was cited.

Mr. Johnny Slaughter, owner, said he had purchased the property with the windows installed. He had removed a structure in the rear, and replaced the front door without knowing he needed a permit. Mr. Slaughter said he had not used an attorney when he purchased the property.

Inspector Oliva informed Chair Mitchell there were no life safety issues on the property, but he was concerned about the windows in the event of a hurricane. Inspector Oliva said he would agree to 119 days. He acknowledged that permitting the windows could be difficult due to their age. The owner could get a letter of certification from an engineer and install shutters to comply.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 154 days, by 4/27/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE04120642

James R & Susan M Mears
810 Northwest 57 Court

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/6/09.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING
MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS OR
INSPECTIONS:

1. CITING THE ABSENCE OF PROPER FIRE SEPARATION --
FIRE DOORS WERE INSTALLED WITHOUT THE PERMITS
BEING ISSUED.

FBC(2007) 1604.1

THE STRUCTURE FOR THE DOORS SUPPORT AND WALLS DO
NOT MEET THE STANDARD FOR GRAVITY LOADING AND HAS
NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED
WIND LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS. ALL
THE WORK THAT HAS BEEN DONE ILLEGALLY IS UNSAFE
AND THEY MUST BE REMOVED.

Inspector Oliva stated the application for the fire doors had been submitted the previous day. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation. Inspector Oliva explained to Chair Mitchell that the violations were for Fire and the Florida Building Code, and he was working the case with the Fire Marshall.

Mr. James Mears, owner, said they had hired an architect and a contractor and were in the process of pulling the permit. He requested 91 days to comply.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 2/23/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE07070394

Noemi Quintero
1235 Northeast 5 Terrace

Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09. Ms. Paris informed the Board that the property was in foreclosure and was scheduled for sale on January 19, 2010.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

- THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS:
1. STRUCTURAL REPAIRS HAVE BEEN MADE TO A PORCH STRUCTURE AT THE NORTHWEST SIDE OF THE BUILDING.
 2. NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
 3. THE CARPORT HAS BEEN ENCLOSED.
 4. A PORCH ADDITION HAS BEEN BUILT AT THE REAR SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE HOME.
 5. PERMIT 01100007 FOR PATIO ENCLOSURE WOOD WITH TRANSPARENT FIBERGLASS WAS APPLIED FOR, BUT NEVER OBTAINED.
 6. PERMIT 98041135 FOR ADDITION/AS BUILT DRAWINGS WAS APPLIED FOR, BUT NEVER OBTAINED.
 7. PERMIT 02110114 TO REPLACE A 135X6 WOOD FENCE, WAS PERMITTED, BUT NEVER INSPECTED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

- THE MECHANICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:
1. WINDOW AND WALL A/C UNITS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

THE PLUMBING SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. A WATER HEATER HAS BEEN INSTALLED UNDER THE PORCH STRUCTURE ON THE NORTHWEST SIDE.
2. SPIGOTS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED IN SAME AREA.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. GENERAL PREMISE WIRING AND NEW CIRCUITS.
2. CIRCUIT TO POWER WATER HEATER.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE WINDOW AND WALL AIR CONDITIONING UNITS AND ALL STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN TO SUFFICIENTLY WITHSTAND ESTIMATED OR ACTUAL IMPOSED DEAD, LIVE, WIND, OR ANY OTHER LOADS THROUGH THE PERMIT AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Inspector Ford informed the Board that a permit application had been submitted in 2001 for the patio enclosure but it was never obtained. The owner had also applied for a permit which was never obtained for an addition to the rear of the house. A permit had been issued for a wood fence but this was never inspected, so the permit had expired. Inspector Ford submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Rene Rodriguez, bank representative, stated when they took possession of the property in January, they intended to hire a contractor and comply the violations.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 91 days, by 2/23/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE09051042

JRP Investment Group LLC
1516 Southwest 5 Place

Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC(2007) 105.4.1

THE QUADPLEX HAS BEEN ALTERED BY ADDING FOUR EFFICIENCY UNITS WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED

PERMITS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

PLUMBING WORK FOR BATHROOMS AND KITCHENETTES HAS
BEEN COMPLETED WITHOUT PERMITS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

ELECTRICAL WORK HAS BEEN PROVIDED FOR THE ADDED
EFFICIENCY UNITS WITHOUT A PERMIT.

Inspector Smilen stated the case had been opened pursuant to a complaint. He said a permit application had been submitted on 11/18/09. Inspector Smilen submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Mr. Maxo Sinal, owner, said he had purchased the property two years ago unaware of the violations. He had hired a contractor, and hoped to have the violations complied within 63 days. Mr. Sinal confirmed that there were tenants in the property, but no children lived there.

Inspector Smilen stated the electrical problems did not appear to be a life safety issue.

Inspector Smilen learned from Supervisor Skip Margerum that the plumbing portion of the permit application had passed on 11/20.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 63 days, by 1/26/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08020079

Manoli Family Ltd Partnership
845 Northeast 63 Street

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/6/09.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:

FBC 105.1

THERE HAS BEEN AN ADDITION BUILT WITHOUT THE
REQUIRED PERMITS.

Inspector Smilen stated this case had originated pursuant to a complaint. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation. Inspector Smilen reminded the Board that the property was rented out.

Chair Mitchell felt the corrective action stated on the Notice of Violation was a little vague. Inspector Smilen said he had not been inside the addition, so he could not say if there was electrical work or anything else, but all work must be legitimized or removed.

Mr. James Manoli, trailer park property owner, said he had just become aware of the violations. He said if the owner of the trailer did not comply, he would take steps to evict the owner. Mr. Manoli requested 119 days, and reported the owner had removed part of the addition. He intended to give the owner 30 days to comply or to be evicted. Mr. Manoli agreed to provide the Board with a progress report in January.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 63 days, by 1/26/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE09010707

Leones & Melagette Mertilus
341 Southwest 29 Terrace

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/7/09.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS OR INSPECTIONS:

1. WINDOWS AND THE FRONT DOOR WERE REPLACED AT THE DWELLING.
2. STUCCO AND FACIA WORK WAS DONE.

FBC 105.2.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE FACILITY HAS BEEN CHANGED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. ELECTRICAL LOAD DEMAND WAS INCREASED BY ADDING A CENTRAL A/C WITH ELECTRIC HEATERS, ADDITIONAL LIGHTS AND WALL OUTLETS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED AMPERAGE LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

FBC 106.10.3.1

THERE IS A BUILDING PERMIT WHICH FAILED INSPECTION AND/OR WAS LEFT TO EXPIRE:

1. ONE EXPIRED ELECTRICAL PERMIT #07080254.

FBC 109.6

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS THROUGH THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

FBC 1612.1.2

ALL THE WINDOWS, SHUTTERS, AND DOOR INSTALLATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED WIND LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

FBC 1626.1

THE NEW WINDOWS AND DOOR WITH GLASS NEED TO BE IMPACT RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Inspector Oliva stated the owner had applied for a permit on 11/23/09. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Leones Mertilus, owner, said he had replaced the windows and door because the old ones were in bad condition. He now knew he must get a permit.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 63 days, by 1/26/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE09021154

George Michael Loveday
812 Southwest 29 Street

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/9/09.

Mr. Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC 1612.1.2

THE INDIVIDUAL A/C UNITS THAT ARE MOUNTED IN THE EXTERIOR WALLS AND WINDOWS DO NOT MEET WIND LOAD REQUIREMENTS FOR A HIGH VELOCITY HURRICANE ZONE.

9-280(b)

THE EXTERIOR OF THE SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING HAS NOT BEEN MAINTAINED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. PAINT IS PEELING OFF OF THE WALLS.
2. SIDING IS LOOSE.
3. THE BUILDING IS NOT RODENT PROOF.
4. WINDOW PANES ARE BROKEN OR MISSING.
5. TRASH HAS ACCUMULATED IN THE BACKYARD.

9-280(d)

THE EXTERIOR WALL SIDING HAS DETERIORATED LEAVING HOLES THAT ALLOW RODENTS AND THE ELEMENTS TO ENTER THE STRUCTURE.

FBC 105.1

THE FOLLOWING WORK HAS BEEN PERFORMED ON THE BUILDING WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS:

1. NEW SIDING WAS INSTALLED ON THE EXTERIOR WALLS.
2. NEW EXTERIOR DOORS WERE INSTALLED.
3. NEW WINDOWS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC 105.2.5

EXTERIOR PREMISE WIRING AND SECURITY LIGHTING HAVE BEEN INSTALLED WITHOUT A PERMIT.

FBC 1604.1

THE NEW WINDOWS HAVE NOT BEEN PROVED TO WITHSTAND WIND LOAD REQUIREMENTS IN A HIGH VELOCITY HURRICANE ZONE.

Inspector Smilen submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Scott Mulheron, contractor, stated he was the contractor who performed the previous partial siding repair. He requested 91 days from issuance of the permit, because he believed the permit process might be difficult. Mr. Mulheron said the plans the City had on file were for an entirely different structure. Chair Mitchell asked of Mr. Mulheron would return the structure to its original form. Mr. Mulheron said he had brought this issue to the City's attention when he applied for the original permit and been told this was not a problem.

Ms. Sheppard asked Inspector Smilen if the rear portion of the building would need a foundation. Inspector Smilen said this would be up to the discretion of the Building Department and the Plan Review Department.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 119 days, by 3/23/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE08100515

Zahra Bahrami
2197 North Ocean Boulevard

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/4/09.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

FBC 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED IN THE FOLLOWING

MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS:

1. NEW ENTRY DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED ON ALL OF THE ROOMS.
2. THE WINDOWS AT THE REAR AND SIDES OF THE ROOMS AND THE WINDOWS BELOW THE LARGE PICTURE WINDOWS IN THE FRONT OF THE ROOMS HAVE BEEN FRAMED IN AND THEN COVERED WITH INSULATION AND DRYWALL.
3. THE EXTERIOR OF THE WINDOW UNDER THE PICTURE WINDOW HAS BEEN COVERED ON THE OUTSIDE WITH T-111 WOOD.
4. WALLS HAVE BEEN ALTERED IN THE REMODELED SHOWERS AND BATHROOMS.
5. NEW CABINETS ARE BEING INSTALLED THAT WILL HOUSE PLUMBING IN THE ROOMS OUTSIDE THE BATHROOMS.

FBC 105.2.11

THE MECHANICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. WINDOW A/C UNITS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC 105.2.4

THE PLUMBING SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. NEW PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN INSTALLED IN THE BATHROOM REMODELS.
2. NEW SINKS AND FIXTURES ARE BEING INSTALLED IN THE ROOMS OUTSIDE OF THE BATHROOMS.

FBC 105.2.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. OUTLETS, SWITCHES, AND FIXTURES ARE BEING INSTALLED.

FBC 109.6

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC 1612.1.2

THE WINDOW AIR CONDITIONING UNITS, NEW ENTRY DOORS, AND FRAMED IN WINDOWS HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN TO SUFFICIENTLY WITHSTAND ESTIMATED OR ACTUAL IMPOSED DEAD, LIVE, WIND, OR ANY OTHER LOADS, BY THE PERMIT AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

Withdrawn:

FBC 105.1.1

Inspector Ford said the owner had submitted the permit application, but the plans had never been returned after they were picked up for revisions. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Mr. Abe Borujedi, owner, said he had hired a contractor and an engineer to address the problems. He explained he had gone through a divorce recently. Mr. Borujedi said the doors had been approved already. Mr. Borujedi explained that he was the property owner's son, but he did not have a Power of Attorney. He was also the engineer of record. Mr. Borujedi said he would resubmit the plans after Thanksgiving and requested 90 days.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 63 days, by 1/26/10 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE07110906

Johnny Mccullough & Odessa Hall
1132 Northwest 5 Court

Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS OR INSPECTIONS:

1. WINDOWS AND THE FRONT DOORS WERE REPLACED.
2. THERE ARE TWO CENTRAL A/C'S THAT REPLACED THE WALL UNITS.
3. INTERIOR REMODELING WORK INCLUDING ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING, AND DRYWALL.
4. NEW CHAIN LINK FENCE.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

THE PLUMBING SYSTEM OF THE FACILITY HAS BEEN CHANGED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. THERE ARE NEW PIPES AND PLUMBING CONNECTIONS IN THE KITCHENS AND BATHROOMS. FIXTURES WERE REPLACED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE FACILITY HAS BEEN CHANGED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. ELECTRICAL LOAD DEMAND WAS INCREASED BY ADDING TWO ADDITIONAL CENTRAL A/C'S WITH ELECTRICAL HEATER, PLUS LIGHTS AND WALL OUTLETS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED AMPERAGE LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS THROUGH THE PERMITTING AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

ALL THE WINDOWS AND DOOR INSTALLATIONS HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED WIND LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 1626.1

THE NEW WINDOWS AND DOOR WITH GLASS NEED TO BE IMPACT RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation and to record the order. Inspector Oliva reported a lis pendens had been filed against the property.

Mr. Johnny McCullough, owner, explained that a former tenant had torn up the property and his mother had done the best she could to repair things. His mother had gone to court a few weeks ago regarding the foreclosure and no one had appeared to represent the bank.

Mr. Nelson advised Mr. McCullough to review his contract with the air conditioning contractor to determine if they were supposed to pull the permit. If so, he should suggest to them that they should get it. Inspector Oliva said the owner could not pull a permit for the electrical or the air conditioner.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 182 days, by 5/25/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Case: CE09030939

Loretta L & William L Smith
C/O Prudential California Realty
1301 Northwest 12 Street

Service was via posting on the property on 11/6/09 and at City Hall on 11/12/09.

Mr. George Oliva, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:

9-280(g)

THE CONDUCTORS OF THE SERVICE DROP, WHICH PROVIDE THE ELECTRICAL SERVICE CONNECTION DO NOT CLEAR THE ROOF EDGE. THIS CONDITION PRESENTS A HAZARD. N.E.C.(2005) 230.24(A) REQUIRES A MINIMUM OF 18 INCHES CLEARANCE ABOVE THE ROOF FOR THE CONDUCTORS AT THIS LOCATION.

9-304(b)

THE REQUIRED SMOOTH SURFACE FOR THE ALUMINUM CARPORT FLOOR IS NOT PROVIDED.

FBC(2007) 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED AND IMPROVEMENTS ATTEMPTED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED BUILDING PERMITS. THE ALTERATIONS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

1. THE CARPORT HAS BEEN ENCLOSED.
2. THE ORIGINAL WINDOWS HAVE BEEN REMOVED AND REPLACED.
3. THE FRONT DOOR AND JAMB HAS BEEN REPLACED.
4. A CONCRETE SLAB ON GRADE HAS BEEN INSTALLED TO PROVIDE A FLOOR IN THE ALUMINUM CARPORT ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE PROPERTY.
5. FENCING HAS BEEN INSTALLED

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

AN AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEM HAS BEEN INSTALLED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED MECHANICAL PERMIT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED ELECTRICAL PERMIT. THE ALTERATIONS INCLUDE THE INSTALLATION OF CIRCUITS TO POWER EXTERIOR LIGHTING AND THE CENTRAL AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEM.

FBC(2007) 109.10

A LIST OF NON-PERMITTED WORK HAS BEEN PROVIDED WHERE SECTION 105.1 OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE WAS CITED. THE WORK SPECIFIED WAS NOT INSPECTED AS REQUIRED AND FASTENERS METHODS, AND MATERIALS ARE NOW CONCEALED.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE EXTERIOR WALLS AND THE WINDOW AND DOOR INSTALLATIONS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED THE RESISTANCE TO WIND AS REQUIRED BY THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE IN A HIGH VELOCITY WIND ZONE.

FBC(2007) 1626.1

THE WINDOWS, DOORS AND WALLS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED

THE REQUIRED RESISTANCE TO WINDBORNE DEBRIS IN A
HIGH VELOCITY WIND ZONE.

Inspector Oliva submitted photos of the property into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation and to record the order.

Mr. Elfman stated there was a pending short sale on the property and it was scheduled to close on December 31.

Ms. Paris said the owner, a realtor in California, had informed her there was a short sale pending.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 63 days, by 1/26/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 6 – 1 with Ms. Ellis opposed.

Case: CE07030137

Adriana Nascimbeni
5712 Northeast 17 Terrace

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 11/6/09.

Mr. Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

THE BUILDING HAS BEEN ALTERED IN THE FOLLOWING
MANNER WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS:
1. NEW EXTERIOR DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
2. FRAMING HAS BEEN DONE TO REDUCE THE SIZE OF THE
WINDOW OPENINGS.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING
THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE DOORS AND WINDOW OPENING FRAMING HAVE NOT BEEN
PROVEN TO SUFFICIENTLY WITHSTAND ESTIMATED OR
ACTUAL IMPOSED DEAD, LIVE, WIND, OR ANY OTHER
LOADS THROUGH THE PERMIT AND INSPECTION PROCESS.

FBC(2007) 1626.1

THE NEW DOORS WITH GLASS NEED TO BE IMPACT
RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED HURRICANE
PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Inspector Ford said the permit application had been out for corrections for months. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and

corrective action into evidence, requested a finding of fact and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged and to order the property owner to come into compliance within 63 days, by 1/26/10 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would be imposed and to record the order. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

[This item was heard out of order]

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Mr. Nelson, to approve the minutes of the Board's October, 2009 meeting. In a voice vote motion passed 7 - 0.

Communication to the City Commission

By consensus, the Board requested that the City Commission complete appointments for the Board.

By consensus, the Board requested that Mr. Thilborger replace Mr. Perkins as a full member of the Board

For the Good of the City

None

Cases Complied

Ms. Paris announced that the below listed cases were complied. Additional information regarding respondents, violations, etc. can be found in the agenda, which is incorporated into this record by reference:

CE07100923 CE08120690 CE08072465

Cases Withdrawn

Ms. Paris announced that the below listed cases had been withdrawn. Additional information regarding respondents, violations, etc. can be found in the agenda, which is incorporated into this record by reference:

CE07081643 CE08051216 CE09040005 CE08110624

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at **2:03 P.M.**


Chair, Code Enforcement Board

ATTEST:


Clerk, Code Enforcement Board

NOTE: The agenda associated with this meeting is incorporated into this record by reference.

Minutes prepared by: J. Opperlee, ProtoType Inc.