

**CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
APRIL 26, 2011
9:00 A.M. – 3:25 P.M.**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative attendance 2/2011 through 1/2012	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Jan Sheppard, Chair	P	3	0
Howard Nelson, Vice Chair	P	3	0
Howard Elfman	P	3	0
Genia Ellis	P	2	1
Joan Hinton	P	2	1
Robert Smith	P	1	0
Chad Thilborger	P	3	0
Paul Dooley [Alternate]	P	3	0
PJ Espinal [Alternate]	P	1	0
Joshua Miron [Alternate]	P	2	1

Staff Present

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

Communication to the City Commission

None

Respondents and Witnesses

CE09040981: Camey Davidson, owner
 CE10092111: Leslie Kanfer, listing agent
 CE10101100: Willie Powell, general contractor's assistant
 CE08050335: Jeffrey Darren Waters, owner

CE10092090: Jose Lairet, contractor
CE07110906: Johnnie McCullough, owner; Odessa Graham, owner
CE09060387: Gil Betzalel, management; Tal Hen, general manager
CE09091388: Ted Arpin, contractor
CE10100039: Robert Belson, owner
CE10071917: Bruce Henry, owner
CE10080653: Ricky Pierce, owner
CE07031444: Richard Coker, attorney; Jared Anthony, sub-contractor; John Duffin, sub-contractor; Richard Guy, tenant's attorney; Richard Maynard, general contractor
CE10081528: John Malec, owner
CE10040803: Patricia Dahl, owner's assistant; Leon Ginsburg, owner
CE09011970: Joey Partin, owner
CE10040096: Uri Ostrovsky, owner's uncle
CE09050642: Damien Dominicis, owner
CE08061524: Joseph Ieracitano, owner's representative; Joseph Quaratella, owner
CE10082026: Aaron Echols, owner
CE09030900: Annette Walters, owner
CE09010920: Melissa Mazzotta, owner
CE05111570: Anne Ginsburg, owner
CE09040018: Noel VanDenHouten, bank attorney; Eve Kearse, owner; Jerome Key, owner's friend
CE10012098: Gary Snyder, owner; Sharon Tiberio, neighbor; John Tiberio, neighbor
CE08121189: Taisto Pesola, lessee; Benjamin Maff, neighbor; Linda Waldbauer, board member; James Morgan, witness; Joyce Phillips, president of board; Anne Rosse, board member; Elmer Generotti, attorney
CE10111450: Robert Devin, owner; Sherry Landess, witness; Thomas Lindgren, witness
CE10090377: Josue Cea, owner
CE10011075: Carrie Anderson, attorney; Randall Mogg, bank representative
CE10060988: Frank Dalcon, owner's employee
CE08080987: Dimitrije Garcey, owner
CE10042246; CE10042248; CE10042243: Ed Nichols, property manager
CE10111822: Emile Luxe, owner
CE10122048: Daniel Barton, authorized agent
CE10080609: Douglas Fleishman, owner
CE10042739: Ricardo Thompson, pastor; Rodney Hammes, general contractor
CE10120954: Osmanis Franqueiro, owner's son; Assel Franqueiro, owner's son
CE10111901: Deborah Thomas, tenant

Chair Sheppard called the meeting to order at 9:01 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: CE10100039

1717 Southwest 11 Court
BELSON, ROBERT

This case was first heard on 2/22/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, stated the owner had made significant progress; he had hired an architect and preliminary plans were on file. He recommended a 63-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE09091388

1629 Northwest 7 Avenue
CAPITAL HOMES & INVESTMENTS INC

This case was first heard on 1/25/11 to comply by 3/22/11. 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 to accrue on 4/27/11. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/5/11.

Mr. Ted Arpin, contractor, said plans had been presented to the City and been returned for corrections. He reported the sub-contractors were ready to go and requested a 63-day extension. Mr. Arpin confirmed that Arpin and Sons was the general contractor.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, stated he supported the request for an extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10040803

1117 Northwest 2 Avenue
GINSBURG, LEON

This case was first heard on 1/25/11 to comply by 3/22/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of a \$680 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property complied. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/1/11.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, displayed photos of the property and reported there had been some progress made; the fence had been removed and the sheds had been dismantled but the material and deck remained at the property. Inspector Smilen stated there were no "For Sale" signs on the property.

Ms. Patricia Dahl, the owner's assistant, stated the tenant had arranged for City pickup of the materials on the third Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Leon Ginsburg, owner, said all of the materials had been removed.

Mr. Elfman asked the closing date on the property and Ms. Dahl stated they had no closing date. Mr. Ginsburg stated he had no contract on the property. Ms. Dahl stated there were people interested in the property but no one had signed any agreement. Ms. Dahl confirmed that the purchaser they were dealing with was aware of the Code Enforcement issues on the property.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 28-day extension to 5/24/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote, motion **failed** 2-5 with Mr. Elfman, Ms. Ellis, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Thilborger and Chair Sheppard opposed.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose the \$680 fine, which would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

At 9:16, Mr. Smith replaced Mr. Dooley on the dais.

Case: CE07031444

2491 State Road 84
BILL RICHARDSON TR
RICHARDSON, BILL

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 City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11. Service was via posting on the property on 4/14/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Mr. Richard Coker, attorney, stated since the last meeting, the owner had signed a contract to install the fire line and the fire sprinkler. He stated the tenant and he had met with the Fire Marshall and his team, who he felt were impressed with the operation. Mr. Coker said they were working toward preparing a plan to which both sides could agree. He stated the "small building code issues" were being addressed by a Master Plan. Mr. Coker stated many of these issues involved permits and activities that had occurred in Broward County in the 1960s and 1970s and were not visible in the City, so they needed to demonstrate that these were grandfathered-in structures, and this was

“moving along fine.” Mr. Coker requested a 63-day extension, and noted that the “operational controls that Cable Marine already has in place, once the sprinkler system gets put in, will be acceptable to the Fire Marshall with a written plan.”

Mr. Nelson pointed out that some of the violations dated to 2009. Mr. Coker said a lot of work had been done but had not been “checked off” but he could not explain why. He said the big issue – the fire line and sprinklers – had now been addressed.

Mr. Nelson disclosed that Mr. Coker had performed his marriage ceremony 25 years ago.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, said a lot of work had been done in the last 10 to 14 days. He said there had been a breakthrough with the owner getting money allocated to the sprinkler system. Inspector Hruschka had spoken with the electrical chief, who informed him the work proposed on the plan looked good. He had also spoken with the Fire Marshall, who indicated they were resolving the issue with the spray booth. Inspector Hruschka recommended a 63-day extension.

Mr. Nelson asked if there would be “a visible difference of work” done within 28 days, and Inspector Hruschka stated it would not. He said 63 days would still be optimistic.

Mr. Ron Tetreault, Fire Inspector, stated this case would set a precedent for a number of marinas in the City. He said the Code specified that the marina must have a spray booth for a 100-foot vessel, which was practically impossible. The Fire Marshall’s office had developed alternatives and would not object to a 63-day extension.

Inspector Tetreault indicated that the marina staff was trained to fight fires.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10092111

1018 Northwest 2 Avenue
COUNTRYWIDE HOME LOANS INC

This case was first heard on 3/22/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/4/11.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, said there was nothing new to tell.

Ms. Leslie Kanfer, listing agent, stated they had trashed out the units, trimmed the trees and repaired the roof. They intended to complete and correct the gas to electric

conversion issues as soon as they received documentation from Bank of America. Ms. Kanfer requested a 28-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 28-day extension to 5/24/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 5-2 with Mr. Nelson and Mr. Thilborger opposed.

Case: CE09030900

1770 Northwest 26 Terrace
LA FAVOR, GLENN R H/E
LA FAVOR, A & LA FAVOR, S

This case was first heard on 9/22/09 to comply by 3/23/10. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was complied, fines had accrued to \$880 and the City was requesting no fine be imposed. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/6/11.

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

Case: CE09060387

1408 Northwest 9 Avenue
B & H REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT LLC

Ms. Paris stated the property had been sold to Klara Natan on 7/7/10. This case was first heard on 8/24/10 to comply by 10/26/10. 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 to accrue on 4/27/11. Service was via posting on the property on 4/11/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Mr. Tal Hen, general manager, reported the project general contractor to whom they had paid a deposit had disappeared and they had hired a new company. Mr. Hen said the new contractor planned to have everything submitted to the City for the permits. Mr. Hen presented an unsigned copy of the contract with the new contractor.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, said he had received no communication on the case since the previous meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 28-day extension to 5/24/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote, motion passed 6-1 with Chair Sheppard opposed.

Case: CE10040096

1213 Northeast 13 Street
MCCUE, JONATHAN J & HADAS F

This case was first heard on 1/25/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Mr. Uri Ostrovsky, the owner's uncle, reported the variance had been approved on March 9 and the plans were ready to submit.

Burt Ford, Building Inspector, confirmed the variance had been approved. He informed Ms. Ellis that the zoning issue had been the only problem with the plans when they were originally submitted.

Mr. Ostrovsky stated the house was currently occupied by a tenant.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE09040018

3220 Northwest 63 Street
KEARSE, EVE

This case was first heard on 3/23/10 to comply by 8/24/10. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Ms. Noel VanDenHouten, bank attorney, reported that Chase had transferred the loan service to Lender Business Process Service [LBPS]. She said the loan was not current, but Ms. Kearse had informed her that she had submitted a loss mitigation package to the new servicer.

Ms. Eve Kearse, owner, said she had visited the City several times to get the permits but still lacked paperwork.

Mr. Jerome Key, the owner's friend, stated he was a subcontractor and he and other subcontractor friends were assisting Ms. Kearse. He stated they intended to demolish the garage and porch because these would never pass inspection. The plumber and electrician would make sure everything was in order and call for inspections.

Burt Ford, Building Inspector, stated the driveway permit needed to be inspected and closed out. He said the City was willing to work with Mr. Key.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE09011970

1133 Southwest 5 Place
ACREE, BARBARA

Ms. Paris noted as of 4/20/10, the property was owned by Cameron Cook and Joey Partin. This case was first heard on 1/26/10 to comply by 5/25/10. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, reported there had been no recent progress. The permit to enclose the garage area had been picked up for corrections on March 7, 2011 but had not been resubmitted. The shed permit had been out for corrections since November 18, 2010.

Joey Partin, owner, said the revisions had been submitted that morning. He stated the architect had finished the corrections the previous evening.

Motion made by Mr. Thilborger, seconded by Mr. Nelson to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote, motion passed 5-2 with Ms. Ellis and Chair Sheppard opposed.

Case: CE09050642

1301 Northeast 17 Avenue
DOMINICIS, MARIA LE
DOMINICIS, LUIS & DOMINICIS D

This case was first heard on 8/24/10 to comply by 10/26/10. 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 to accrue on 4/27/11. Personal service was made to the owner on 4/1/11.

Mr. Damien Dominicis, owner, stated the property had failed inspection because the architect had misstated the building's framing. It had taken time to have the architect make the revisions because he was in and out of the hospital.

Burt Ford, Building Inspector, confirmed what Mr. Dominicis had said. He recommended a 63-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE07110906

1132 Northwest 5 Court
MCCULLOUGH, JOHNNY
HALL, ODESSA

This case was first heard on 11/24/09 to comply by 5/25/10. 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 to accrue on 4/27/11. Personal service was made to the owner on 4/11/11.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, said there was nothing new to report.

Mr. Johnnie McCullough, owner, said he had a licensed electrician and air conditioning contractor helping with the central air units that had been installed without permits. He stated their other home had needed sewer work, which had cost them over \$2,000. Mr. McCullough said his mother and another relative were occupying the property.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08061524

1650 Northeast 60 Street
QUARATELLA, JOSEPH F

This case was first heard on 6/22/10 to comply by 9/28/10. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Mr. Joseph Ieracitano, the owner's representative, stated they had a hearing at the City on May 11 to see if they could keep what was there. He requested an extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 91-day extension to 7/26/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a roll call vote, motion passed 5-2 with Ms. Ellis and Chair Sheppard opposed.

Case: CE05111570

3051 Northeast 32 Avenue
ANNIEOPA LLC

This case was first heard on 8/26/08 to comply per stipulated agreement by 11/25/08. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was complied, fines had accrued to \$47,600 and the City was requesting no fine be imposed. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/6/11.

Anne Ginsburg, owner, thanked the Board.

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

Case: CE10080653

2001 Northwest 28 Avenue
PIERCE, RICKY

This case was first heard on 1/25/11 to comply by 3/22/11. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, stated the permits were ready to be picked up and recommended a 28-day extension.

Mr. Ricky Pierce, owner, stated he was trying to get the fees reduced.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 28-day extension to 5/24/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10082026

1650 Southwest 27 Avenue
ECHOLS, AARON

This case was first heard on 2/22/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/12/11.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, said there was no progress to report.

Mr. Aaron Echols, owner, said he had been unable to find a reliable general contractor and requested a three-month extension. Ms. Paris advised there was a list of contractors on the City's website; they were not approved by the City, but the list could provide a starting point.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 28-day extension to 5/24/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE09010920

1904 Southwest 4 Avenue
FORT LAUDERDALE LEARNING CTR LLC

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.

The owner was not present and the Board heard other cases.

Upon returning to the case, Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, stated only the plumbing permit was outstanding, and corrections had been resubmitted on April 25, 2011. He recommended a 28-day extension.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 28-day extension to 5/24/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10092090

1125 Northwest 16 Court
PHD DEVELOPMENT LLC

This case was first heard on 3/22/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda and the property was not complied

Mr. Jose Lairet, contractor, said the owner had purchased the home in August. He requested a 60-day extension to apply for permits.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, said he had received a letter from the owner requesting 90 days. Inspector Hruschka recommended 63 days.

Mr. Lairet confirmed the property had been vacant since the owner purchased it.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08050335

1061 Northwest 25 Avenue
LINDER, JERON F. JR

Ms. Paris reported as of 7/9/10 the owner was 1061 NW 25th Avenue Trust, Catalina Management LLC Trustee. This case was first heard on 2/24/09 to comply by 5/26/09. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, stated all permits had been issued on April 21 and recommended a 91-day extension.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger to grant a 91-day extension to 7/26/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE09040981

921 Southwest 31 Avenue
DAVIDSON, CAMEY CHEBETER

This case was first heard on 8/24/10 to comply by 11/23/10. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of a \$4,810 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property complied. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/7/11.

Jorg Hruschka, Building Inspector, stated the demolition permit application had been submitted earlier.

Ms. Camey Davidson, owner, said she had tried her best. The contractor had called her earlier and asked her to meet him at City Hall. Ms. Davidson said finances had been an issue. She requested 60 days.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Ms. Hinton to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10101100

1033 Northeast 16 Terrace
MAINI, ARCHANA
SHETH, KISHOR

This case was first heard on 2/22/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, stated the kitchen remodel permit was still in review and recommended a 63-day extension.

Mr. Willie Powell, the general contractor's assistant, was present.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman to grant a 63-day extension to 6/28/11, during which time no fines would accrue. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE06061015

2051 Northwest 28 Avenue
WILLIAMS, TOCCARA

This was a request to vacate the Final Orders dated 11/28/06 and 2/27/07 and the Order Imposing a fine dated 2/26/08.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to vacate the Final Orders dated 11/28/06 and 2/27/07 and the Order Imposing a fine dated 2/26/08. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE05110901

1629 Northeast 12 Street
MCDERMOTT DEVELOPMENT LLC

This case was first heard on 10/26/10 to comply by 2/22/11. 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 to accrue on 4/27/11. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/2/11.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Thilborger, to find the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE09021699

680 Southwest 29 Terrace
TELCY, EUGENA

This case was first heard on 3/23/10 to comply by 4/27/10. Violations and extensions were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of a \$1,020 fine, which would continue to accrue until the property complied. Personal service was made to the owner on 4/4/11.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to find the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose the \$1,020 fine, which would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10040725

2675 Southwest 6 Court
RODRIGUEZ, MANUEL & SELVA CALVO

This case was first heard on 3/22/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11. Service was via posting on the property on 4/11/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10052098

3505 Southwest 12 Court
DIVINE AUTHORITY INC

This case was first heard on 1/25/11 to comply by 4/26/11. Violations were as noted in the agenda. The property was not complied and the City was requesting imposition of the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11. Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/1/11.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to find the violations were not complied by the Order date, and to impose the fine, which would begin to accrue on 4/27/11 and would continue to accrue until the violations were corrected. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

The Board took a break for lunch from 10:24 until 10:59.

Case: CE10012098

3300 Northeast 16 Court
SNYDER, GARY S & JANE LE
SNYDER FAM TR

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/13/11.

Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
47-34.1.A.1.

THE SINGLE FAMILY HOME ORIGINALLY HAD A SEPARATE MAID'S QUARTERS WITH A GARAGE ATTACHED. THE GARAGE HAS BEEN CONVERTED INTO LIVING SPACE AND IS BEING USED AS A RENTAL UNIT, WHICH IS A PROHIBITED LAND USE IN THIS RS-8 ZONING DISTRICT, AS INDICATED IN SECTION 47-5.11.

FBC(2007) 105.1

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

1. THE GARAGE THAT IS ATTACHED TO THE ORIGINAL MAID'S QUARTERS HAS BEEN CONVERTED INTO LIVING SPACE.
2. A PVC FENCE HAS 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. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED IN THE GARAGE CONVERSION.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED DURING THE GARAGE CONVERSION.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

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

1. THE GARAGE CONVERSION HAS A/C INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE PVC FENCE HAS 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 reported the property was in foreclosure; the owners were unsure if they would keep the property or sell it. Inspector Ford recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation.

Mr. John Tiberio, neighbor, said the unit had been used as a rental.

Mr. Gary Snyder, owner, requested a 90-day extension to address the violations. He confirmed the property was in foreclosure, and said they were awaiting notice of refinancing, which would allow them to re-roof the existing house and address the code issues. Mr. Snyder said a contract for short sale had been submitted, but if the financing came through they would address the violations. If not, the prospective buyer was aware of the violations and would address them.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to continue the case for 91 days.

Ms. Wald stated the City wished a finding of fact, and the respondent had requested an extension. Mr. Nelson said he understood this when he made the motion.

In a voice vote, motion **failed** 0-7.

Inspector Ford stated the maid's quarters were occupied and the Board should determine if this was a rental, which was prohibited. Mr. Snyder stated a friend was

occupying the maid's quarters; she was not paying rent. He admitted the building had been rented in the past, including when they purchased the property. Mr. Snyder said they had paid an additional \$4,000 in taxes per year for multi-family and his attorney had advised him not to oppose this because it would make renting the unit legitimate. He said they became aware one year ago that the City did not recognize this as a multi-family and they had not rented it since.

Mr. Snyder stated they had been unable to address the issues until recently because of financial difficulties.

Mr. Tiberio reiterated that the issue with the cottage was the rental, and the fact that the Tiberios had to "live with that person in our bedroom." He pointed out the proximity of the cottage to his home on photos he had taken. Mr. Tiberio stated he had witnessed the renovation, during which the walls were removed and re-configured. He said the unit had been rented in the past, and presented a 2007 Craig's list ad indicating a full kitchen. Mr. Tiberio stated the current listing for the house highlighted the cottage and called it a guest cottage. He noted that the zoning on the listing stated multi-family.

Inspector Ford explained that the property was zoned RS-8 single family with the City.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Mr. Elfman 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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08121189

1525 Southeast 15 Street # 5
SOUTH EAST ISLANDER APARTMENTS INC
AND PESOLA, TAISTO A

Personal service was made to Linda Waldbauer, Officer on 4/7/11 and to Taisto A. Pesola on 4/7/11.

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 DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
3. A DOOR HAS BEEN REMOVED AND THE OPENING HAS
BEEN CLOSED IN.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING
THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE WINDOWS AND 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.

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 recommended ordering the owner to bring the property into compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation. He clarified for Mr. Jolly that he was recommending the violator was responsible for compliance.

Ms. Wald reminded that Board that they had previously heard the case brought against South East Islander Apartments and that Order had been vacated pursuant to a motion by South East Islander Apartments' attorney. The City had since determined that either the owner, "South East Islander Apartments" cooperative and/or the unit owner, the long-term lessee, Taisto Pesola, could be found in violation. The term "violator" was defined in the City Code as the person or legal entity deemed responsible for the violation. Under Florida Statute 719.507, laws, ordinances and regulations concerning buildings or zoning were applied without regard to form of ownership. The City had therefore brought the case against the unit owner and South East Islander Apartments, the cooperative owner of the entire complex. Ms. Wald continued that regarding the exterior doors and windows issue, there had been a question of whether this was a structure of the property or interior improvements and changes.

Inspector Ford explained that anything on the exterior of a building was considered part of the exterior envelope, including windows and doors because they sealed the envelope and protected the integrity therein. The wall air conditioning unit that had been removed was part of the structural wall as well.

Mr. Elmer Generotti, attorney for South East Islander Apartments, said the Florida Legislature had been eroding the co-op law to the point it was "negligible." He referred to other Statutes and explained that unit owners were no longer called lessee, but unit owner, and that person transferred ownership, after approval by the cooperative. Mr. Generotti added that co-op associations had no access to any unit except in exigent circumstances, to prevent damage. He read the full definition of unit owner from the Statute. Mr. Generotti added that a unit owner did not have the authority to act for the association and was entitled to exclusive use and possession of his/her own unit. Unit owners were also governed to comply with the documents and bylaws of the cooperative association.

In this case, Mr. Generotti said a unit owner had made changes without a permit. He noted that previous violations had begun in 2008 and had been eliminated by the unit owner after the association President provided rules and regulations to the inspector indicating that doors and windows were the obligation of the unit owner.

Mr. Generotti stated transfer of title occurred from unit owner to unit owner, not from the co-op. He provided a copy of the document that conveyed this property to Mr. Pesola from the prior unit owner, and stated it was an "assignment of a residential owner's proprietary lease." Mr. Generotti said Mr. Pesola had indicated at a meeting that he would be responsible for the rules and regulations. Mr. Generotti said these rules and regulations specified that the unit owner was responsible for windows and doors of the unit. Mr. Nelson pointed out that this was contractual, not statutory.

Mr. Generotti said in the past, all City permits had been issued to unit owners, and presented a list of all permits pulled. He said the association had pulled permits for public areas only, such as docks and walkways. Mr. Generotti noted that the association did not need to approve windows installed by unit owners.

Mr. Generotti acknowledged that Mr. Pesola had not made the changes without a permit, but as the current owner, he was responsible. Mr. Generotti said he could not tell the other unit owners that they were responsible.

Mr. Generotti stated Mr. James Morgan, witness, was an attorney, real estate broker and general contractor. Mr. Morgan said he had inspected the unit and the windows were not load bearing but did create the building envelope. He said penetration of this ground floor unit would not result in damage to the upstairs unit or flood any other units. Mr. Morgan stated windows in the units were not consistent. Mr. Nelson asked Mr. Morgan the South Florida Building Code definition of "structure," and Mr. Morgan stated windows and doors were part of the "structural envelope." He acknowledged there was a conflict between the co-op documents and the Code regarding who was responsible for structural repairs and windows and doors.

Mr. Generotti said Anne Rosse, board member, would testify that Mr. Pesola had agreed to abide by the revised rules and regulations prior to becoming unit owner. She would also testify to the composite bylaws and rules and regulations that stated the owner was responsible for windows and doors.

Mr. Generotti stated Joyce Phillips, president of board, would testify that the association did not require approval of windows that owners wished to install. She would also testify to common area work the association had done such as walkways and the dock area.

Mr. Generotti asked that the City treat this unit owner as other owners had been treated and hold him responsible for pulling the permits.

Mr. Elfman asked if the association took a position if a unit owner did work without a permit. Mr. Generotti said this had not been a problem before this case.

Mr. Generotti informed Mr. Smith that the association had the right, not the responsibility to access a unit to prevent damage to the building or another unit.

Mr. Taisto Pesola stated he was lessee in unit 5. He said he had not been provided with the documents Mr. Generotti had distributed. Mr. Pesola said he had many emails criticizing changes he had made to his unit and threatening litigation. He claimed that there was not one unit in the association that did not have violations pending. Mr. Pesola said his unit had been totally remodeled and the association must have known about it. He insisted the violations occurred prior to his ownership.

Mr. Pesola said, "It was quite well understood by everybody there that everything had to conform" and he referred to doors, windows and storm shutters. He added that the Notice of Violation did not indicate that he was responsible "merely because I happen to be there." He asked what he could do, and Mr. Nelson informed him he could either make the repair or obtain permits for the work done to the property he owned or owned share right to. The City had alleged that work was done without a permit. Mr. Pesola stated, "Well, it's going to have to be determined somewhere else than in here finally."

Inspector Ford stated on the whole, there were actually more window and door installations performed by associations than by individual unit owners, and the City gave permits to associations and/or unit owners, whoever applied for them. He explained that when windows were installed, they were tested for wind load and impact load if they were impact windows. Once installed, the windows became part of the structure and impact and wind loads were transferred into the adjoining structure, so they were indeed part of the structure.

Ms. Wald referred to the rules and bylaws for the association, which indicated that replacement of exterior windows must be approved in writing by the board. She notes there had been no testimony or proffer regarding this.

Ms. Wald explained that inspectors referred to the Property Appraiser's records to determine ownership of a property, and she noted that under Florida Statute, a unit owner could be, and was, listed as owner in the Property Appraiser's records.

Regarding the association's right of access in the Statutes, Ms. Wald said this discussed structural components of the building and the City had brought the case against both parties because they were permitted to cite the violator or violators. She referred to the definition of "violator" she had read earlier from City Code. Ms. Wald

stated the question became whether this was structural or not, and she said it was both. She believed that both parties could be found in violation.

Ms. Wald stated the City had determined that permits must be pulled and both parties were responsible.

Inspector Ford informed Ms. Ellis that five to six windows, a French door and an entry door were in violation.

Mr. Nelson asked if the Board would make one motion for both respondents or two separate motions. Mr. Jolly noted the difficulty of the association being able to comply by removing the work instead of pulling a permit. He stated they did not want the association to be entering the unit and "ripping out the guy's kitchen." Mr. Nelson said he would not mind the association going forward with a judicial order to allow them to do it, if need be, and this would be between the association and Mr. Pesola. Mr. Jolly was unsure if "violation" was the right test, because the violator, presumably, was the previous owner. Mr. Pesola would become theoretically the violator if the Board determined it to be so and the association would become the violator if the Board was "suggesting that the association had the burden to go forward on each occasion where windows were to be replaced..."

Mr. Generotti asked how the association could fund what the City was requesting when the individual owner had exclusive use and possession and the only time the association had this right was when they were seeking to prevent damage to another unit, which they could not prove to a court.

Mr. Nelson stated there were two issues: did the violations exist and who was the violator(s). He believed that a co-op, under Florida Statute, was still the owner; Mr. Pesola had a share interest. He referred to the statutory definition of unit owner that referred to "one with a share interest and a muniment of possession." Mr. Nelson did not believe the right of exclusive occupancy was that substantially different from the right of quiet enjoyment on a tenant that would give him that type of fee simple title, and was borne out by the instrument by which Mr. Pesola had gained title: a transfer in proprietary interest. Therefore, as the unit occupier, Mr. Nelson felt the Board could find both Mr. Pesola and the association violators and should make one motion.

Motion made by Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Hinton, to find for the City that the violations existed as alleged jointly and severally for each violator listed as a respondent in this matter, and to order the property owners to come into compliance within 63 days, by 6/28/11 or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 6-1 with Chair Sheppard opposed.

Case: CE10111450

816 Southwest 10 Terrace
DEVIN, ROBERT D

Service was via posting on the property on 4/11/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violation:
FBC(2007) 105.4.1

A WOOD FRAME STRUCTURE WITH A PLASTIC CORRUGATED
ROOF HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTED ON THE REAR OF THE
SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING WITHOUT A PERMIT.

Withdrawn:
FBC(2007) 3105.

Inspector Smilen stated this case was begun as the result of a complaint. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$10 per day.

Mr. Robert Devin, owner, asked what research had been done to determine the structure was not permitted and Inspector Smilen replied he had researched the permit history and discovered a permit had never been issued for the structure. Mr. Devin distributed documents and stated in 1991, after-the-fact permits #91014535 and #91014536 had been issued. Mr. Smilen said he had researched that.

Ms. Sherry Landess, witness, reported she lived next door to Mr. Devin and stated a prior owner had done a lot of work to the property in the mid 1980s. She stated she had signed a petition related to a zoning variance and she was aware that a wooden deck was attached to the carport/dining area and that they were built at the same time. Ms. Landess also recalled that the former owner had pulled after-the-fact permits in 1991 and she assumed that the deck would have been covered under the 1991 permit.

Ms. Landess informed Mr. Nelson that she had lived next door when the deck was built and the deck work included the roof structure noted in the violation. Mr. Nelson pointed out that the permit sketch showed just an open deck, not a deck with a structure on it.

Mr. Devin referred to his exhibits, including a 1977 survey, and stated the relevant information was that the "alleged offending structure" did not exist in 1977. Mr. Devin said the person who purchased the property after this survey was completed was William Jones, who had subsequently done a lot of work on the property, including enclosing the carport into a dining room and constructing the wooden deck structure.

Mr. Nelson asked which permit was for the deck, and Mr. Devin said it appeared that "this is computer generated and they might have ran out of room." He said it was Mr.

Jones' intention to make this a global permit to address all of the outstanding problems. Mr. Nelson referred to the permit application, which mentioned enclosed carport/dining room, stucco, after the fact. Mr. Devin said the roof structure existed over the Jacuzzi and "would have been very hard for an inspector to miss." Mr. Nelson pointed out there was no final inspection report for the global permit. Mr. Devin felt this was typical, and indicated a lack of evidence at the City.

Mr. Devin listed his exhibits, including the 1977 survey, the 1999 survey, and the Order from the Board of Adjustment for the carport variance. He noted that the body of the variance indicated the carport had been converted six years earlier, in 1985. Mr. Nelson noted that the variance mentioned the side yard reduction for the carport, but if the owner at that time had wanted to legalize the deck, one would expect it to fall into the 4'8" side yard envelope, but the survey showed the deck fell into a zero-foot envelope because it extended to the property line. He noted that this damaged Mr. Devin's case that this was a "global settlement to reach out." Mr. Devin stated this had been a variance for a zoning issue, not a permit issue. Mr. Nelson stated a permit issued to allow a structure in the impermissible side yard was not a valid permit.

Mr. Thomas Lindgren, witness, stated he lived two houses away. He recalled that all items had been built at the same time.

Inspector Smilen confirmed that the only structure they were discussing in the violation was the vertical structure over the existing Jacuzzi. Inspector Smilen could not be certain whether or not the structure could be permitted. He reiterated that the permit to which Mr. Devin referred mentioned to enclose the carport, dining room, stone and stucco. There was no record of a permit for the vertical structure and roof.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10011075

2031 Northeast 54 Street
PAVICIC, MARY JEAN

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/12/11.

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. A GAZEBO HAS BEEN BUILT IN THE BACKYARD.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING
THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE GAZEBO HAS 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 reported a lis pendens had been recorded on this property on 2/19/09. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 28 days or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation.

Ms. Carrie Anderson, respondent's attorney, stated Mary Jean Pavicic had surrendered the property to the bank in bankruptcy court in 2009 and had not lived in the home since 2009. Ms. Pavicic had no funds and did not have access to the property. She had also been in the hospital recently.

Mr. Randall Mogg, bank representative, stated the bankruptcy went against the personal property of the respondent but did not attach to the property. They were therefore in limbo until the foreclosure action on the property was finished. The bank would not own the property until the summary judgment was granted and the property went to a public sale. Mr. Mogg stated there was a docket lag in Broward County.

Ms. Wald said the City, pursuant to its police power, could move forward with this hearing, but could not impose fines or liens against Ms. Pavicic. She recommended that the Board grant a long compliance period to allow the foreclosure to go through. Ms. Wald said the City would not bring the case forward for imposition of fines until the resolution of title was complete.

Mr. Mogg stated removal of the structure to resolve the problem would not be an issue; as soon as the bank had certificate of title they would remove the structure. At present, there was a privacy fence on the property and the bank could not access the structure without permission from the trustee or Ms. Pavicic, who could not grant it. He said this was possible, but it was very difficult to get permission from a bankruptcy trustee.

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 210 days, by 11/22/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

The following three cases at the same address were heard together:

Case: CE10042246

3333 Northeast 36 Street # 2
DADDARIO, ANGELA

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/13/11.

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. A FENCE HAS BEEN INSTALLED ON THE ROOF SURROUNDING THE CUPOLA.
2. AN EXTERIOR DOOR TO THE LAUNDRY ROOM HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
3. PAVERS 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 SPRINKLER SYSTEM HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
2. A WATER HEATER HAS BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. EXTERIOR LIGHTING HAS BEEN INSTALLED AND CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THEM.
2. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THE NEW WATER HEATER INSTALLED.
3. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THE NEW SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE FENCE AND THE EXTERIOR LAUNDRY ROOM DOOR 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. He stated permit applications had been submitted some time ago and the only pending permit was for paving. There was also a landscape issue that must be complied with per Zoning. Inspector Ford recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation, per case.

Mr. Ed Nichols, property manager, remarked that "getting anything done was torment" because the owners were mostly absentees. He explained that the son of an owner had become president of the association and done the work. Mr. Nichols said the sprinklers had been installed many years ago; they were not new. He stated they had a permit application in for the water heater. Mr. Nichols explained they had spent \$5,000 on architects and contractors to try to make sense of the violations. The architect had recommended obtaining an attorney because he believed they were being harassed.

On January 22, Mr. Nichols had sent a certified letter to David Gennaro, Chief Landscaping Plans Examiner, asking him to explain the City's concerns regarding the landscaping. Mr. Gennaro had not phoned him until April 7 and informed him he should speak with John Heller, Chief Structural Inspector, who referred him back to Mr. Gennaro. Mr. Nelson noted there were no landscape violations, but Mr. Nichols stated, "They're telling me there is; they're telling me they won't give us any of the permits that we've applied for because it's all under a Master Permit and there's something to do with landscaping." Mr. Nichols stated Inspector Ford had indicated the landscape issue was with the pavers and they should be removed.

Inspector Ford explained that certain things, such as installing pavers, triggered landscaping requirements. He had recommended removing the pavers and re-sodding the areas.

Mr. Nichols showed a site map of the property and explained that the paths people used to get from the parking area to their doors had been resurfaced with pavers. Mr. Nelson advised Mr. Nichols that a permit must be sought for the pavers. Mr. Nelson agreed with Inspector Ford that the easiest way to comply would be to remove the pavers. Inspector Ford confirmed that if the pavers were removed, all of the other permits would be released.

Mr. Nichols stated he had Power of Attorney for Angela Daddario and Richard D Feldmann, but not for Maureen Bailey. Mr. Jolly recommended separate motions for the individual cases.

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$5 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10042248

3333 Northeast 36 Street # 3
BAILEY, MAUREEN

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/7/11.

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. A FENCE HAS BEEN INSTALLED ON THE ROOF SURROUNDING THE CUPOLA.
2. AN EXTERIOR DOOR TO THE LAUNDRY ROOM HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
3. PAVERS 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 SPRINKLER SYSTEM HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
2. A WATER HEATER HAS BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. EXTERIOR LIGHTING HAS BEEN INSTALLED AND CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THEM.
2. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THE NEW WATER HEATER INSTALLED.
3. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THE NEW SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

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

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$5 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10042243

3333 Northeast 36 Street # 4
RICHARD D FELDMANN REV TR
FELDMANN, RICHARD D TRSTEE

Service was via posting on the property on 4/7/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

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. A FENCE HAS BEEN INSTALLED ON THE ROOF SURROUNDING THE CUPOLA.
2. AN EXTERIOR DOOR TO THE LAUNDRY ROOM HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
3. PAVERS 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 SPRINKLER SYSTEM HAS BEEN INSTALLED.
2. A WATER HEATER HAS BEEN INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. EXTERIOR LIGHTING HAS BEEN INSTALLED AND CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THEM.
2. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THE NEW WATER HEATER INSTALLED.
3. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ADDED/ALTERED TO POWER THE NEW SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

FBC(2007) 1612.1.2

THE FENCE AND THE EXTERIOR LAUNDRY ROOM DOOR HAVE NOT BEEN PROVEN TO SUFFICIENTLY WITHSTAND ESTIMATED OR ACTUAL IMPOSED DEAD, LIVE, WIND, OR

ANY OTHER LOADS THROUGH THE PERMIT AND INSPECTION

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$5 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

At 1:36 PM, Ms. Ellis and Mr. Elfman left the hearing and Mr. Dooley and Ms. Espinal took their places on the dais.

Case: CE10111901

6337 North Andrews Avenue
CYPRESS CREEK ASSOC LTD PRTNR
C/O KIMCO REALTY CORPORATION

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

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

THE COMMERCIAL SPACE HAS BEEN ALTERED TO
ACCOMMODATE A BEAUTY SALON RENOVATION WITHOUT A
PERMIT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

THE PLUMBING SYSTEM HAS BEEN ALTERED TO
ACCOMMODATE THE RENOVATION FOR A BEAUTY SALON
WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM HAS BEEN ALTERED IN THE
COMMERCIAL SPACE TO ACCOMODATE A BEAUTY SALON
RENOVATION WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS.

Inspector Smilen submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Ms. Deborah Thomas, tenant, stated she had taken over the salon in November, and all of the work had been done by a previous tenant. She stated the only notice she had received was dated April 12. Ms. Thomas said she had pulled the permit for the sprinkler system and hired someone to do the work. She said she must contact the building owner.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$50 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10111822

25 Northwest 11 Street
LUXE, EMILE

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/13/11.

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

FBC(2007) 105.1

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

1. NEW FRENCH DOORS WERE INSTALLED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

VARIOUS ELECTRICAL WIRING HAS BEEN INSTALLED
WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT INCLUDING CONNECTIONS
TO THE A/C EQUIPMENT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

NEW AIR CONDITIONING EQUIPMENT HAS BEEN INSTALLED
WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS.

Complied:

FBC(2007) 105.1 #2

Inspector Smilen stated this case had begun as the result of a complaint. He submitted photos of the property into evidence. He stated only the air conditioning units and French door violations remained.

Mr. Emile Luxe, owner, said the air conditioning unit had been built with the house; he had not installed it. The previous owner had installed the French doors. Chair Sheppard reminded Mr. Luxe that as the new owner, he was responsible for the permits for the items.

Inspector Smilen confirmed that after-the-fact permits could be obtained for the remaining violations. He recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation.

Motion made by Mr. Dooley, 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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10090377

1025 Northwest 8 Avenue
CEA, JEANNITTE &
CEA, JOSUE

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/13/11.

Hruschka, 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. THE TRIPLEX APARTMENT BUILDING WAS CHANGED INTO A FOURPLEX WITH FOUR KITCHENS AND BATHROOMS.
2. ATF PERMITS WERE ISSUED TO COMPLY THE VIOLATIONS BUT THE PERMITS WERE LEFT TO EXPIRE AND THE MASTER WAS VOIDED BY THE G.C.
3. THE FLOOR PLAN IN APARTMENT #1 WAS CHANGED TO BUILD THE EXTRA APARTMENT. BY ENCLOSING THE FIRST BEDROOM DOOR AND BUILDING NEW PARTITIONS, THIS CREATED THE MASTER BEDROOM, KITCHEN AND BATHROOM AREA WHERE THE STORAGE AREA USED TO BE.
4. AN EXTERIOR DOOR OPENING WAS ENCLOSED AND A WINDOW WAS SET IN THAT PLACE FACING THE SOUTH. ANOTHER WINDOW WAS SET IN A DOOR OPENING FACING THE EAST. AN OPENING WAS CUT IN THE WALL FACING THE NORTH SIDE TO INSTALL ANOTHER WINDOW.
5. THE REMAINING THREE APARTMENTS WERE REMODELED WITH NEW KITCHEN AND BATHROOM CABINETS WITH ALL THE FIXTURES.
6. THE KITCHENS SLIDING DOOR OPENINGS FACING THE NORTH SIDE WERE ENCLOSED AND AN EXTERIOR DOOR WAS INSTALLED IN THAT PLACE.
7. THE WINDOWS IN THE LIVING ROOM AREAS WERE REPLACED IN EACH APARTMENT.

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. THE EXISTING THREE BATHROOMS AND KITCHENS WERE REMODELED WITH NEW FIXTURES.
2. A FOURTH BATHROOM AND KITCHEN WERE BUILT INSIDE THE ILLEGAL APARTMENT.

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. REMODELING OF THE THREE EXISTING APARTMENTS WITH ELECTRICAL FIXTURES IN THE KITCHENS AND BATHROOMS.
2. IN THE NEW APARTMENT THAT WAS BUILT, THE METER HAS BEEN JUMPED AND IS FEEDING FROM APARTMENT #2. THIS EXCEEDS THE CAPACITY OF THE EXISTING 150 AMPS CIRCUITRY IN THE APARTMENT AND IS A FIRE HAZARD.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

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

1. THREE CENTRAL A/C'S WERE INSTALLED IN THE APARTMENTS WITH PERMITS, BUT THE CONDENSER UNITS WERE REPLACED (OUTSIDE UNIT) WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMIT AND INSPECTION.
2. A NEW SYSTEM WAS INSTALLED IN THE ILLEGAL APARTMENT WITH DUCTS AND ELECTRICAL HEATER.

FBC(2007) 105.10.3.1

THERE ARE FIVE BUILDING PERMITS WHICH FAILED INSPECTION AND/OR WERE LEFT TO EXPIRE:

1. P#02030631 - INSTALL 11 SMOKE DETECTORS, NO INSPECTIONS.
2. ATF P#01081794 - NEW KITCHEN FOR TRIPLEX, 24 WINDOWS, 4 DOORS.
3. ATF P#01080013 - ELECTRIC FOR FOUR KITCHENS AND BATHROOMS.
4. ATF P#01080011 - PLUMBING FOR FOUR KITCHENS AND BATHROOMS.
5. ATF P#01080010 - APARTMENT 4. NEW KITCHENS, BATHROOM, NEW WALLS.

FBC(2007) 109.10

THE 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 NEED TO BE IMPACT RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Inspector Hruschka submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation. Inspector Hruschka stated the expired after-the-fact permits were issued to the previous owner. He explained that a minor repair had partially addressed FBC(2007) 105.4.5. Inspector Hruschka stated there were two or three tenants on the property.

Mr. Josue Cea, owner, said he had hired an electrical inspector, who informed him everything was okay. Regarding the citation for changing the triplex into a fourplex, Mr. Cea said he had not done this; he had purchased the property like this.

Mr. Nelson said someone had turned the property into a fourplex and Mr. Cea must obtain a permit for this conversion or return the property to a triplex. Mr. Nelson advised Mr. Cea to hire a general contractor.

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 7/26/11 or a fine of \$5 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a roll call vote, motion passed 4-3 with Mr. Dooley, Mr. Thilborger and Chair Sheppard opposed.

Case: CE10060988

2900 Riomar Street
TIFFANY HOUSE LLC

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 2/24/11.

Burt Ford, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
9-306

THIS VACANT BUILDING IS IN A GENERAL STATE OF DISREPAIR AS FOLLOWS:

1. EXTERIOR WALLS ARE STAINED.
2. THERE ARE AREAS WHERE THE PAINT IS PEELING OR IS MISSING.
3. THERE ARE AREAS WHERE THE EXTERIOR STUCCO AND CONCRETE HAVE FALLEN OFF OR IS SPALLING AND HAS EXPOSED THE REINFORCING STEEL.

9-307(a)

MANY OF THE WINDOWS ARE BROKEN.

FBC(2007) 105.1

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

1. THE INTERIOR HAS BEEN GUTTED DOWN TO THE EXTERIOR WALLS. ALL OF THE FRAMING HAS BEEN REMOVED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. ALL PLUMBING PIPE, FIXTURES AND EQUIPMENT HAVE BEEN REMOVED FROM ALL OF THE BUILDINGS. THE INTERIOR HAS BEEN DEMOLISHED DOWN TO THE EXTERIOR WALLS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM ALL OF THE BUILDINGS. THE INTERIOR HAS BEEN DEMOLISHED DOWN TO THE EXTERIOR WALLS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

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

1. ALL MECHANICAL DUCT AND EQUIPMENT HAVE BEEN REMOVED FROM ALL OF THE BUILDINGS. THE INTERIOR HAS BEEN DEMOLISHED DOWN TO THE EXTERIOR WALLS.

FBC(2007) 109.10

WORK WAS PERFORMED AND/OR COVERED WITHOUT OBTAINING THE REQUIRED APPROVALS.

Inspector Ford described the condition of the building exterior and added that there had been a "complete interior demo." He submitted photos of the property into evidence and said the City wished the exterior to be kept up and demolition permits to be pulled for all of the trades. Inspector Ford recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Ms. Wald stated the structure was a designated landmark and any permit must go through the Historic Preservation Board [HPB] for approval. She recommended 91 days. She noted the former owner had planned to rehabilitate the building to save it. There was a new owner, and she thought it would have been unfair to move forward with an Unsafe Structures Board [USB] case with a new owner. If the USB determined the property should be demolished, this would still need to be presented to the HPB.

Mr. Frank Dalcon, the owner's employee, said he had spoken with Inspector Ford. They were currently painting the building, and he requested six months to pull permits for demolition. Since they were already working on the exterior, Mr. Dalcon suggested 90 days for the exterior violations.

Motion made by Mr. Dooley, seconded by Mr. Nelson 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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10122048

924 West Las Olas Boulevard
BRIGHT ASSETS LLC

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/8/11.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
FBC(2007) 105.1

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

1. NEW KITCHENS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
2. BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.
3. EXTERIOR STAIRWAYS AND LANDINGS HAVE BEEN CONSTRUCTED.
4. EXTERIOR OVERHANGS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
5. NEW WINDOWS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
6. NEW EXTERIOR DOORS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
7. AREAS OF THE BUILDING HAVE BEEN RESTUCCOED.
8. A SHED HAS BEEN PLACED IN THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY.
9. DRYWALL HAS BEEN REPLACED ON EXTERIOR WALLS.
10. SUPPORT COLUMNS HAVE BEEN REPLACED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. BATHROOM FIXTURES HAVE BEEN REPLACED.
2. WATER HEATERS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED.
3. KITCHENS HAVE BEEN REPLACED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. PREMISE WIRING.
2. ELECTRICAL CONNECTIONS FOR WATER HEATERS.
3. 220 VOLT OUTLETS FOR KITCHEN RANGES.
4. GFI OUTLETS FOR KITCHENS AND BATHROOMS.

FBC-P 502.1

THE INSTALLATIONS OF THE WATER HEATERS DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE.

FBC(2007) 1009.3

THE STAIR TREADS AND RISERS ON THE EXTERIOR STAIRWAY DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE.

FBC(2007) 1009.10

THE HANDRAILS ON THE EXTERIOR STAIRWAY DO NOT CONFORM WITH THE FLORIDA BUILDING CODE.

Mr. Nelson left the dais at 2:20.

Inspector Smilen stated the case had begun as the result of a complaint and he had issued a stop work order. He said permit applications had been submitted on April 4 and were out for corrections. Inspector Smilen submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

Inspector Smilen confirmed that no work had been done since the stop work order had been issued.

Mr. Daniel Barton, authorized agent, said the owner lived out of the country and intended to comply. He had hired an architect to draw plans to submit for the permits. Mr. Barton requested 120 days.

Ms. Wald described the location of the property and said plans must be submitted to the HPB for approval.

Motion made by Mr. Thilborger, seconded by Mr. Dooley 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 7/26/11 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, with Mr. Nelson absent from the dais, motion passed 6-0.

Mr. Nelson returned to the dais at 2:26.

Case: CE10042739

1501 Riverland Road
LIVING WATER COMMUNITY CHURCH INC

Service was via posting on the property on 4/12/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Hruschka, 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 INSPECTION:

1. THE REAR BUILDING WHERE THE KITCHEN AREA IS LOCATED USED TO HAVE 8 WINDOW OPENINGS ON THE NORTH SIDE. THREE OF THE WINDOWS WERE REPLACED AND THE OPENINGS WERE RETROFITTED FOR THE NEW WINDOW INSTALLATIONS.
2. FIVE OF THE REMAINING WINDOW OPENINGS WERE CUT AND MODIFIED FOR THE FIVE NEW DOORS THAT WERE INSTALLED TO BUILD FIVE ROOMS.

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 WALL A/C UNITS, LIGHTS AND WALL OUTLETS INSIDE THE NEWLY CREATED ROOMS. THEY 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 WITH GLASS NEED TO BE IMPACT RESISTANT OR BE PROTECTED BY AN APPROVED HURRICANE PROTECTION SYSTEM.

Complied:

FBC(2007) 105.1 #3

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

FBC(2007) 105.4.11 #2

Inspector Hruschka said there had been a complaint that the church was housing people overnight, but they had stopped doing this. The property still needed designs for the doors and windows, and for the air conditioning units. Inspector Hruschka recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Ricardo Thompson, pastor, said they had been approached by the Broward Coalition for the Homeless in 2008 to help with taking in women and children and the church had agreed. They had installed temporary showers to accommodate the people they took in. Mr. Thompson stated the church also fed up to 70 families per week. He said when they were made aware that the showers were not compliant they had removed them and halted all family assistance. They had already submitted applications for after-the-fact permits.

Mr. Rodney Hammes, general contractor, said drawings had been returned for insufficient detail and should be resubmitted within a week or two.

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$5 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

The following six cases at the same address were heard together. A respondent was present for unit #5 only.

Case: CE08080987

3061 Northeast 49 Street # 05
GARCEY, DIMITRIJE

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/13/11.

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. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ALTERED/REPLACED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE ELECTRICAL SYSTEM OF THE BUILDING HAS BEEN

ALTERED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE
FOLLOWING MANNER:

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ALTERED/ADDED DURING THE
KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

Inspector Ford submitted a photo of the property and noted that it was typical of the alterations done at all of the units. He stated he had visually inspected all of the cited units with the contractor. Inspector Ford reported all of the permits had been ready for pickup since July 2010.

Inspector Ford submitted the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. He said he had spoken with this unit owner, who informed him he had paid for his permits but the contractor had not picked them up. Inspector Ford said the permits for units 7, 9, 11 and 14 had also been paid for and not picked up by the contractor. He explained that picking up the permits would comply these cases. Inspector Ford recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Dimitrije Garcey, owner, confirmed he had paid for the permits for units 5 and 11 and was unaware the contractor just needed to pick them up. He said he would speak to the president of the board about this.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08080979

3061 Northeast 49 Street # 01
3061 Northeast 49 STREET LLC

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/6/11.

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. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ALTERED/REPLACED
DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ALTERED/ADDED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08080981

3061 Northeast 49 Street # 02
BRAWLEY, THOMAS JR & GAIL M

Service was via posting on the property on 4/7/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

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. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ALTERED/REPLACED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ALTERED/ADDED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08080983

3061 Northeast 49 Street # 03
DEL RUSSO, SUSAN & MARIANO, CARL

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/8/11.

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. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ALTERED/REPLACED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ALTERED/ADDED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08080985

3061 Northeast 49 Street # 04
MUYS, KELLY S

Service was via posting on the property on 4/7/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

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. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ALTERED/REPLACED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ALTERED/ADDED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE08080992

3061 Northeast 49 Street # 09
KLUCSERITS, DAVID J

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/13/11.

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. KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS HAVE BEEN REMODELED.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

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

1. PIPING AND FIXTURES HAVE BEEN ALTERED/REPLACED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

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

1. CIRCUITS HAVE BEEN ALTERED/ADDED DURING THE KITCHEN AND BATHROOM REMODELING.

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 28 days, by 5/24/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10120954

3105 Southwest 13 Street
CRESPO, ELBA

Service was via posting on the property on 4/5/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Hruschka, 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. THE OWNER IS BUILDING A ROOM ADDITION WITH A ROOF ON THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER.
2. WINDOWS WERE REPLACED. SOME OF THE OPENINGS WERE ENCLOSED. A DOUBLE DOOR WAS INSTALLED IN PLACE OF A SINGLE DOOR AND WINDOW BY ENLARGING THE DOOR OPENING.
3. AN ALUMINUM ROOF WAS INSTALLED AT THE REAR OF THE DWELLING OVER A CONCRETE SLAB.

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. A GAS LINE WAS INSTALLED WITH WATER PIPES TO SUPPLY THE NEW WATER HEATER.
2. THE LAUNDRY ROOM WAS RELOCATED TO THE NEW ADDITION WITH 220V POWER SUPPLY, PLUMBING PIPES FOR THE HOT & COLD WATER, AND THE DRAIN LINE.

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 UPGRADE, NEW WEATHERHEAD, METER CAN, AND MAIN BREAKER PANEL.
2. A 110V AND 220V POWER SUPPLY RUN TO THE NEW LAUNDRY ROOM.
3. NEW 110V ELECTRIC OUTLETS WERE DONE INSIDE THE ROOM ADDITION.
4. POWER SUPPLY TO THE CENTRAL A/C WITH THE 7.5 KW ELECTRIC HEATER.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

THE MECHANICAL SYSTEM OF THE FACILITY HAS BEEN CHANGED WITHOUT OBTAINING A PERMIT IN THE

FOLLOWING MANNER, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. GAS WATER HEATER HAS BEEN INSTALLED ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY CLOSE TO OR OVER THE SETBACK LINE. A GAS WATER HEATER SHALL BE PROTECTED FROM THE WEATHER WHEN PLACED OUTDOORS. COMBUSTION AIR SHALL BE PROVIDED THROUGH TWO PERMANENT OPENINGS, ONE COMMENCING WITHIN 12 INCHES OF THE TOP AND ONE COMMENCING WITHIN 12 INCHES OF THE BOTTOM OF THE ENCLOSURE. IT SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MANUFACTURER'S INSTALLATION INSTRUCTIONS. GAS FIRED WATER HEATERS SHALL CONFORM TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS CODE AND THE FLORIDA GAS CODE, FLORIDA MECHANICAL CODE AND FLORIDA BUILDING CODE.
2. CENTRAL A/C WAS INSTALLED WITH DUCT WORK AND A 7.5 ELECTRIC HEATER.

FBC(2007) 109.10

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

FBC(2007) 1604.1

THE STRUCTURES FOR THE ALUMINUM ROOF EXTENSION AND THE ILLEGAL ADDITION DO NOT MEET THE STANDARD FOR GRAVITY LOADING AND HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED WIND LOADING THROUGH THE PERMITTING PROCESS. ALL THE STRUCTURES THAT WERE DONE ILLEGALLY ARE DEEMED TO BE UNSAFE AND THE CONSTRUCTION IS UNDERDESIGNED AND WOULD NOT PROVIDE THE REQUIRED RESISTANCE TO UPLIFT THAT THE CODE PROTECTS ITS NEIGHBORS FROM FLYING DEBRIS IN A STORM, WHICH THIS STRUCTURE MAY BECOME, SO THEY MUST BE REMOVED.

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 Hruschka submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. He said the owner had

come in on December 14, 2010 and discussed what must be done. The owner had hired a general contractor, who had hired an engineer, but the plans submitted did not reflect the scope of the work. The Master Permit application had been submitted in March 2011. Inspector Hruschka recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

Mr. Assel Franqueiro, the owner's son, served as interpreter for his father, Osmanis Franqueiro. Mr. Franqueiro said his father had hired a contractor but the plans were not done properly and the contractor had taken \$3,000 and never returned phone calls. Mr. Franqueiro said he had hired a new contractor and requested 63 days.

Motion made by Mr. Dooley, 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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$15 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a roll call vote, motion passed 4-3 with Mr. Nelson, Mr. Thilborger and Ms. Espinal opposed.

Case: CE10080609

1329 Northwest 7 Avenue
FLEISHMAN, DOUGLAS

Service was via posting on the property on 4/5/11 and at City Hall on 4/14/11.

Hruschka, 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. BATHROOMS WERE BUILT INSIDE THE RENTAL APARTMENT.

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. THE WASTE DRAIN PIPES AND WATER SUPPLY LINES WERE RUNNING INTO THE EXTRA KITCHEN AND BATHROOMS INSIDE THE ILLEGAL TRIPLEX CONVERSION.

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. THE ELECTRICAL LOADS IMPOSED ON THE CIRCUITS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE TWO EXTRA

COOKING AREAS, EXCEED THE CAPACITY OF THE
EXISTING 200 AMP CIRCUITRY.

FBC(2007) 109.10

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

Withdrawn:

FBC(2007) 105.1 #1 and #2

FBC(2007) 110.1.1

Inspector Hruschka submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. He said at his inspection the previous day, the doors and closures had been opened up again into one unit. Inspector Hruschka recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation. He confirmed that one person who was not the owner currently occupied the property.

Mr. Douglas Fleishman, owner, said he had inherited the violations from a previous owner.

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE10120975

2012 S Miami Rd

MIAMI ROAD PARTNERS LLC

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/9/11.

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

FBC(2007) 105.1

THE DOOR OVERHANGS HAVE BEEN REBUILT WITHOUT
OBTAINING THE REQUIRED PERMITS.

FBC(2007) 1604.1

THE DOOR OVERHANGS DO NOT MEET THE STANDARD FOR
GRAVITY LOADING AND HAVE NOT BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO
WITHSTAND THE REQUIRED WIND LOADING THROUGH THE
PERMITTING AND PLAN REVIEW PROCESS.

Inspector Smilen stated the case was opened in response to a concern from Code Officer Aretha Wimberly. He submitted photos of the property and the Notice of

Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$30 per day, per violation.

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$30 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

Case: CE11020528

720 Southwest 19 Street
BANK OF NEW YORK TRUSTEE

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/8/11.

Gerry Smilen, Building Inspector, testified to the following violations:
9-280(b)

THE ENVELOPE OF THE BUILDING HAS SUCCUMBED TO
DETERIORATION FROM EXPOSURE TO THE ELEMENTS AND
FROM LACK OF MAINTENANCE.

FBC(2007) 105.4.4

A SPRINKLER SYSTEM AND WATER HOOK-UPS FOR AN RV
HAVE BEEN INSTALLED WITHOUT A PERMIT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.5

THE FOLLOWING ELECTRICAL WORK HAS BEEN COMPLETED
WITHOUT A PERMIT:

1. SECURITY LIGHTING.
2. EXTERIOR WIRING WITH OUTLETS.
3. ELECTRICAL SERVICE TO THE SHED.
4. OUTLETS FOR RV HOOK-UPS.
5. OUTLETS FOR A/C UNITS.

FBC(2007) 105.4.11

WALL A/C UNITS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED IN THE BUILDING
WITHOUT A PERMIT.

FBC(2007) 105.4.15

NEW WINDOWS HAVE BEEN INSTALLED IN THE BUILDING.

Inspector Smilen submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence. He said a contractor had phoned him and informed him he would put in a bid to remove the work done and board up the property but Inspector Smilen had not heard from him since. He recommended ordering compliance within 91 days or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation.

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 7/26/11 or a fine of \$25 per day, per violation would begin to accrue and to record the order. In a roll call vote, motion passed 4-3 with Mr. Nelson, Mr. Thilborger and Ms. Espinal opposed.

Case: CE10111580

6045 Northwest 31 Avenue # B
LAKEVIEW PLAZA INC

Certified mail sent to the owner was accepted on 4/15/11.

Hruschka, 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. OVER 50% OF THE LOAD BEARING WALL, WHICH IS ALSO A FIRE WALL DIVIDING TWO TENANT SPACES WAS REMOVED TO COMBINE TWO WAREHOUSES 604B AND 603B AS ONE.

FBC(2007) 708.3

THE REQUIRED FIRE-RESISTANCE RATINGS AND SEPARATIONS BETWEEN THE SEPARATE UNITS HAVE NOT BEEN PROVIDED FOR THE TENANT SEPARATIONS. EACH TENANT SPACE SHALL BE SEPARATED FROM OTHER TENANT SPACES BY A FIRE PARTITION COMPLYING WITH FBC 708. OPENINGS IN A FIRE WALL SHALL BE PROTECTED AS FER FBC 715.

Inspector Hruschka submitted photos of the property and the Notice of Violation detailing the violations and corrective action into evidence, and recommended ordering compliance within 63 days or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation.

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 6/28/11 or a fine of \$10 per day, per violation would begin to accrue 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 Mr. Nelson, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to approve the minutes of the Board's March meeting. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 – 0.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

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:

CE10020466 CE10031742 CE10070285 CE10081528
CE10062109

Cases Withdrawn

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


CE08080933 CE10050973 CE10071917 CE10091113

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 3:25 P.M.

ATTEST:



Clerk, Code Enforcement Board



Chair, Code Enforcement Board

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