Τ,

# CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE UNSAFE STRUCTURES BOARD THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2013 AT 3:00 P.M. CITY COMMISSION MEETING ROOM CITY HALL

Cumulative Attendance 10/12 through 9/13

Board Members	Attendance	Present	
Michael Weymouth, Chair	P	3	1.
Joe Holland, Vice Chair	P	3	1
John Barranco	P	3	0
Joe Crognale	A	3	1
Pat Hale	А	3	1
Thornie Jarrett	P	4	0
Don Larson	P	4	0
John Phillips (arrived 3:15)	P	4	0
B. George Walker	P	4	0

#### City Staff

Lori Grossfeld, Board Secretary
Erin Saey, Clerk III
Ginger Wald, Assistant Attorney
George Oliva, Building Inspector
Chris Augustin, Chief Building Official
Jeri Pryor, Code Enforcement Supervisor/Clerk
Lisa Edmondson, ProtoType Inc. Recording Clerk

### Communication to the City Commission

None

#### Witnesses and Respondents

CE11111569: Gerry Scanlon, owner; Tom Milletas, contractor

_
2
3

1.4

Index		
Case Number	Respondent	Page
1. CE11111569	BROWN, MORRIS L & JACQUELINE D	3
Address:	1642 NW 13 CT	
Disposition:	The Board granted a 28-day extension to March 21, 2013. Board approved 6-0.	
2. CE11111505	HSBC BANK USA NA AS TRUSTEE %OCWEN LOAN SERVICING	14
Address:	2424 NW 21 ST	
Disposition:	Withdrawn.	
3. CE12101972	EDWARDS, EDNA M, EDWARDS, STANLEY B & EDWARDS, BRUCE B	14
Address:	846 NW 17 AVE	
Disposition:	Withdrawn.	
	Communication to the City Commission	14
	For the Good of the City	14

The regular meeting of the Unsafe Structures Board convened at 3:03 p.m. at the City Commission Meeting Room, City Hall, 100 North Andrews Avenue, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

All individuals giving testimony before the Board were sworn in.

#### Approval of meeting minutes

Motion made by Mr. Larson, seconded by Mr. Holland, to approve the minutes of the Board's January 2013 meeting.

In a voice vote, motion passed 6-0.

#### Cases

## 1. Case: CE11111569

1642 NW 13 CT

INDEX

# BROWN, MORRIS L & JACQUELINE D

5 ||

MS. SAEY: Out first case is on page one. Case number CE11111569. Property address: 1642 Northwest 13 Court. The owner is Morris L. Brown and Jacqueline D. Brown. This is a old business case, the inspector is George Oliva.

This was posted on the property on 1/28/2013 and advertised in the Daily Business Review on 2/1/2013 and 2/8/2013.

This case was first at the 7/19/2012 USB hearing. The Board ordered a final order to demo. After the second property search, an interested property submitted a request for reconsideration. It was heard at October 18, 2012 USB hearing. The Board amended the final order and granted a ninety-one-day extension to the 1/17/13 USB hearing. At the 1/17/13 USB hearing, the Board ordered a continuance to the 2/21/13 USB hearing as is today.

Certified mail was signed for by all the people noted on the agenda as well as the violations as noted on the agenda.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Before we hear from the respondents, Inspector, if you would refresh at least my memory, if not the Board's memory.

INSPECTOR OLIVA: George Oliva, Building Inspector for the City. This case is about the flat deck at the rear of the property that was giving in to the property. And we already deemed it to be unsafe once and then the property changed ownership and we have the new owner that he got a permit for re-roof the flat deck but he never got a permit to replace the rafters and the rafters were replaced without permit. And so far that's where we are.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay. Good afternoon. State your name please.

MR. SCANLON: Good afternoon. Gerry Scanlon, I'm the general partner of the owner which is American Real Estate Strategies Fund. It's still showing the old owner on the documents I just read. Just to clarify, we actually purchased this house I believe around the twenty-eighth of December, sometime in the, over the holiday period.

And when I came last month what had happened was there was some rain coming. So the first thing that happened was the roof, a roof permit was taken out and gentleman, the general contractor did the roof, had not strapped down with beams, the rafters. So when I was last here we discussed that and I was told to submit a full set of plans for the

building which we, I believe have just gone in today.

Because there's architect's drawings in. There was a bit of back and forth but they have now been submitted.

So, I think that we're, you know, whilst it's not gone as quick as I'd like, they have been submitted and we intend to remediate everything. Tom Milletas, our general contractor who's with me is really overseeing the work on the project once we get going, once the plans are approved.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: The violations here, can inspector refresh my memory, is that the rafters on not properly secured, correct? Or are they, have they been replaced and they were not properly secured? They were not replaced?

INSPECTOR OLIVA: Well, the case was because, like I said, the flat deck where the rafter were replaced, before they were replaced, they gave in into the property. And we deem that part of the property to be unsafe. They replaced everything in the back, we have permit for reroof but never got the permit for the re-raft, which require a different permitted structure, architect or engineer design for the rafters so. As per Florida Building Code, it states that anything that is done without permit is to be deemed unsafe so we back to square one because the rafter haven't been permitted or have any inspections on.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: There's an image that's put up on our screens. Can you or whomever is putting this before us explain what we're looking at here?

INSPECTOR OLIVA: What you're looking at is a permit history on the property. And you can see the only permit that we have issued for the owner is the permit to replace the roof, the flat roof, which [inaudible]. You can do a minor repair on the plywood in case it's damaged by the weather but doesn't allow you to replace all the rafters, and do the restriping and the sheathing of the roof without the approval of the Building Official or a permit that has been issued for that type of work.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: So, as we sit here today the only evidence we've got that there's been a new set of plans submitted to the Building Department is what the respondent is telling us is that they submitted something.

INSPECTOR OLIVA: I spoke to the Building

Department at 3:01, that's what I put it there, and we don't have anything on the computer yet.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Any questions?

MR. JARRETT: I have a question for the owner.

MR. SCANLON: Yes.

MR. JARRETT: The plan you have in your hand there that you're'presenting --

MR. SCANLON: Yes.

1 MR. JARRETT: That is the plan that is to be 2 submitted? 3 MR. SCANLON: Absolutely. What actually happened 4 is they tried to submit it yesterday. Sorry --5 MR. JARRETT: Well, let me ask you a question. 6 MR. SCANLON: Oh, sure. 7 MR. JARRETT: Would you mind officially submitting that just for review. We have architects and engineers 8 9 sitting right here. Okay, perfect, absolutely. 10 MR. SCANLON: MR. JARRETT: Would, you know, and if one of them 11 12 would look at it --MR. SCANLON: I just, I just need -- absolutely. 13 MR. JARRETT: -- and tell us that the plan 14 addresses the issues, then maybe we might be inclined to give 15 16 you another thirty days. 17 MR. SCANLON: Of course. I just wanted to explain 18 and what actually happened was they tried to submit them 19 yesterday but they, not both sets were stamped; only one set 20 was stamped so they didn't accept them. So they tried to 21 resubmit them now as we speak. 22 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Is that, is that --23 MR. JARRETT: Actually, they want three sets. 24 MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. SCANLON: Sorry? Oh, is it three sets? I don't know I'm not the expert.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Who did you try to submit them to?

MR. SCANLON: To the Building Department. It was

done through the contractor who's managing the project for

us, Infinity Custom Homes, who did the roof.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: I don't know what protocol is in the City and maybe we could hear from the Chief Building Official as to whether that is a reason not to consider a submission or not. I don't know the answer to that.

MR. AUGUSTIN: Yes, it would be a reason not to accept the plans. Generally, that would not be recognized by the clerk that would take plans in. There's an application would need to be filled out and the clerk at that time would assign a permit review number which would show up on this screen, what you're seeing on, before you. There is no application numbers and it would be an eight digit number.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay.

MR. LARSON: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: So, so, so, if I'm hearing you correctly, under normal protocol, the plans would have been received more than likely and been given a processing number

and then that would have come up as a comment during plan review, that it's not a signed and sealed permit.

MR. AUGUSTIN: Correct.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay.

MR. LARSON: George? May I ask you a question? On the flat roof over there, has the joists that's come across, that have any of those been compromised? Are they sagging or have they been rotted or anything like that or they just have to be anchored into the wall?

INSPECTOR OLIVA: The new ones, where they were replaced I was not allowed to go inside the property by the contractor that was doing the work. But what I saw, I saw from the window and I took a picture and I put it on the records. But I can't testify there's sagging or [inaudible] or they were done properly or not.

MR. LARSON: Yes, you don't know whether the joists have been compromised prior to them putting the new ones in or anything like that. Maybe the contractor can answer that question.

INSPECTOR OLIVA: Well, everything there is brandnew, they replaced all the damaged one, but like I said, I can't testify either way.

MR. LARSON: Okay. Alright.

INSPECTOR OLIVA: Due to the fact that I haven't seen it.

MR. LARSON: Okay, alright, thanks.

INSPECTOR OLIVA: Okay.

\_

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Before we go back to the respondent, Inspector, hang on a second. Are there any other questions of the Inspector before we go back to the respondent? We're not doing this back and forth ping-pong match here. Any other questions? Okay, thank you. I'm sorry. Did somebody have a question of the contractor or of the respondent?

MR. BARRANCO: I just want to make one statement. We've had a lot of applicants come before us where we said, next time you come in here you better have an architect or an engineer or some plan to do something with this building to see some good intent. He may not have the permit yet, but looking at those drawings, sounds like they just have to be signed and sealed and submitted. So I'd be willing to grant an extension for a month, and if he gets it done and in for permit in the next couple of weeks then hopefully this case will go away and we can move on. So I'd be willing to grant a month-long extension at this point.

CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Would you like to make a motion Mr. Barranco?

MR. BARRANCO: Yes. I'd like to make a motion that we grant a month extension to the March twenty-first meeting.

MR. LARSON: I'll second.

1 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Any other conversation before we 2 put it to a vote? MR. BARRANCO: Yes, I should probably use the same 3 4 language that we do on everything else. 5 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay. 6 MR. BARRANCO: Even though I think this is an old 7 case. CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Why don't you go ahead and read 8 9 it. 10 MR. BARRANCO: But it's basically a new site. So, I move that we find the violations exist as alleged and we 11 grant the respondent how many days is that, thirty days? 12 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Twenty-eight. Twenty-eight days. 13 14 MR. BARRANCO: Twenty-eight days to the March 15 twenty-first agenda and that he brings the property into compliance by that date. 16 17 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay. We have a renewed motion. Second to the renewed motion? 18 19 MR. JARRETT: You want to re-second that? MR. LARSON: I'll second. 20 21 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay, any additional conversation, input, questions? 22 23 MR. JARRETT: Only because the gentlemen still want 24 to speak. 25 [Mr. Phillips arrived at 3:15]

1 MR. MILLETTAS: Go ahead and vote first. 2 CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Before we vote, if the clerk would 3 please note that John Phillips has joined the dais. MR. PHILLIPS: 4 I've read the case and I remember 5 [inaudible] 6 MR. HOLLAND: Our language says 28 days to bring 7 the property into compliance. Do we consider the application 8 as being in compliance? Okay, thank you. 9 MR. MILLETAS: That was my question. 10 MR. HOLLAND: Well, wait a minute, I got a nod. The language of the motion, number of days to bring the 11 property into compliance by? And by our standards the 12 13 application --14 MS. WALD: The -- Ginger Wald, Assistant City 15 Attorney -- the application actually doesn't necessarily bring it into compliance because compliance is going to be 16 fix it. 17 18 MR. HOLLAND: That's my point. 19 MS. WALD: That is your point. I thought you were 20 saying the opposite. 21 MR. HOLLAND: No, that's my point. I'm sorry I didn't miss it at other meetings if that's been there a 22 23 while.

25

24

MS. WALD:

Okay.

1	CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Should this be a continuance
2	instead of an extension?
3	MS. WALD: No, you've already made the finding.
4	CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Okay, alright.
5	MS. WALD: So you can just do it as an extension of
6	time to come into compliance. That would be fine just as Joe
.7	said.
8	MR. BARRANCO: Well, if they don't bring it into
9	compliance we'll tear it down. But as soon as they pull the
10	permit, it goes away so.
11	MR. JARRETT: It goes away then, yes.
12	MS. WALD: Well they have, yes, that's what they
13	need to do in this case is finishing up the permit process.
14	CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Any additional conversation,
15	questions? Alright, let's put it to a vote. All in favor
16	say aye.
17	BOARD MEMBERS: Aye.
18	CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Any opposed? Hearing none,
19	passes. We'll see you guys in twenty-eight days.
19 20	MR. SCANLON and MR. MILLETAS: Thank you.
20	MR. SCANLON and MR. MILLETAS: Thank you.
20	MR. SCANLON and MR. MILLETAS: Thank you.  MR. JARRETT: Unless, of course, you have a permit,
20 21 22	MR. SCANLON and MR. MILLETAS: Thank you.  MR. JARRETT: Unless, of course, you have a permit, and then you don't have to come back.

1	2. Case: CE11111505 <u>INDEX</u>
2	HSBC BANK USA NA AS TRSTEE
3	%OCWEN LOAN SERVICING
4	2424 NW 21 ST
5	MS. SAEY: Okay, on page two, case number
6	CE11111505 has actually been withdrawn.
7	
8	3. Case: CE12101972 <u>INDEX</u>
9	EDWARDS, EDNA M,
10	EDWARDS, STANLEY B &
11	EDWARDS, BRUCE B
12	846 NW 17 AVE
13	MS. SAEY: And bottom of the page, case CE12101972
14	has also been withdrawn.
15	CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Very good.
16	INDEX
17	COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION
18	CHAIR WEYMOUTH: Is there anything that we would
19	like to communicate to our fearless leaders at the City
20	Commission, our commissioners?
21	INDEX
22	FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY
23	[None]
24	
25	[Meeting concluded at 3:17 pm.]

[Minutes prepared by: J. Opperlee, Prototype, Inc.]

Fort Lauderdale,

1 CERTIFICATION I hereby certify that I have recorded and transcribed the 2 City of Fort Lauderdale Unsafe Structures Board meeting held February 21, 2013, at 3:00 p.m., City Hall, 100 North Andrews 3 Avenue, City Commission Meeting Room, Florida. 4 Dated at Ft. Lauderdale, Broward County, Florida, this Z 5 , 2013. day of 6 PROTOTYPE, INC. 7 8 Recording Clerk 9 10 SWORN TO and SUBSCRIBED before me by JAMIE OPPERLEE who is personally known to me and who signed the foregoing for the 11 purposes therein expressed. 12 DATED this of day of MARCH 13 14 D.J. GROSSFELD MY COMMISSION # EE 065058 EXPIRES: April 26, 2015 15 State of Florida Bonded Thru Budget Notary Services 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25