

**DUNEDIN CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
REGULAR MEETING OF TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2020
CITY HALL – 542 MAIN STREET – 2:00 PM**

PRESENT: Chair Michael Bowman; Members Arlene Graham, Ken Carson, William Motley, Bunny Dutton and Dave Pauley; Alternate Member Gordon Chize
ABSENT: Vice-Chair Lowell Suplicki
ALSO PRESENT: City Attorney Tom Trask, Secretary to the Board Joan McHale, Code Enforcement Inspector Michelle Gilbert, City Arborist Craig Wilson, Pinellas County Sheriff's Deputy Morison and twelve attendees.

Chair Bowman called the meeting to order at 2:00 P. M. and explained the purpose of this Board and meeting procedures to those in attendance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes from Regular Meeting of December 10, 2019

MOTION: Mr. Chize moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of December 10, 2019. Second was made by Ms. Graham.
VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. McHale swore in Code Enforcement Inspector Michelle Gilbert.

AFFIDAVITS OF COMPLIANCE

Chair Bowman advised those in attendance that if their case number was called, they did not need to attend the meeting unless they were attending for a request for fine reduction.

1. DCEB 19-277 City vs. DEBRA S MIKELS *(Also Fine Reconsideration Request)*
2. DCEB 19-309 City vs. MONDI GJONI *(Also Fine Reconsideration Request)*
3. DCEB 19-686 City vs. USA FED NATL MTG ASSN
4. DCEB 19-693 City vs. KELLI NICOLE COHEN *(Also Affidavit of Non Compliance)*
5. DCEB 19-699 City vs. LUCIENNE S VALLON EST *(Also Affidavit of Non-Compliance)*

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved to accept the Affidavits of Compliance. Second was made by Mr. Motley.
VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1. DCEB 19-693 City vs. KELLI NICOLE COHEN *(Also Affidavit of Compliance)*
1307 Ranchwood Drive E
Violation of the Land Development Code Section 103-14.4 TRANSIENT USE PROHIBITION

Ms. McHale swore in Kelli Cohen.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-693:

- At the meeting of December 10, 2019 this Board ordered compliance by December 16, 2019 or a fine of \$250.00 per day would be imposed.
- As of inspection of the advertising with Host Compliance on December 18, 2019 the violation remained.
- An Affidavit of Non-Compliance is being submitted for consideration.
- An Affidavit of Compliance has also been submitted and approved for this particular case.
- With the advertisement the dates were all completely blocked out and there was no mention of a minimum anywhere in the ad or advertising which is why the date of the 18th and the respondent would have to apply for a hardship for fine reconsideration. There was a period of non-compliance when the fine was in effect. The order was for December 16th and the listing was not removed until January 10, 2020.

Ms. Cohen stated:

- Every single day it was blocked which makes it completely impossible, if you ask Airbnb nobody can book and there are no bookings listed.
- As soon as she left here she called and cancelled every single reservation she had. She was completely in compliance.
- During the meeting Ms. Gilbert was spoken with about even if the advertisement stayed up it was fine as long as she was not booking and if she did decide to book it would have to be for 90 days.
- Airbnb told her if she completely cancelled her account she would never be able to go back and have her perfect ratings listed.
- She was figuring out what to do; she did not want to lose her house and she was trying to figure out other options. Luckily she got a job so she does not have to figure that out anymore.
- Everything was blocked, no one could rent or do anything; she just needed a short period of time to figure out if she was going to need to rent it for 90 days or if she would be able to handle it financially.
- The ad is completely gone as soon as she could figure out her options. She got divorced and lost her job all in one day so she had to come up with a plan.

Ms. Gilbert stated to be clear many people do this, they block the dates so that they have to call direct to be able to get reservations. She is not saying that is what happened in this case, only that the request that the 90 days minimum be on the ad somewhere and it was not. The ad was completely removed on January 10, 2020. It was a simple fix to put in the 90 day minimum and if anyone tried to make a reservation they could not because of the 90 day minimum; that would be instead of blocking all the dates out. It is made very clear and Airbnb, Vrbo and Homeaway and all the websites know the procedures and they have been working with people and correcting their advertising for that minimum.

Ms. Cohen stated it is completely impossible to book when the dates are blocked; once blocked you can't book for anything even 90 days; people could not go in; they have to be able to see the reservation or it is not a reservation.

Mr. Motley asked her reason for not putting in the 90 day minimum and Ms. Cohen stated she did not have any days listed, it was just blank; she could not decide if she was ever going to do this again. If she put that in and she didn't block out 2022 then people could go in and book; but once you're blocked no one can book a reservation whatsoever.

Mr. Motley stated it was very clear that she should have put the minimum of 90 days; Ms. Cohen explained she was not able to book at all, not 90 days or 7 or 5.

Chair Bowman verified with Ms. Cohen it literally said blocked on everything and she stated you can't book blocked.

Ms. Gilbert explained people can still call and get through to the owners; that is how it was circumvented the last time, bookings were done under the radar and if someone had not called in the complaint it would not be in this situation. The rules are very clear in the Notice of Violation it does say 90 nights or 3 calendar months; that is all that had to be put on the ad and at that time if it had been there the case would have been closed out. She could do whatever she wanted, block booking and they do not have to accept the booking. It is the same for everyone.

Ms. Cohen stated if you go on Airbnb right now and try to book something that is blocked it will not allow you; people can't even go in and ask if they can rent the place because it is blocked; it is telling them it is not available.

Mr. Motley asked if Ms. Cohen is understanding from Ms. Gilbert had she put the 90 day minimum in the ad, the case would have been closed.

Ms. Cohen stated she understood that, but she did not want to rent for 90 days, she did not want to rent at all she just needed a period of time to figure out if that was going to be her only option because of her divorce and losing her job and she had to pay her husband alimony, so she had to decide if she was going to lose her house or rent her place and where was she going to live. The people at Airbnb said once she deleted this and came back on all those perfect rating are gone like a whole new listing. She just needed time, she did not rent to anyone and did what she was told when she left her.

Mr. Motley asked if she understood she has a hardship in this case and that is required after the Board has a finding here; if there is a finding of a violation and she is penalized then she can come back to the Board and request a reduction of the fine. Ms. Cohen stated she understood. He asked if she understood she has a hardship, Ms. Cohen stated yes.

Ms. Gilbert stated that was explained also.

Mr. Carson suggested accepting the Affidavit of Compliance and then have the respondent come back for a fine reduction request.

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved in case DCEB 19-693 to accept the Affidavit of Non-Compliance. Second was made by Mr. Motley.

VOTE: Motion carried 6 - 1 with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting nay.

Chair Bowman explained to Ms. Cohen she can call the City and get a form to fill out for a hardship and list the circumstances; there are instructions on it. Then she can come back and ask for a fine reconsideration or removal.

Ms. Gilbert advised Ms. Cohen she could email her with the address on the card she provided.

Chair Bowman advised she has to do that within 30 days.

2. **DCEB 19-699 City vs. LUCIENNE S VALLON EST** *(Also Affidavit of Compliance)*
1581 Roxburg Lane
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 303.1 SWIMMING POOL MAINTENANCE

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-699:

- At the meeting of December 10, 2019 this Board ordered compliance by December 15, 2019 or a fine of \$250.00 per day would be imposed.
- As of inspection on December 16, 2019 the violation remained.
- An Affidavit of Non-Compliance is being submitted for consideration.
- There was no contact from the owner; apparently he had passed away between the time of January 10, 2020. Since then she has put into place having the grass cut and met with the County to have mosquito control. Once that was done she prepared an Affidavit of Compliance. It is a vacant house and she is waiting to hear from someone; it is not known if there are any family members living to be contacted; she is waiting for the paperwork from the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Motley inquired if there were any other safety issues at the property.

Ms. Gilbert stated she made sure it was secure when she left, the screen enclosure around the pool was closed, anything plugged in was unplugged outside and that the gate was closed. They also distributed flyers through the neighborhood in regard to mosquitos and where they can infest aside from pools. The City did its due diligence and partnered with the County on that to get that done.

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved in case DCEB 19-699 to accept the Affidavit of Non-Compliance. Second was made by Mr. Pauley.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

3. **DCEB 19-729 City vs. AMERICAN HOME MTG INVESTMENT TRUST 2005 4C**
2622 Jarvis Circle
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.7 ACCESSORY STRUCTURES
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 303.2 SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-729:

- At the meeting of December 10, 2019 this Board ordered compliance by December 12, 2019 or a fine of \$250.00 per day would be imposed.
- As of inspection on December 20, 2019 the violations remain.
- An Affidavit of Non-Compliance is being submitted for consideration.
- She was unable to enter the property. The fence was fixed around the entire property, but she did not have access to the screen enclosure and no one has contacted her for this case except for the homeowners' association manager.

Ms. Dutton clarified with Ms. Gilbert this is a vacant property.

- MOTION:** Mr. Pauley moved in case DCEB 19-729 to accept the Affidavit of Non-Compliance. Second was made by Ms. Dutton.
- VOTE:** Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

4. DCEB 19-741 City vs. GLENN D & ANNE E SANDERS

1669 San Mateo Drive

Violation of the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 303.2 SWIMMING POOL ENCLOSURES

Ms. McHale swore in David Dinsber, Contractor of 5175 Justamere Road, Jacksonville 32210.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-741:

- At the meeting of December 10, 2019 this Board ordered compliance by January 20, 2020 or a fine of \$250.00 per day would be imposed.
- As of inspection on January 21, 2020 the violations remain.
- An Affidavit of Non-Compliance is being submitted for consideration.
- A permit application was submitted on December 3, 2019 and there were items to be addressed for almost a month from the Deputy Building Official. There was a second review process done as of January 28, 2020; there was no action taken with the items to be addressed by the contractor.

Mr. Dinsber stated:

- They were originally going to pull a permit to do an addition. He went to the old building to apply and explained they wanted to remove an above ground pool and deck to grade the yard.
- He misunderstood that she said it looked like they did not need it. As they were doing it Ms. Gilbert inspected and they were in violation as they had removed the fence and there was an above ground pool that was open, a safety hazard.
- They removed the pool.
- They went to put the plans in for permitting and changed that they were going to do the structure from block to wood, so they had to go back to the engineer and that took a couple of weeks.
- They stopped work after they removed the danger of the pool and have not been to the property since.
- The plans were sent in and came back twice, so they sent them in on 12/5, got them back on 12/9; sent them in again on 1/9 and got them back on 1/13; sent them in again on 1/28 and got them back on 1/29.
- He delivered today what he thought were the final items to be addressed.
- They have done everything they can and do not want to be egregious in any way and do not want to go back to the property and be seen as violating the work order.
- He does not know what to do at this point in regard to the fine. He got the email yesterday saying the final things needed and he delivered them today. He hopes to have the permit today.

Chair Bowman verified with Mr. Dinsber this started back in October and then they changed how they were going to frame it.

Ms. Dutton commented she was confused about what went in and who paid for what.

Ms. Gilbert explained they did work without permits and took down a structure that was a life/safety barrier for a pool. The pool was removed leaving a hole, then gas lines were run without permits.

Mr. Dinsber explained the gas lines had permits pulled from before; they did not do that it was for the gas company.

Ms. Gilbert stated the work should not have been started; the building code is very clear on what requires permits, demolition, alterations and so forth. What is needed is for them to obtain their permit so they can commence with their work.

Chair Bowman explained usually in these types of cases the fines would begin and then end as soon as he had the permit in hand.

Chair Bowman clarified they did start work without a permit and Mr. Dinsber stated only because it was a misunderstanding on his part with the people in the Building Department and soon as he realized that no more work was done, they immediately stopped; the stop work order was issued after they stopped.

Mr. Chize noted they still did not have the permit and Mr. Dinsber stated they have applied and done three revisions and he is waiting on it.

Mr. Motely asked if there is a fine running in this case and Ms. Gilbert stated not yet.

Mr. Motley asked if Ms. Gilbert objected to several days extension and she said not at all, but taking a month to get questions clarified from the Deputy Building Official was her concern and the concern now is to get him the permit so they can continue with their work.

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved in case DCEB 19-741 to extend the compliance date to February 11, 2020. Second was made by Mr. Pauley.

VOTE: Motion carried 6 - 1 with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley and Pauley voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, Mr. Chize.

Chair Bowman explained to Mr. Dinsber by February 11, 2020 the permit has to be in hand and paid for.

NEW BUSINESS

1. **DCEB 19-424 City vs. ANDREA H / CARL S DIVITO**
1635 Dale Circle N
Violation of the Dunedin Code of Ordinances Section 70-72 (a) BUSINESS TAX RECEIPT
REQUIRED

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-424:

- The violation exists on a single family residential property that is currently occupied by a tenant.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected by Inspector Colbert on May 23, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of June 7, 2019.
- The violation includes a Business Tax Receipt required to operate a sober group home and operating this this business as Dale House LLC.

- At the time he was trying to run a sober living house here. There was much criteria he had to meet and did not, so he stopped at this property, but has two other businesses he is running there. He did come in and apply on January 28th for the Business Tax Receipts that are currently in review.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence the memorandum, a memo from Senior Planning and Development Technician Fuller and photographs. She recommends a compliance date of February 28, 2020 or a fine of \$250.00 per day thereafter for non-compliance.

- MOTION:** Mr. Motley moved to find DCEB 19-424 based on testimony, evidence and facts presented in law that at the time of the alleged violation Dunedin Code of Ordinances Section 70-72(a) was in full force and effect and the Respondents are found in violation, and shall come into compliance by February 28, 2020 or suffer a fine of \$250.00 per day. Second was made by Ms. Dutton.
- VOTE:** Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

2. **DCEB 19-433 City vs. ZBIGNIEW & CHRISTOPHER HOROCKI**
2502 Gary Circle
Violation of the Land Development Code Section 105-27.1.1(f) BOATS, RVS., TRAILERS
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.8 INOPERATIVE MOTOR VEHICLES

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. McHale swore in Carlo Mardirosin, Tenant Apt. #4.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-433:

- The violations existed on a single family residential property that is currently occupied by tenants.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected on May 24, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of June 21, 2019.
- The violations include the boat and trailer being used and stored with no license plate on the trailer and expired boating license tag and including but not limited to the pink SUV on a car jack with expired license plates.
- The inoperable vehicle violation remains. The case was closed out June 21, 2019 because they came into compliance, but recently a different boat and trailer was placed on the same lot and has since been removed.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence photographs taken on May 24, 2019 and January 15, 2020. She recommends the Board find the respondent was in violation after the requested compliance date of June 21, 2019; however, is currently in compliance in order for any future violations within 5 years to be considered repeat violation and subject to a higher daily fine.

Mr. Motley inquired why the case was reopened if it is a different incident and a different vehicle or boat and why not just open another case.

Ms. Gilbert explained it is the same violation, so they decided to reopen the same case. She noted also at no time has anyone made contact on this ownership; she just happened to be driving by and noticed it had been removed.

Mr. Motley asked for a legal opinion on his question.

City Attorney Trask advised the way the Statute reads is if it is in violation, comes into compliance, but goes in violation again before the Code Enforcement Board hearing it can still be brought forward under Chapter 162 and also the City Code. That is what City staff is doing bringing it back because even though it was in compliance at one time it went back out of compliance. Whether it was this situation with a boat or car, it would be the same situation if it was high grass, if it was in compliance by being cut and it grew back again and it was over the 12 inches in height it is the same theory or process.

Mr. Mardirosin stated:

- It was his boat and he moved the first boat and bought the second boat he brought it home just to unload and took it back for repairs.
- He is still trying to get the owner to get him a new title and he had tried to sell it to someone else and that is why it is not registered; it expired in November 2019. He is going to get the new title next week by going with the owner to the DMV.
- While he was unloading their equipment for fishing the axle broke, so it was parked there for almost three weeks. That happened on Saturday and he went on Monday to order the parts and they said about 5 -7 business days and then it was on back order and he had to wait another week and a half.

Mr. Mardirosin stated he had photographs showing the first boat that is in Clearwater and he has money orders to the person he bought the boat from, it is his property where he stores the boat. It is gone now and he does not leave it there since that first incident.

Chair Bowman explained Ms. Gilbert was requesting a repeat violation which means he is not in trouble now unless it comes back. There are no fines now, but there very well can be if the boat comes back.

Ms. Graham thought there are tenants in the property. Ms. Gilbert explained it is apartments.

MOTION: Ms. Dutton moved to find case DCEB 19-433 was in violation of the Land Development Code Section 105-27.1.1(f) and the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.8 after the requested compliance date of June 21, 2019 on the Notice of Violation; however, is now in compliance. Any future violation will be considered a repeat violation. Second was made by Ms. Graham.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

3. **DCEB 19-725 City vs. US BANK NATL ASSN TRE / C/O OCWEN LOAN SERVICING LLC**
1351 Ohio Avenue
Violation of the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.1 MAINTENANCE OF STRUCTURES
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.2 PROTECTIVE TREATMENT

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.7 ROOFS AND DRAINAGE

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 305.3 INTERIOR SURFACES

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-725:

- The violations exist on a single family residential property that is currently vacant.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected by Inspector Colbert on May 31, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of November 29, 2019.
- The violations include a building permit required for the installation or alteration of an air conditioning unit; soffits or eaves in poor condition as evidenced by missing or rotted boards; missing or peeling paint in various areas of the exterior walls and trim; the roof and flashing maintenance; the interior ceiling is missing in various areas exposing insulation and wood framing and interior walls in disrepair as evidenced by the black substance.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence photographs taken on March 11, 2019 and May 31, 2019. She recommends a compliance date of February 28, 2020 or a fine of \$250.00 per day thereafter for non-compliance.

Mr. Carson inquired if the power is on in the house and Ms. Gilbert stated not that she is aware of and she did see a big hole in the back bedroom.

Ms. Gilbert added the house has been on auction multiple times and there have been a number of issues including those causing issues for the neighborhood now. A gentleman did come in to speak with her about the house and she directed him to City Attorney Trask about what he can do about getting the house.

Mr. Motley asked had there been any contact from anyone and Ms. Gilbert explained only from the property management company and it is always last minute and a different person every time; no one seems to communicate there with each other; no one has addressed this particular case with her or Mr. Colbert and the bank has never been in contact.

Mr. Motley expressed concern for waiting until February 28 because the house is a complete hazard with mold and other kinds of danger.

Ms. Gilbert advised they did clean it, the mold is still there, but she is not a mold expert, but it does appear to be black mold.

MOTION: Mr. Motley moved to find in case DCEB 19-725 based on testimony, evidence and facts presented in law that at the time of the alleged violations the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 and the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.1; Section 304.2; Section 304.7 and Section 305.3 were in full force and effect and the Respondent is found in violation thereof and that the Respondent shall come into compliance by February 10, 2020 or suffer a fine of \$250.00 per day. Second was made by Mr. Chize.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

4. DCEB 19-727 City vs. BASKAL KORKIS & ADIBA KORKIS

405 Locklie Street

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.15 DOORS-EXTERIOR

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.1 MAINTENANCE OF STRUCTURES

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.2 PROTECTIVE TREATMENT

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.7 ROOFS AND DRAINAGE

Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 308 RUBBISH AND GARBAGE

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-727:

- The violations exist on a single family residential property that is currently occupied by tenants.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected on October 8, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner of record with a requested compliance date of November 4, 2019.
- The violations include but not limited to the blue exterior with damage to the lower portion, the screen door missing the door closer assembly and safety spring door closer; concrete on the entire structure especially the front; painting of the entire structure; the hanging wood trim in front of unit 407 and the satellite dish on the ground, firewood in the driveway, bamboo across the walkway in front of unit 407.
- She was in contact with their attorney who called and said there was ongoing litigation with an insurance company and he was supposed to provide her with a letter that would have stopped her from having to present this case today. She followed up a couple of times requesting the letter which was never received. The last correspondence she had with the attorney said that since she had not received the letter she would have to present the case to the Board on today's date. It would have been simple for the attorney to provide her the letter in regard to the litigation which he indicated an insurance company was having repairs done and the person caused more damage to the property and because of the litigation they could not correct the violations.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence photographs taken on October 7, 2019, December 9, 2019 and December 10, 2019. She recommends a compliance date of February 11, 2020 or a fine of \$250.00 per day thereafter for non-compliance.

Mr. Motley noted many of the violations listed do not have anything to do with that; it is maintenance issues.

When Mr. Carson inquired if this was a citizen complaint, Ms. Gilbert advised that it was in relation to the property never being maintained which is when she did the inspection as best she could without trespassing.

Mr. Pauley verified with Ms. Gilbert the property is rented; not homestead property.

- MOTION:** Mr. Carson moved to find case DCEB 19-727 in violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.15; Section 304.1; Section 304.2; Section 304.7 and Section 308 and that the Respondents shall come into compliance by February 11, 2020 or suffer a fine of \$250.00 per day. Second was made by Mr. Pauley.
- VOTE:** Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

5. **DCEB 19-749 City vs. KRISTIAN QELESHI**
1602 Bayshore Boulevard
Violation of the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED
Violation of the Land Development Code Section 105-35.7 TREES – PROHIBITED ACTS
Violation of the Land Development Code Section 105-35.22 TREES – PENALTY FOR VIOLATION

Ms. McHale swore in Kristian Queleshi of 2652 N. McMullen Booth Road #233, Clearwater 33761.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-749:

- The violations existed on a single family residential property that is currently vacant.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected by City Arborist Wilson on August 22, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of November 4, 2019.
- The violations include a permit required for the removal of a Southern Live Oak located in the front of the property; removal of protected tree; violator shall pay a civil penalty equal to two times the rate of the permit for such tree removal.
- City Arborist Wilson mailed a letter to the owner documenting this and other violations.
- The notice of this hearing was handed to the property owner on December 17, 2019 upon his visit to the office.
- Currently money owed to the Tree Bank is totaling \$4,320.00 that has not been paid.
- City Arborist Wilson was present to answer any questions.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence the letter sent by the City Arborist and photographs taken. She recommends a compliance date of February 25, 2020 or a fine of \$250.00 a day.

Chair Bowman verified with Ms. Gilbert compliance means paying the Tree Bank \$4,320.00.

Ms. McHale swore in City Arborist Craig Wilson.

Mr. Wilson advised the \$4,320.00 is two times the fee which is \$120.00 per diameter inch removed. He would say the tree was 75 to 80 years old and the diameter to his recollection was 30 or 32 inches.

Mr. Motley asked if he would consider this to be an irreplaceable violation.

Mr. Wilson stated the fine associated with it, you could not buy that tree for that price, not even a quarter the size of that tree.

Mr. Motley asked if there was any damage to the tree, was there rot or was it dead.

Mr. Wilson advised:

- On August 15, 2019 he was contacted by the homeowner by phone stating he was looking to remove the tree and he had a tree service that would be filing the permit. He told the homeowner he could go by and look at the tree to see if it meets the criteria for removal and if not it would save him and his tree service the trouble of filing the permit and he said sure.
- On August 16th he performed an ISA basic tree risk assessment on the tree that includes a standardized form and he took pictures of the tree including the diameter tape. At that time he found no issues with the tree at all. It posed a low risk based on the ISA Tree Risk Assessment Form for which he is Tree Risk Assessment qualified.
- On August 22nd was the day he was going to call the homeowner back and explain he had looked at the tree and it did not meet the requirements for removal. When he drove by on the way to work he saw the tree half cut down; the only thing left was the trunk a couple of big sticks off the top. When he got to the office he immediately called the owner's phone number and asked what happened because he wasn't supposed to do anything until he heard back from him. The owner said he had a tree service saying they filed the permit or had something that allowed them to cut the tree down. He explained that was not the case. The owner forwarded a copy of the ISA Certified Arborist Report that an independent tree service did on behalf of the property and that Arborist also said the tree was of good condition, large, mature and healthy specimen and low amount of dead wood, low amount of crown die back and no obvious signs of damage to the residential structure.
- During his conversation with the owner he explained he had to put this in writing and he would be receiving something shortly. Both the regular and certified mail came back that were sent to the address of the infraction and then he found a business address for the homeowner and mailed them there; the certified came back, but the regular mail did not.
- On November 5, 2019 the homeowner requested a meeting between himself, Ms. Gilbert, Mr. Colbert, his Supervisor and they did comply with that meeting at the Community Center and the homeowner had the opportunity to sort of state his case. Upon the completion of that meeting it was suggested by Ms. Gilbert the homeowner begin making some progress, maybe apply for the tree removal application and maybe plant the required replacement tree to show progress and between then and this date he was supposed to make payment for the \$4,320.00.

Mr. Motley verified with Mr. Wilson he is a Certified Arborist and has been for about 15 years and he has worked for the City about 16 years.

Mr. Queleshi stated:

- As Mr. Wilson said he spoke with Mr. Wilson before hiring a company. He asked if he could remove the tree or not and he showed up later. He hired the company and they said they pulled the permit for him; they lied to him, they just hired an Arborist. When they showed that to him it was late and they had already cut the tree and he stopped them in the middle and fired them from the job for lying to him.
- He called Mr. Wilson for a meeting like he said and asked what to do; it was his first house and he had no idea about the trees. He planted a new tree and did the application.

Chair Bowman clarified that the person came out and checked the tree and said he could get a permit and he didn't.

Mr. Queleshi stated he told him it is a law in Florida if you hire an Arborist who says you can cut the tree down, you can. He has the mail from the Arborist that says you can remove the peen (SP?) but not the tree. Mr. Queleshi stated that Mr. Wilson actually told him that on the phone.

When Chair Bowman asked about paying this person to take the tree down, Mr. Queleshi stated he gave them 10% to start the job and they did not finish the job. He showed a picture of the new tree he planted.

When Mr. Motley asked if he asked to see the permit, Mr. Queleshi stated he asked, but he said he had it at his house and the same day Mr. Wilson called about the permit he explained they had lied and he stopped them, but it was late, the tree was gone. Mr. Motley noted it is the owner's responsibility to make sure there is a permit.

Mr. Wilson commented he thought this all could have been avoided if Mr. Queleshi had just waited for his phone call, he had told him he would view the tree and let him know his thoughts and between then the tree was cut down. As far as the new law, he would have to have a letter from an ISA Certified Arborist stating that tree is dangerous and he does not have that, nor did he at that time.

Mr. Motley referred to the meeting and the agreement that the owner would pay the amount of \$4,320.00 and clarified the problem now is that he is not paying.

Mr. Queleshi stated at the meeting he asked if the fine could be reduced because he has to pay for the removal of the tree and to pay to plant a tree; that is why he met with them to see if they could help him by reducing the fine.

Mr. Motley noted this is an irreplaceable; irreversible violation and the Code Enforcement Board cannot reduce that fine.

Chair Bowman noted the permit would have been half that amount.

Mr. Wilson explained that refers to \$60.00 per diameter inch if the tree was removed correctly; this was removed without permission so it is double that amount. The permit is a lot less money; the ordinance is referring to the fee associated with that permit that would have been \$60.00 per diameter inch. There is a fee of \$25.00 for a tree removal application and the fees associated with that would be \$60.00 per diameter inch for an approved tree removal, say for new construction.

Chair Bowman noted then it would have been about \$2,000+ had it been done correctly and approved.

Mr. Motley noted under Florida State Statute 162 Section 9 it states an irreversible, irreplaceable violation the individual could be fined up to \$5,000.00; so the amount noted is within that range.

City Attorney Trask advised the permitting fee has nothing to do with what the Code Enforcement Board is doing, so disregard whatever amount that was; it has nothing to do with what the Board is doing here today.

Chair Bowman explained he realized this is here because that fee has not been paid.

City Attorney Trask explained to the Board members not to be worried about what it cost for the permitting fee which is what ordinarily would have been required. They are to make a decision as to whether or not he is in violation of these Code Sections cited and if so assess a fine. Where Mr. Motley is referring to is

really two options; one is to set a compliance date and associate a fine up to \$250.00 a day until compliance which would be to obtain the permit or fine him a one-time fine up to \$5,000 because the Statute says:

Section 162 Section 9 (2a)

However, if a Code Enforcement Board finds the violation of irreparable and irreversible in nature it may impose a fine not to exceed \$5,000 per violation.

When Chair Bowman asked why he did not wait for Mr. Wilson to call him or contact him, Mr. Queleshi commented he works for a company and they do not do work without permits and he hired them and trusted the company, how could he know they would lie to him.

Ms. Gilbert noted to be clear it is the homeowner's due diligence and responsibility to follow up with anyone they hire or get to do work at their property.

Chair Bowman asked how long he thought it would take to come up with the money to pay the fee and Mr. Queleshi said he did not know what to tell him.

Mr. Motley asked if there is some type of payment plan that could be worked out with the City or is it beyond that now. Mr. Wilson stated it is beyond that for sure; this has been going on since August and that amount has been known since that time and during the initial meetings a couple months ago it was suggested making payments or something, but nothing has been done yet.

MOTION: Mr. Chize moved to find case DCEB 19-749 based on testimony, evidence and facts presented is in violation of the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 and the Land Development Code Section 105-35.7 and Section 105-35.22 and that the Respondent shall suffer a one-time penalty fine of \$1,000.00 if there is not compliance by February 28, 2020 by paying the \$4,320.00 penalty imposed by the City. Second was made by Ms. Dutton.

City Attorney Trask advised the motion needs to have some end as to what happens if the \$1,000 is not paid by that time frame; if it is a one-time fine due to the irreversible and irreplaceable violation then it should be just paid, no time frame.

Mr. Motley clarified with City Attorney Trask that the respondent is still responsible to pay the other penalty to the City.

Chair Bowman clarified the \$1,000.00 fine goes away if the \$4,320 is paid prior to February 28, 2020.

Ms. Graham asked if there was any way to reduce the \$4,320.00. Chair Bowman explained that amount is twice the permit fee for removing the tree without a permit; the respondent still has to pay that amount.

VOTE: Motion carried 4 - 3 with Ms. Dutton, Messrs. Motley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson and Pauley.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

Chair Bowman explained to Mr. Queleshi he had to pay the fine and noted at the beginning of this it would have been half that amount.

6. **DCEB 19-759 City vs. AIMEE HEGH**
931 Dumont Drive
Violation of the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 BUILDING PERMIT REQUIRED
Violation of the Florida Building Code Section 115 STOP WORK ORDER
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 304.3 HOUSE NUMBERS
PREMISES IDENTIFICATION

Ms. McHale swore in Jerod Hansen, Contractor of P.O. Box 221, Dunedin 34697.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-759:

- The violations exist on a single family residential property that is currently vacant.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected on November 1, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of November 22, 2019.
- The violations include but are not limited to a permit required for the concrete pad in the rear of the home and enclosing of the wall around the door and rear of the home and installation of the conduit for the attic air handler; continuing work after the stop work order and the building should have approved address numbers placed in a position plain and legible from the street or road fronting the property.
- The owner did put the house numbers on so that is in compliance.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence photographs taken on September 11, 2019, December 2, 2019 and November 1, 2019. She recommends a compliance date of February 11, 2020 or a fine of \$250.00 per day thereafter for non-compliance.

When Mr. Motley inquired whether or not the contractor has been cooperative with her, Ms. Gilbert stated he contacted her at the beginning of this process to attempt to get things resolved; however, it was just lately a permit was pulled maybe a day or two ago; she was not contacted about it though.

Chair Bowman asked if he was in compliance then and Ms. Gilbert stated no because the permit has not been issued to her knowledge.

Mr. Hansen stated:

- He had to do a full product approval number for the door he is installing which will be high velocity zone door.
- If they are not using the glass then he has to fill out another form about the impact glass.
- He was requested to write on the site plan 1-foot from the opening on the rerouting that was done for the HVAC tray that was in question.

Chair Bowman asked why he did not get a permit at the beginning.

Mr. Hansen stated he was not aware of this until two weeks ago.

Ms. Gilbert explained Mr. Hansen is assisting the homeowner with this; he did not do any of the work.

Mr. Hansen stated his understanding was that it was a licensed contractor who did the HVAC work, but he did not pull a permit and his understanding is that contractor will be pulling a permit, but that had nothing to do with him.

Mr. Motley verified with Mr. Hansen that he is a Florida Certified Contractor.

Chair Bowman asked when he thought he could have the permit in hand and Mr. Hansen thought it would take a couple of days for review so about 3 days and he noted it is paid for.

Ms. Dutton verified with Ms. Gilbert the third violation listed was in compliance, the house numbers.

MOTION: Ms. Graham moved to find case DCEB 19-in violation of the Florida Building Code Section 105.1 and Section 115 and that the Respondent shall come into compliance by February 11, 2020 or suffer a fine of \$50.00 per day. Second was made by Mr. Pauley.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

7. DCEB 19-766 City vs. DARRELL RAGANS
1334 New York Avenue
Violation of the Land Development Code Section 103-14.4 TRANSIENT USE PROHIBITION

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-766:

- The violation existed on a single family residential property that is currently being used as a vacation rental.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- Host Compliance inspected the online adds November 7, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner of record with a requested compliance date of November 25, 2019.
- The violation includes the property being in a designated R-60 zone district where rentals need to be at least 90 days or 3 calendar months whichever is greater; short term rentals are prohibited.
- On October 1, 2019 a courtesy letter was sent with the compliance date of October 18, 2019. The City tries to send a courtesy notice first to let them know they cannot do this here.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence the online advertising from Airbnb. Since then the listing was removed from Airbnb on January 10, 2020. She recommends the Board find the respondent was in violation after the requested compliance date; however, is currently in compliance in order for any future violations within 5 years to be considered repeat violation subject to a higher fine.

MOTION: Ms. Dutton moved to find case DCEB 19-766 was in violation of the Land Development Code Section 103-14.4 after the requested compliance date of November 25, 2019 on the Notice of Violation; however, is now in compliance. Any future violation within 5 years will be considered a repeat violation. Second was made by Mr. Motley.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

8. **DCEB 19-783 City vs. WILLIAM H / MARY GREER**
1717 Douglas Avenue
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.1 CLEAN, SAFE AND SANITARY
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.8 INOPERATIVE MOTOR VEHICLES

Ms. McHale swore in Mary Greer.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-783:

- The violations existed on a single family residential property that is currently occupied by the owner.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected on September 26, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of December 13, 2019.
- The violations include but are not limited to the property having extreme vegetation and tree overgrowth due to lack of maintenance, further the roof has vegetation material covering it; the open parking or storage of a vehicle not displaying a current license tag as prohibited.
- Inspections were done on January 23, 2020 and it shows the violations were addressed at that time. To date she has had no contact with the owner.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence photographs taken on September 26, 2019, November 21, 2019 and December 18, 2019. She recommends the Board find the respondent was in violation after the requested compliance date; however, is currently in compliance in order for any future violations within 5 years to be considered repeat violation.

Ms. Greer stated it was all done and the car is gone; it was her grandson's car.

Chair Bowman asked if she knew now she cannot bring a car back there that is out of date and cannot let the things grow over that much and Ms. Greer said they got rid of it.

MOTION: Mr. Carson moved to find case DCEB 19-783 was in violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.1 and Section 302.8 after the requested compliance date of December 13, 2019 on the Notice of Violation; however, is now in compliance. Any future violation within 5 years will be considered a repeat violation. Second was made by Ms. Graham.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

Chair Bowman explained to Ms. Greer if these violations come back again within the next five years they will be considered repeat violations.

9. **DCEB 19-805 City vs. US BANK NATL ASSN TRE**
1351 Ohio Avenue
Violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.5 PEST-RAT CONTROL

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Ms. Gilbert reviewed case DCEB 19-805:

- The violation existed on a single family residential property that is currently vacant.
- Ownership was confirmed by the County Tax Rolls and Pinellas County Property Appraisers' Office.
- The property was inspected on December 30, 2019 and a notice of violation was sent to the owner with a requested compliance date of January 9, 2020.
- The violation includes pest/rat infestation to include but not limited to the dead rat located in the front eaves of the home.
- Multiple emails went back and forth with the property management company, they sent numerous photographs saying there was no dead rat at this property. When she made it very clear the location with photo evidence and an arrow pointing to where it was located, they came back and said there was no evidence of rats and she asked to please have their person go back and check again. They finally found it but by that time it was so decomposed and the neighbors had to put up with the smell of the rotting rodents. The property is in compliance now.

Ms. Gilbert submitted into evidence photographs taken on December 31, 2019, January 2, 2020, January 9, 2020 and January 10, 2020. She recommends the Board find the respondent was in violation after the requested compliance date; however, is currently in compliance in order for any future violations within 5 years to be considered repeat violation subject to a higher daily fine.

MOTION: Mr. Pauley moved to find case DCEB 19-805 based on testimony, evidence and facts presented in law was in violation of the International Property Maintenance Code Section 302.5 after the requested compliance date of January 9, 2020 on the Notice of Violation; however, is now in compliance. Any future violation within 5 years will be considered a repeat violation. Second was made by Mr. Motley.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the Finding and Order of the Board.

BREAK 3:36 P.M. – 3:40 P.M.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. **REQUEST FOR FINE RECONSIDERATION**
DCEB 19-277 City vs. DEBRA S MIKELS
1365 Windmoor Drive
Current Owner: DEBRA S MIKELS
Fine due as of 2/4/2020: \$10,106.37

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.

Time was provided for the Board members to review the written request for fine reduction.

Mr. Chize asked if the respondent has been half way cooperative. Ms. Gilbert advised she was to a certain extent as much as she could because of the situation in her house and she has attended the meetings a couple of times.

Mr. Pauley inquired if the Board Rules of Procedure dictate the Board has to recover a minimum administrative cost for a case like this.

City Attorney Trask advised Rule 5 Section 4 of the Board Rules of Procedure says the fine can be reduced, but it should not be reduced below the cost of the action.

Section 5 Section 4:

After a fine has been imposed by the Board and within 30 days after the violation is brought into compliance the violator may petition for reconsideration of a fine. The petition must be in writing signed by the violator including a copy of the Affidavit of Compliance executed by the Code Officer. The petition must include conclusive evidence showing extreme or undue hardship in the payment of the fine or preventing the violator from coming into compliance within the time period established by the Board's Order. The Board Clerk shall schedule the petition to be considered and the Board shall make its determination based solely upon the written petition unless the Board determines that it is necessary to hear oral argument from the violator and/or the City. The Board may request information from the Code Officer. The Board Clerk shall notify the violator by regular mail of the determination made by the Board. No petition for reduction of fine will be considered prior to the Board's acceptance of an Affidavit of Compliance. Under no circumstances may the amount of the fine be reduced below the costs of the action. Under no circumstances may the amount of the fine be reduced once a foreclosure action is instituted. Additionally, under no circumstances may the amount of the fine for a repeat violation be reduced.

City Attorney Trask advised the analysis done in July 2013 places the dollar amount at \$1,167.18 as the cost of bringing the case through the fine reduction hearing.

Mr. Carson asked if any more work was done on this case than any other fine reduction case. Ms. Gilbert stated they have come into compliance since then and kept it in compliance even though the cars have not been washed, they have current tags, are operable and new tires were put on one.

MOTION: Mr. Pauley moved in case DCEB 19-277 based on the testimony and evidence and facts in law to reduce the fine to \$1,167.18 to be paid by February 28, 2020 or the fine reverts to the original amount of \$10,106.37 plus interest. Second was made by Mr. Carson.

Mr. Motley commented that according to the reconsideration letter this person had several surgeries and a transplant and is also having some marital status issues. He believes the reduction entered is substantial and a good mark.

VOTE: Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the decision of the Board.

2. **REQUEST FOR FINE RECONSIDERATION**
DCEB 19-695 City vs. JOHN E CREWE / ALLAN JONES
1138 Somerset Circle S
Current Owners: JOHN E CREWE / ALLAN JONES
Fine due as of 2/4/2020: \$2,427.32

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.
Time was provided for the Board members to review the written request for fine reduction.

Mr. Motley noted this property is used as a part time rental unit as their second home. The respondent does not clearly state any kind of a hardship case.

- MOTION:** Mr. Motley moved in case DCEB 19-695 to deny the request for fine reduction.
Second was made by Ms. Graham.
- VOTE:** Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the decision of the Board.

3. **REQUEST FOR FINE RECONSIDERATION**
DCEB 18-825 City vs. JOHN P ST HILAIRE / JULIE FRASE
340 Socrates Drive
Current Owners: JOHN P ST HILAIRE/ JULIE FRASE
Fine due as of 2/4/2020: \$4,580.62

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was present, Julie Frase.

Chair Bowman explained that requests for fine reduction are done in writing and if the Board had any questions the respondent would be asked to be sworn in to address the Board.

Time was provided for the Board members to review the written request for fine reduction.

Mr. Motley asked if the property owner has been very cooperative of her requests and Ms. Gilbert stated yes, they were with time. He understood there were some medical issues and Ms. Gilbert acknowledged that was correct.

Mr. Motley noted his understanding this took some time to come into compliance because of the medical issues and Ms. Gilbert acknowledged that was correct.

Chair Bowman asked if the Board is bound to only reducing the fine to that minimum amount.

City Attorney Trask stated ordinarily he would tell the Board to follow their rules that they have established for themselves. He noted in the past the Board has lowered the fine lower than that minimum dollar amount.

- MOTION:** Mr. Carson moved in case DCEB 19-825 to reduce the fine to \$0. Second was made by Ms. Graham.
- VOTE:** Motion carried with Ms. Dutton, Ms. Graham, Messrs. Carson, Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting aye. Voting nay, none.

Chair Bowman reviewed the decision of the Board.

4. **REQUEST FOR FINE RECONSIDERATION**
DCEB 19-309 City vs. MONDI GJONI
1444 Overcash Drive
Current Owner: MONDI GJONI
Fine due as of 2/4/2020: \$12,322.94

Chair Bowman determined the respondent was not present.
Time was provided for the Board members to review the written request for fine reduction.

Mr. Motley asked if this homeowner was cooperative, yes or no. Ms. Gilbert stated to an extent, yes.

Mr. Motley asked if there was a lack of responsibility of the owner in this taking care of responsibilities for the property, yes or no. Ms. Gilbert asked for the property or for the Property Appraiser. Mr. Motley stated the Property Appraiser's address. Ms. Gilbert stated, yes.

Mr. Motley verified with Ms. Gilbert this case was the result of a citizen complaint and asked what was the complaint about the door that was damaged; Ms. Gilbert advised it was the side door. He verified with Ms. Gilbert then the respondent received a notice for that violation and then they installed the door without a permit.

Mr. Motley stated this is actually a rental property and this case started in March 2019 and contact was finally made with the homeowner in October 2019, simply because they failed to keep the correct address for the Property Appraiser's Office here in Pinellas County. Finally, with research done on behalf of the Code Inspectors and other individuals in December contact was finally made. The owner of this property installed a side door, a new door without a permit, that is why it took so long to get this into compliance.

MOTION: Mr. Motley moved in case DCEB 19-309 to deny the request for fine reconsideration. Second was made by Mr. Chize.

VOTE: Motion carried 4 - 3 with Ms. Dutton, Messrs. Motley, Pauley and Chize voting aye. Chair Bowman voting nay. Voting nay, Ms. Graham and Mr. Carson.

Chair Bowman reviewed the decision of the Board.

Meeting adjourned at 4:01 P. M.

NOTE: This meeting was recorded and those recordings are a part of the official file.

Michael Bowman, Chair
Dunedin Code Enforcement Board