



reported the following cases had either complied, been rescheduled, or were recommended by staff for an extension of time on the Consent Agenda. Cases #2013090162, #2013070138, #2013120032, #2013120061, #2013080097, #2013120006, #2012110011, #2013120012 and #2013100146 - 30 day extension until March 21, 2014. Case #2013110012 - 60 day extension until April 25, 2014. Cases #2013060054, #2013070120, #2013120009 and #2013030051 were rescheduled.

In compliance were Cases #2014010049, #2013110005, #2013110006, #2014010027, #2013120069, #2014010011, #2014010006, #2013120016, #2014010023, #2014010086, #2013100123, #2013120038, #2014010031, #2013090202, #2013090210, #2013110002, #2013100110, #2013100114, #2013090118, #

Mr. DeBlois noted there was one Administrative Hearing on the agenda and recommended it be heard at a time certain of 2:30 p.m. He recommended the Lien Release Requests be heard no sooner than 3:00 p.m., and pointed out there was also an addendum to today's agenda consisting of two additional Lien Release Requests.

11:23:00

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Bowles, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to accept the Consent Agenda with the revisions.**

11:23:53 **Swearing in of Those Who Will Testify**

The secretary proceeded to administer the testimonial oath to everyone who would be testifying at today's hearings.

### **EVIDENTIARY HEARINGS**

11:24:15 **Case #2013110008 – Irene Julian Perry**

Mr. DeBlois recapped this case involved property zoned mobile home residential zoning district that was cited for junk, trash and debris and recreational vehicle (RV) storage violation for an untagged RV that appeared to be set up for occupancy on the property.

Ms. Betty Davis, IRC Code Enforcement Officer, submitted 14 photographs

taken February 13, 2014 into evidence, along with an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 14, 2014. She indicated she had received complaints about a fence erected by the Respondent that was leaning against the neighbor's fence and creating a storm hazard, and an RV that appeared to be lived in. Inspector Davis pointed out on the photographs a green fence erected by the neighbor and observed the Respondent had placed lattice against the fence, along with aluminum, tin, stones and wooden structures.

Mr. DeBlois advised the Board it was County policy not to require a permit for landscape features such as lattice work to support plants or as part of a garden, providing it did not interfere with drainage easements, etc., and the issue was whether or not the materials being put up went beyond the landscape border allowance and became a hurricane hazard. He advised the RV stored on the property needed to be registered to someone associated with the property and was not allowed as living quarters as an accessory use to the property.

Inspector Davis submitted into evidence a registration for the RV titled to the property.

Ms. Jannet Perry, representing her mother Respondent Irene Perry, stated she had put in the lattice work and landscape border to keep the neighbor out of her yard. She claimed the neighbor was poisoning her vegetation with spray and digging dirt out from under her fence into the Respondent's yard, and related she had put tiles, rocks and tin down to stop that activity.

Mr. Zimmermann observed this case appeared to be a civil matter rather than a code enforcement matter. Attorney Hancock opined in a sense it involved code enforcement, but it was definitely something that could be remedied in civil court or perhaps criminally.

Mr. DeBlois clarified from a code enforcement standpoint it concerned what was considered to be an allowable landscape border versus what was not. He noted the tin against the latticework went beyond a non-permitted landscape border and the initial wooden rail and the latticework itself would qualify as a non-exempt landscape border; however staff's position was the other materials came under the category of miscellaneous debris.

Ms. Perry confirmed nobody was living in the RV. Mr. DeBlois said he would withdraw the violation for RV storage and recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for the Respondent to remove the loose tiles, tin and other



was permitted under the zoning.

Inspector Carter Solomon pointed out Mr. McCoy's letter indicated the site was approved in 1987 as a contractor trades/warehouse use, with one change of use in 2004 for Nemo's Chowder House.

Mr. DeBlois outlined staff's position that there needed to be a change of use Administrative Approval application submitted so it could be fully evaluated and go through a process to determine what level of change of use improvements or non-improvements were required, also parking, impact fees, etc.

Chairman Clements said he was confused why there was a problem if a health fitness center was a permitted use. Mr. DeBlois responded even though it was a permitted use, impact fees were calculated based on square footages used for different aspects.

Mr. Gervasio recalled the original business on the subject site was Southern Electric Supply, which was retail in the front and warehouse and showroom in the rear. He asked if it was the County's position that every time a business moved out and a new business went in and reconfigured the space they had to get a change of use and pay a new impact fee. Mr. DeBlois explained staff's position was if a use changed from what was approved as contractor trades warehouse to a use in a different category such as membership sports, it needed to be evaluated through a change of use application process.

Discussion followed.

Mr. DeBlois indicated staff considered a tile and carpet business as a contractor's trade but did not consider a baseball training camp as a contractor's trade. He recommended granting an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for the Respondent to apply for and obtain Administrative Approval for a change of use.

Mr. Gervasio opined the current use created less of an impact on infrastructure in that area than any of the past uses he was aware of. Mr. Bowles understood the site was approved for contractor trades, and felt a baseball training camp was obviously not a contractor trade designation regardless of whether or not it was less or more traffic, parking, etc. He opined if the Administrative Approval process was not followed something else such as a restaurant might go in there and he did not see how it could be regulated.



Sheriff's office meet her and the Respondent at the site, and cleared up the confusion and confirmed the hot dog stand was not allowed in the right-of-way.

Respondent Nicholas Romano testified in September, 2013 a Health Inspector and a Sheriff's deputy checked out his permits and said the business was allowed, and he had obtained a tax license and a home occupancy permit and thought he was allowed to sell the hot dogs until he received the citation from Inspector Davis.

Inspector Davis and Mr. DeBlois explained to the Respondent what was allowed under County code.

Chairman Clements suggested in the spirit of cooperation and the possibility there was some confusion supported by others outside of code enforcement staff, perhaps staff could ease up on the fine.

Mr. DeBlois said based on the discussion and testimony, staff could consider the citation and today's hearing as a warning. He recommended the fine be rescinded; however with a clear record the Respondent was on notice in the event of a recurrence of the violation.

12:30:43

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Gervasio, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to rescind Citation #0194 and the \$300 fine, with the understanding the Respondent was on notice and would be fined in the event the violation recurred.**

It is noted for the record the Respondent was present for this hearing.

### **EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

12:31:51 **Case #2013060096 – Thomas Fisher & Mark & Patricia Hedman**

Inspector Davis confirmed service on February 13, 2014 and submitted one photograph into evidence. She indicated this case involved property maintenance for a concrete utility shed with a collapsing roof and mobile home undercarriage skirt violation, adding the overgrown weeds had been taken care of. Mr. DeBlois recommended the Respondent be granted 90 days, until May 16, 2014, to resolve the violations.

Respondent Ms. Patricia Hedman testified she was not sure whether she was going tear everything down and build a new house or repair what was there.

12:35:24

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Bowles, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violations and grant an extension of 90 days, until May 16, 2014, for compliance or a \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record Respondent Patricia Hedman was present for this hearing.

### **LIEN RELEASE REQUESTS**

12:36:13 **Case #201110027 – James Franks & Brenda Williams (HSBC Bank**

Mr. DeBlois recalled this case had initially been to the Board on November 28, 2011 for property maintenance, junk, trash and debris and swimming pool maintenance violations, at which time the Board had entered an Order requiring the Respondents to comply by December 23, 2011. He continued when the case came back for a compliance hearing on January 23, 2012, upon hearing nothing had been done the Board entered a \$100 per day fine with a start date of December 24, 2011. Mr. DeBlois verified compliance as of October 21, 2013, which was 667 days of non-compliance for a flat fine calculation in the amount of \$66,700.

Inspector Carter Solomon advised the junk, trash and debris and property maintenance violations had been resolved one year prior to final compliance on October 21, 2013; however the pool company kept telling the bank they had taken care of the pool but had only put a wire mesh over it. She confirmed Respondent James Franks was deceased and the property was vacant, and everything done towards compliance was initiated by the bank.

Respondent Ms. April Hariott, representing the bank, requested the fine be reduced to administrative costs.

Mr. DeBlois noted the bank had worked towards compliance and

recommended the fine be reduced to \$1,700 to cover administrative costs.

12:41:19

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance and reduce the fine to \$1,700 to cover administrative costs.**

It is noted for the record the Respondent bank's representative was present for this hearing.

12:41:35 **Case #2010110106 – Sally Ann Hosein & Jamil Mikati**

Mr. DeBlois related this case originally came to the Board on January 24, 2011 for overgrown weeds, and after one extension the Board granted until March 25, 2011 to comply. He continued when the case came back for a compliance hearing the Board entered a \$100 per day fine with a start date of March 26, 2011. Mr. DeBlois verified compliance as of August 27, 2012, which was a passage of 520 days for a flat fine in the amount of \$52,000.

Ms. Helena Kennedy, representing the bank, asked for a reduction in the fine amount.

Mr. DeBlois recommended the fine be reduced to \$2,000 for administrative costs.

Mr. Petrulak noted there was still a tenant on the property and it was obvious they were the ones who had maintained the site for at least the last year. Mr. Zimmermann felt perhaps it was premature for the bank to be asking for a reduction in the fine at this time when they could not go in and maintain the property because of the presence of the tenant.

Ms. Kennedy confirmed the bank had a Certificate of Title issued in January, 2014, and the tenant was in the process of vacating the property.

Discussion followed.

12:51:09

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted (3-2) to find compliance and**

**set a fine certain in the amount of \$3,000 to cover administrative costs. Mr. Bowles and Mr. Zimmermann opposed.**

It is noted for the record the bank's representative was present for this hearing.

12:52:08 **Case #2010110033 – Nathan Jacobs**

Mr. DeBlois recapped this case first came to the Board on February 28, 2011 when the Respondents were Nathan Jacobs and BAC Home Loan Services, at which time the hearing was attended by an attorney representing the foreclosing bank. He continued the violations were for an unmaintained swimming pool and insufficient pool enclosure and the Board granted until March 7, 2011 to secure the pool and until March 25, 2011 for cleaning of the pool, and when it came back to the Board on March 28, 2011 upon hearing nothing had been done the \$100 per day fine was imposed with a start date of March 8, 2011. Mr. DeBlois verified compliance as of November 12, 2013, which was 981 days for a flat fine of \$98,100.

Ms. Christina Ripple, representing the bank, advised the lender had received the property on October 31, 2013 and had complied within two weeks, and requested the fine be reduced to 5% of the flat fine.

Mr. DeBlois noted the unsecured pool violation constituted a hazard and recommended more than just administrative costs, and set the amount at \$5,000.

12:57:44

**ON MOTION BY Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance and set the fine in the amount of \$5,000 to cover administrative costs and more due to the hazardous nature of the violation.**

It is noted for the record the bank's representative was present for this hearing.

12:58:03 **Case #2011040177 – Stephen Burke (BAC Home Loans)**

Mr. DeBlois advised this case related to a Board Order dating back to June 27, 2011 for swimming pool maintenance and junk, trash and debris violations, at which time the Board granted the Respondents until July 22, 2011 for compliance. He continued when the case came back for a compliance hearing on July 25, 2011, upon hearing of non-compliance the Board imposed a \$100 per day fine with a start date of July 23, 2011.

Mr. DeBlois verified compliance with the junk, trash and debris; however there was still an issue with swimming pool maintenance and the new owner had asked for a potential conditional setting of fine whereby if the fine was set to a certain amount he would commit to resolving the violation within a certain amount of time.

Mr. Thomas Christopher Clark stated he was under contract with HUD to purchase the property and confirmed the pool was enclosed and had metal mesh and boards across it; however it was dirty and there was no way to clean it because there was no electricity, water or pool pump. He requested the Board consider reducing the fine from \$94,000 to something HUD would accept so he could purchase the property and grant a period of time to allow him to erect a fence before he addressed the pool violation.

Mr. DeBlois felt it would be appropriate to promote the sale and cleanup of the property as a conditional setting of the fine, and if compliance was not attained the fine would revert to the accruing amount. He recommended something beyond administrative costs because it was a pool violation, and recommended the fine be set at \$2,500 contingent on the violation being resolved in approximately 90 days, by May 16, 2014, otherwise the fine would revert to the accruing amount.

Mr. Gervasio wanted to make sure the pool stayed secure while Mr. Clark was trying to determine if it was salvageable. Mr. Clark said the reason he had asked for the extra time was to make sure he could permit and build a fence before taking the mesh off the pool.

13:05:47

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED by Mr. Bowles, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to reduce the fine to \$2,500 contingent on the pool violation being resolved in approximately 90 days, by May 16,2014, otherwise the fine would revert to the accruing amount.**



Mr. DeBlois recommended the fine be set at \$2,300.

13:14:20

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Bowles, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance and set the fine at \$2,300 for administrative costs.**

It is noted for the record the bank's representative was present for this hearing.

13:14:33 **Case #2013070152 – PNC Bank NA**

Mr. DeBlois related this case initially came to the Board on September 23, 2013 for overgrown weeds, junk, trash and debris and swimming pool maintenance, and PNC Bank NA was the Respondent at that time. He advised the Board granting the Respondent until October 25, 2013 to comply; however when it came back on October 28, 2013 upon learning nothing had been done the Board imposed a \$100 per day fine with a start date of October 26, 2013. Mr. DeBlois confirmed compliance as of February 12, 2014, which was 109 days of non-compliance for a flat accrued fine amount of \$10,900.

Inspector Carter Solomon testified PNC Bank NA told her they did not have possession of the property and since this property would be transferred back to Fannie Mae, PNC chose not to resolve the violation until the bank representative present at today's meeting got involved.

Ms. Tammy Bogart, representing PNC Bank NA, advised she was assigned the property on November 25, 2013 and obtained bids to resolve the violations, which were complied on December 17, 2013. She requested the fine be reduced to administrative costs.

Mr. Gervasio observed the bank was in possession of the property from the beginning of this case, and he did not see why the Board should consider reducing the fine when PNC Bank NA could have complied months ago but did not.

Mr. DeBlois calculated there had been 48 days of non-compliance based on Ms. Bogart's December 17, 2013 compliance date, and recommended compliance be acknowledged as of that date and the fine be set at the accrued amount of

\$4,800.

13:20:22

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance as of December 17, 2013 and set the fine at the accrued amount of \$4,800.**

It is noted for the record the bank's representative was present for this hearing.

13:20:38 **Case #2010070326 – Joyce & William Simpson (Nationstar Mortgage, LLC)**

Mr. DeBlois stated this case originally came to the Board on September 27, 2010 for junk, trash and debris, overgrown weeds and junk vehicles, at which time a representative of Nationstar Mortgage, LLC was present. He continued the Board's initial Order granted 30 days, until October 22, 2010, for compliance, with one extension, and when it came back to the Board on November 22, 2010 as uncomplied, the \$100 per day fine was imposed with a start date of November 20, 2010. Mr. DeBlois verified compliance as of September 24, 2013, which was the passage of 1,039 days for a flat fine of \$103,900.

Mr. James Gazlay, the new purchaser of the property, asked for a reduction in the fine to administrative costs in order for the sale to close.

Mr. Petrulak inquired how long the bank had the property, and was advised Nationstar bank took possession in September, 2013.

Mr. DeBlois expressed concern that Nationstar Mortgage was identified as a Respondent and notified from the beginning of this case and a representative was present at the evidentiary hearing, and even though the bank did not get title until 2013, staff had previously dealt with banks that were diligent enough to make an effort to mow the grass and clean up properties prior to transfer of titles taking place. He noted the property was in non-compliance for almost three years and felt there should be some fine beyond administrative costs, and recommended the fine be set at \$5,000.

13:26:39

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Bowles, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance and set the fine at \$5,000 for administrative costs and other considerations.**

It is noted for the record the proposed new owner of the property was present for this hearing.

13:27:31     **Case #2010110114 – Scott Kennedy (Wells Fargo Bank)**

Mr. DeBlois recapped this case came to the Board for an evidentiary hearing on January 24, 2011 for overgrown weeds and junk, trash and debris, at which time the Respondents were Scott Kennedy and Wells Fargo Bank. He continued the Board granted until March 25, 2011 for compliance and when it came back on March 28, 2011 the Board found non-compliance and imposed a \$100 per day fine with a start date of March 26, 2011. Mr. DeBlois verified compliance on May 14, 2011, which was 49 days for an accrued flat fine in the amount of \$4,900.

Inspector Carter Solomon testified the bank had cleaned up and maintained the property after the owner left before they got a final judgment and had taken title in 2014.

Mr. Mark Moore, MSM Homes LLC, advised he was the winning bidder at an auction of the property and asked for the fine to be reduced to administrative costs.

Mr. DeBlois noted the bank was diligent in maintaining the property prior to getting title and recommended the fine be set at \$1,700 to cover administrative costs.

13:32:32

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Gervasio, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance and set the fine at \$1,700 to cover administrative costs.**

It is noted for the record the new owner was present for this hearing.

13:32:04     **Case #2012080105 – Paul & Suzanne Key (Branch Banking & Trust)**

Mr. DeBlois indicated this case first came to the Board on September 24, 2012 for overgrown weeds, pool maintenance and junk, trash and debris violations, at which time the Board gave the Respondents until October 19, 2012 to comply. He continued one extension was granted and the case came back for a compliance hearing on November 26, 2012, at which time staff testified nothing had been done and the \$100 per day fine was imposed with a start date of November 24, 2012. Mr. DeBlois confirmed compliance as of February 20, 2014, which was 453 days of non-compliance for a flat fine of \$45,300.

Ms. Anesha Worthy, representing the bank, testified the bank received a Certificate of Title to the property as of July, 2013 but was not aware of the violations until December 10, 2013, at which time an effort was made to comply. She requested the fine be reduced to administrative costs.

Mr. DeBlois advised the administrative costs would normally be \$2,000; however this was a case whereby the bank was initially notified as the foreclosing bank and there was a safety issue because a pool was involved in the violations. He recommended the fine be set at 10% of the accrued fine for an amount of \$4,500.

13:38:54

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find compliance and set the fine at 10% of the accrued fine in the amount of \$4,500.**

It is noted for the record the bank's representative was present for this hearing.

Chairman Clements called a recess at 4:05 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

### **EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

13:39:45 **Case #2014010091 – Robert Weber**

Inspector Davis submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 14, 2014 and one photograph into evidence. She described hanging gutters and property maintenance issues at a vacant building, and recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

Respondent Robert Weber was in agreement with the recommendation.

13:41:19

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Gervasio, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondent was present for this hearing.

### **COMPLIANCE HEARING**

13:41:41 **Case #2013040135 – National Oil & Gas Dist. Inc.**

Mr. DeBlois observed this case came to the Board as a repeat violation on June 24, 2013 for landscape maintenance and site plan non-conformance, with several extensions being granted. Inspector Davis testified she had met with landscapers several times at the site and the Respondent needed to determine what he wanted to do to come into compliance, because so far he had just put in a few hedges. Mr. DeBlois recommended the \$100 fine be imposed.

Respondent Angel Rivera, representing the owner, stated the irrigation had to be replaced after the hedges were planted and asked for an extension until March, 2014.

Mr. DeBlois said staff could support one more extension until March 21, 2014.

13:47:11

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to impose a \$100 per day fine with a start date of February 22, 2014, with the fine to be held in abeyance if compliance was attained by March 21, 2014. If compliance was not confirmed by that date, the \$100 per day fine would revert back to the original imposition date of February 22, 2014.**

It is noted for the record the Respondent's representative was present for this hearing.



Mr. Mike Vitali, a neighbor, said he had a problem with the constant howling by hound dogs in crates on the subject property.

Mr. DeBlois was hopeful the fence would address the noise; however if there was an issue after that the case could be brought back as a repeat violation and subject to fines after immediate Notification to Appear.

13:59:37

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violations and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record Respondent Kris Svelling was present for this hearing.

14:02:24     **Case #2014010004 – WTH Oakmont Mortgage, Pool 285 LP**

Inspector Carter Solomon submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 14, 2014 and one photograph into evidence and reported this case had to do with overgrown weeds, property maintenance and unsecured vacant structure violations. She confirmed the overgrown weeds violation had been resolved and recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

Mr. Steve Oliver, an engineer hired by the Respondent, said he had inspected the subject property on February 14, 2014 and proposed removing structures from the property that were not built to current building codes and making other necessary repairs. He promised to maintain the property and board it up until he obtained permits to do the necessary work.

Mr. DeBlois recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

14:07:56

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violations and grant an extension of 30 days,**





2014, for compliance.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violations and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2014010048 – Lynn & Suzanne Akerley (Wells Fargo Bank)**

Inspector Carter Solomon submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 13, 2014 into evidence, and related this case had to do with overgrown weeds, zoning district use violation and swimming pool maintenance. She reported the Respondents had a rooster and pig and the neighbor was complaining about the noise, and recommended an extension of seven days, until March 3, 2014, to remove the rooster and 30 days, until March 21, 2014, to resolve the remaining violations.

**ON MOTION BY MR. Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Gervasio, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violations and grant an extension of seven days, until March 3, 2014, to remove the rooster and 30 days, until March 21, 2014, to remove the pig, mow the overgrown weeds and maintain the swimming pool or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2014010055 – James Ranson (Deutsche Bank National Trust)**

Inspector Carter Solomon submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 14, 2014 and one photograph into evidence, and described overgrown weeds in the rear yard. She recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Bowles, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the**

**violation and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2013120054 – Flagstar Bank FSB**

Inspector Carter Solomon submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 14, 2014 and one photograph into evidence. She related this case involved a property maintenance violation for an unsecured vacant house and recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondent was not present for this hearing.

**Case #2013120018 – Ariful & Tasnim Karim**

Inspector Jefferson confirmed service on February 14, 2014 and submitted one photograph into evidence. She described overgrown weeds on the subject property and recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Bowles, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2014010014 – Hampton & Pearl Jackson et al**

Inspector Buck confirmed service on February 8, 2014 and submitted one

photograph taken February 18, 2014 into evidence. She related this case concerned a zoning district use violation for two large donation bins placed on the subject property, and recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for removal of the bins.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2013100130 – Tracey Scarborough**

Inspector Carter Solomon confirmed service on February 14, 2014 and related this case had been referred to her by the IRC Building Department for a roof replaced without a permit. She stated the Respondent had applied for a permit on February 20, 2014 and recommended an extension of 60 days, until April 25, 2014, to finish the work and obtain final inspection.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Gervasio, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 60 days, until April 25, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondent was not present for this hearing.

**Case #2014010093 – Greene Investment Prtn Ltd. (Liberty Tax Services)**

Inspector Davis submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating that the property of the owner had been posted on February 14, 2014 and confirmed service on the tenant Liberty Tax Services on February 10, 2014 by certified mail. She submitted one photograph into evidence showing illegal signage in the right-of-way, and recommended the Board find the violation had occurred even though it was currently in compliance and enter a Continuing Order in the event of a re-occurrence in the future, since Liberty Tax Services had previously posted illegal signs.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the sign violation had occurred and enter a Continuing Order in the event of a recurrence of the violation in the future.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2014020008 – LaCrystal Demario & Antonio Yorker**

Inspector Buck confirmed service on February 10, 2014 and submitted two photographs taken on February 14, 2014 into evidence. She noted this was a repeat violation for overgrown weeds as the property had been cited on October 26, 2013, but later complied. Mr. DeBlois recommended an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 30 days, until March 21, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2013110071 – Timothy & Elizabeth Sigman (Bank of New York Mellon)**

Inspector Davis submitted an Affidavit of Service indicating the property had been posted on February 14, 2014 and confirmed service to the bank on February 14, 2014. She submitted one photograph into evidence and related the violation was for repair and alterations to a seawall and boat dock without permits. She recommended an extension of 60 days, until April 25, 2014, for compliance.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Gervasio, SECONDED BY Mr. Petrulak, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation and grant an extension of 60 days, until April 25, 2014, for compliance or a possible \$100 per day fine.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Case #2013120015 – Mary Jane Christiansen (Match.Com)**

Mr. DeBlois related this case had to do with illegal signs placed throughout the County advertising Sebastian Singles. Inspector Davis submitted three photographs into evidence and confirmed service to both Respondents on February 18, 2014. She indicated the signs had been removed and a \$250 fine had been paid; however she recommended the Board enter a Continuing Order in the event the violation recurred in the future.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Zimmermann, SECONDED BY Mr. Bowles, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find the violation had occurred and enter a Continuing Order in the event the sign violation recurred in the future.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**COMPLIANCE HEARING**

**Case #2013080077 – Robert & Gladys Jean Williams (First Impressions)**

Mr. DeBlois recapped this case had been to the Board for an evidentiary hearing on October 28, 2013 and had to do with landscape maintenance and site plan non-conformance violations at a child day-care business. He advised the Board had granted 60 days, until December 20, 2013 for compliance with one additional extension granted until February 21, 2014.

Inspector Jefferson submitted six photographs into evidence and described dead and missing landscape material on the subject property with no real progress being made, and recommended the fine be imposed.

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Gervasio, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to find non-compliance and impose the fine in the amount of \$100 per day with a start date of February 22, 2014.**

It is noted for the record the Respondents were not present for this hearing.

**Authorization for Notices to Appear**

**ON MOTION BY Mr. Petrulak, SECONDED BY Mr. Zimmermann, the Board voted unanimously (5-0) to authorize the Notices to Appear for cases leading up to the March 24, 2014 meeting.**

**Other Matters**

There were none.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.