Mr. Palu called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

I. Roll Call

Steven Andersen – Present
Jeffrey Ehler – Not Present
James Lang – Not Present
Jay Palu – Present (Acting Chair)
Gerald Reimer - Present
Ryan Richard - Present
Jerry Standerford - Present

Others Present:

Anna Bespoyasny, Superintendent
Scott Lane, Chief Housing Inspector
Jennifer Taylor, City Attorney
Todd Shearer, Housing Inspector
Mike Champion, Housing Inspector
Clinette Ingram, Board Secretary

II. Approval of Minutes: Approval of June 4, 2020 minutes.

Motion by Mr. Standerford to approve the minutes. Second by Mr. Richard.

AYES: Reimer, Standerford, Richard, Palu

ABSTAIN: Andersen

Motion carried: 4-0-1.
III. Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-04 (Layover from 4/2/2020)</th>
<th>LOCATION: 2208 Fowler Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim B Hughes</td>
<td>APPEAL: Notice dated November 6, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2627 Pawnee Meadows Road</td>
<td>Fremont, NE 68025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 2, 2020, the applicant failed to appear before the board. Mike Champion appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Champion stated that this case was from 2015. He noted that he has had several conversations with the owner and that Mr. Hughes had also come into the office to discuss the property. He informed the applicant that all he would need to take care of was the southwest corner of the garage, the fascia on the home and remove the boards from the windows. The applicant chose to fill out an application to appeal the case to the board.

Mr. Reimer noted the length of time that the City had been attempting to work with the applicant and the applicant's refusal to work with the City.

Mr. Reimer moved to DENY the appeal. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion.

Mr. Champion explained that the applicant lived in Fremont and he could not get permission to give him a citation. He wanted to properly close this case so that it could be removed from his list. There was some discussion about what would happen if the appeal was denied.

Mr. Palu read an email from the applicant dated July 1, 2020, where he requested a layover due to doctor’s appointments and the fact that he was considered to be “at risk” with regards to Covid19. Mr. Reimer and Mr. Andersen both withdrew their original motion.

Mr. Reimer moved to LAYOVER the case until the August 6, 2020 meeting. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Reimer, Standerford, Richard, Palu

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 2, 2020, Sandra Franklin (6707 South 27th Street) appeared before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that the house had not been repaired but that it was currently for sale. The Planning Department wanted to give a 90-day extension so that the applicant had enough time to sell the property. Mr. Lane stated that when he visited this home with the inspector the previous week he saw a realtor and prospective buyers at this property.

Ms. Franklin read the email that she sent to Ms. Ingram, Board Secretary. It stated in part that she and her sister planned to sell the home and it later stated that a buyer had made a cash offer which she and her sister accepted.

In response to Mr. Reimer, Ms. Franklin stated that she would accept a 90-day extension to finalize the sale of the property.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 90-day extension. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Reimer, Standerford, Richard, Palu

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 2, 2020, Michele Mitchell appeared before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that a demolition order had been issued for this property and that he had an approved bid. The applicant had filed a Temporary Restraining Order which prevented the Planning Department from demolishing the home. He stated that there had been major progress in the last 4 weeks with just 3 major issues remaining: 1) installation of the gas meter; 2) repair of the damaged areas around the siding; and 3) clean-up of the property. Mr. Shearer stated that before he would approve the gas/water service being turned on, he would require that permits be pulled for the installation of a new furnace and also for plumbing. He stated that MUD had sent him an email requesting that he give approval for service to be turned on which he denied since the permit had not been pulled. He recommended a 30-day extension so that those issues could be resolved.

Mr. Lane explained that this property had been in District Court and that the applicant had dealt with some contractors who did not properly do repairs. He added that there were some issues with the siding and windows. He acknowledged that the applicant had done enough work on the property so that it was no longer condemnable. He believed that all of the issues could be resolved in 30 days.

Ms. Mitchell explained that her parents owned the property before they passed away, at which point she and her husband acquired the property. She explained the issues that she had with contractors and she stated that there was someone currently repairing the inside of the home.

There was some discussion about the repair of the siding and downspouts on portions of the home. Mr. Shearer stated that a mechanical permit needed to be pulled for the gas meter. Ms. Mitchell stated that she had talked to MUD about the gas meter and she was told that it was a 2 – 3 week process that was delayed due to Covid19.

In response to Mr. Reimer, Mr. Shearer stated that the home had not received any code violations for the furnace, only for the gas meter. Mr. Reimer believed that the Planning Department was overreaching in this case. He stated that someone could inspect the furnace and determine that it worked fine instead of requiring that a permit be pulled. Mr. Shearer stated that a mechanical contractor could inspect the furnace and let him know that it is acceptable. He explained that he did not feel comfortable authorizing gas/water service without the applicant having the proper contractors in place. Mr. Reimer responded that in this case the Planning Department was operating outside of its jurisdiction since they had not issued a code violation for the furnace.

In response to Mr. Palu, Ms. Mitchell stated that she was not willing to let Mr. Shearer into the building. Mr. Palu felt that allowing Mr. Shearer into the home could help to alleviate concerns about the furnace. Ms. Mitchell stated that she had a licensed plumber and heating/cooling ready to do the work.

Mr. Lane explained that when the City has allowed certain situations to exist in the past, it has been sued when something happens.
In response to Mr. Reimer, Ms. Mitchell stated that she intended to fix the violations, she intended to make the house habitable, she believed that all of the issues could be taken care of within 30 days and she intended to have the furnace inspected. She stated, however, that she did not understand why she needed to obtain a permit if MUD would be doing the work. Mr. Reimer agreed and added that if she had a licensed contractor come out to evaluate the furnace a permit would not be required. Ms. Mitchell stated that she would agree to get documentation from a licensed contractor showing that the furnace was in good working condition. Mr. Reimer noted that if the furnace needed to be replaced, the HVAC company would be required to pull a permit for it anyway.

Ms. Mitchell also inquired as to why she was required to obtain a plumbing permit. In response to Mr. Reimer, Mr. Shearer stated that there were no violations issued for the plumbing. Mr. Reimer again believed that the Planning Department was overreaching.

Mr. Reimer asked how much time was needed to repair the outstanding issues. Ms. Mitchell stated that she would have everything completed in 60 days and that she would have a licensed plumber and HVAC contractor check the utilities to ensure that everything is safe. In addition, any faulty equipment would be replaced.

Mr. Reimer mentioned that there was no way for the furnace to be checked if the gas was disconnected.

In response to Mr. Palu, Mr. Shearer stated that he could support a 90-day extension as long as it could be determined that the furnace was safe and working. Mr. Reimer stated that he was not sure that it was Mr. Shearer’s responsibility to require the applicant to obtain certain permits. He added that the applicant was issued violations for issues on the exterior and not the interior of the home.

Ms. Bespoyasny stated that the Planning Department would make some accommodations so that the HVAC contractor could properly inspect the furnace and any other gas. She stated that she would authorize MUD to install the meter. Mr. Lane agreed, adding that MUD would be contacted immediately in an effort to help the applicant.

There was a brief discussion about the other properties that the applicant owns. Mr. Reimer encouraged Ms. Mitchell to work with Mr. Lane regarding any violation issues with any of her properties. Mr. Shearer mentioned that he did not believe that the property had been registered with the city.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 60-day extension subject to the following conditions: 1) the applicant must contact MUD to have them install a meter so that the furnace can be checked for any issues; 2) the applicant must have a licensed HVAC person inspect the furnace and any issues must be corrected; 3) the water must be turned on; 4) the property must remain clean, maintained and secured; 5) the applicant must register the property with the Rental Registration with the City of Omaha. Mr. Andersen seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Reimer, Standerford, Richard, Palu

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 2, 2020, the applicant failed to appear before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City for Kevin Mulcahy.

Mr. Shearer stated that he had recently spoken with the applicant who was extremely concerned with Covid19 because of her age and certain underlying health conditions. She requested that her case be laid over. Mr. Mulcahy had indicated that the applicant had done extensive work to the exterior of the property along with keeping it secure and clean.

Mr. Standerfor moved to LAYOVER for 90 days until the October 1, 2020 meeting. Mr. Reimer seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Reimer, Standerford, Richard, Palu

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.

IV. Adjournment

It was the consensus of the board to adjourn the meeting at 2:39 p.m.