Mr. Lang called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The roll was called with seven members being present.

Mr. Andersen moved to approve the minutes for the March 3, 2016 meeting. Second by Mr. Deane.

AYES: Andersen, Bexten, Deane, Palu, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on April 7, 2016, Elmer Lopez appeared before the Board. Jay Davis (Assistant Director – Permits & Inspections), Kevin Denker (Chief Housing Inspector) and Todd Shear (Housing Inspector) appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer presented the case on behalf of Yvonne Barna (Housing Inspector) who was not present. He stated that he visited the property on April 5, 2016 and that it appeared that progress was being made. Ms. Barna had previously requested that the applicant submit a construction schedule. Mr. Shearer suggested that the exterior of the home be completed before work continued on the interior. He stated that the inside of the duplex had been completely gutted and that there were approved plans for the interior. He added that work needed to be completed on the gutters, storm doors, basement stairs, windows and brick facade. Mr. Shearer submitted several photos of the exterior and interior of the duplex (Exhibit 2).

Mr. Davis confirmed that a building permit had been issued and that the City was in the process of inspecting the property. He was not opposed to extending more time to allow the applicant to complete the work.

Mr. Lopez presented pictures of the property that showed that the work was advancing. He explained that he was not originally aware of the laws that pertained to his property with regards to the permits required to complete repairs. He submitted a schedule of repairs (Exhibit 3) that addressed the framing, plumbing and electrical. He explained that the other side of the duplex (821 Park Avenue) had been completed and that he expected to complete the repairs for 823 Park Avenue in approximately 3 months. He had not yet received the final inspection for 821 Park Avenue.

Mr. Denker stated that the Permits & Inspections needed to know who would be doing the HVAC work on the property. Mr. Lopez responded that he would provide that information to the department at a later date.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 6-month extension for the completion of work. Mr. Deane seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Bexten, Deane, Palu, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on April 7, 2016, Doug Quinn, Robert Gould and Fran Garey appeared before the Board. Jay Davis (Assistant Director – Permits & Inspections), Kevin Denker (Chief Housing Inspector) and Todd Shear (Housing Inspector) appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Andersen moved to have Cases 16-07 through 16-09 heard together. Mr. Reimer seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Bexten, Deane, Palu, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0

Mr. Denker stated that a complaint was received from the Fire Department about various issues with the property. Mr. Shearer performed a re-inspection which resulted in the 3 notices listed above. He noted that Mr. Davis had been in contact with the owners and their representatives.

Mr. Shearer submitted current photos of the hotel and pool area (Exhibit 2). He explained that the pool had a current active file from May 28, 2015 and continued to be structurally unstable, which resulted in a wreck order being issued. In addition, because of several violations throughout the hotel, a vacate order was also issued. He explained that the parties who were appealing the notices owned the note on the building and not the property itself. He stated that he was contacted by a roofer the week before the meeting who inquired as to whether a new roof could be put on the building. He further stated that the rooms had been cleaned and that the drain had been cleaned in one room where there was a plumbing issue. No additional repairs had been made. In response to Mr. Reimer, Mr. Shearer stated that the hotel had no occupants with the exception of a manager who appeared to spend a significant amount of time on the property. Because of the problems with break-ins, Mr. Shearer stated that he allowed someone on site to watch the property. It appeared that the individual sat in lobby, which he agreed with as long as he did not live there.

Mr. Davis clarified that the demolition order was for the roof of the pool. He explained that the laminated timber structure supporting the roof was rotted at the bottom and center, making the roof structurally unsound. He believed that the rest of the building was stable and could be repaired and replaced.
Mr. Quinn, (Attorney with McGrath-North), represented the first lien holder; the managing
director for the lien holder at the time was Fran Garey. He explained that the original owners of
the building had disappeared and that his client had commenced with a non-judicial foreclosure
proceeding with a sale scheduled for May 13, 2016. His client was looking into some options for
the structure, which included an assisted-living facility. However, until a legal title was obtained,
very little could be done. He requested a 60-day layover so that ownership could be finalized
and decisions could be made as to what would happen with the property. He indicated that the
property was secure and well-guarded.

Ms. Garey stated that she wanted some time to obtain an engineer’s report so that it could be
determined what repairs needed to be done. She stated that she is working with investors who
were creating a business plan for the property. She added that more than 60 days was needed.

Mr. Denker suggested laying the case over so that it comes back before the board for 90 days/3
months to give the applicant time to obtain the title, subject to the property remaining vacant and
secure. At the next meeting, future uses for the property could be discussed.

Mr. Reimer moved to LAYOVER for 90 days or until the July 7, 2016 meeting, subject to the
property remaining vacant and secure. Ms. Bexten seconded the motion.

AYES: Andersen, Bexten, Deane, Palu, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on April 7, 2016, Nick Woloszyn and Martin Gonzalez appeared before the Board. Jay Davis (Assistant Director – Permits & Inspections), Kevin Denker (Chief Housing Inspector), Todd Shear (Housing Inspector) and Jim Wonder (Chief Plumbing Inspector) appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Denker submitted photos from February 29, 2016 (Exhibit 2). Mr. Shearer submitted photos of the exterior dated May 4, 2016 (Exhibit 3) and photos of the interior dated May 6, 2016 (Exhibit 4). He stated that a pending plan had been submitted to Permits & Inspections. The entire dwelling was illegally plumbed with PVC and there were major electrical and fire-stopping issues. He explained that the home had been converted into a 4-plex. Many cosmetic repairs were also needed.

In response to Mr. Reimer, Mr. Shearer stated that there were people living in Unit 1 and possibly in Unit 3 or 4. Mr. Gonzalez has owned the property since June of 2015.

The property owner was not aware of the repairs that would be needed for the interior because the inspector had not yet notified him that they were necessary. Mr. Gonzalez wanted more time to finish the exterior. The stairs and deck on the outside needed repairs.

Mr. Wonder confirmed that most of the plumbing inside the structure did not meet and had possibly never met code. He added that there were major violations and that it was apparent that repairs had not be made by a licensed plumber.

Mr. Reimer was concerned that granting an extension to the owner could possibly put the residents, some who were children, at risk. Mr. Wonder noted that there was a washing machine opening that could allow sewer gasses to enter the building. There was also a sink with a pan underneath to catch leaking water. Mr. Shearer added that the water heaters were in very poor condition and were too undersized to meet the needs of the residents.

Mr. Denker explained that, although the board had been made aware of the interior violations, the applicant’s appeal was for the exterior. Mr. Shearer was provided access to the interior by one of the tenants. The notice and pictures for the interior would be generated at a later time. When the notice was sent, it would probably include a vacate order that the applicant could choose to appeal at that time. He stressed that the current appeal was for the exterior code violations.

The applicant requested an extension of 3 months.

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

AYES: Bexten, Deane, Reimer, Standerford, Lang

NAYES: Andersen, Palu

MOTION CARRIED: 5-2
ADJOURNMENT:

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 2:42 p.m.