Mr. Lang called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The roll was called with six members being present. He informed the public that a notice of the meeting was published in the Daily Record. Mr. Lang stated that the Nebraska Open Meetings Law was in effect and that a copy was available in the room for review.

Mr. Palu moved to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2017 meeting. Second by Mr. Reimer.

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

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0
CASES:

Case No. 16-30 (from December 2016) LOCATION: 911 South 20th Street
Patrick S. O’Donnell REQUEST: Appeal Notice of Violation - Reinspect
911 South 20th Street dated June 7, 2016.
Omaha, NE 68108

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 2, 2017, Patrick S. O’Donnell appeared before the board. Yvonne Barna appeared on behalf of the City.

Ms. Barna mentioned that the board had received copies of the letter that had been sent to the applicant from the Planning Department. That letter listed the conditions of approval for the Special Use Permit which allowed a Construction Yard in a DS District. One of the conditions was that the fence should be repaired. The fence that the applicant proposed at the December Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting was approved by the Planning Board at its January 4, 2017 meeting. The applicant agreed to install the vinyl fence and requested an extension until July 31, 2017. Ms. Barna supported an extension.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 6 month extension until August 2017. Mr. Deane seconded the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 2, 2017, James L. Williams III appeared before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that the home was in very poor condition. The applicant had pulled a permit for foundation repair. The foundation was inspected in November 2016 but did not pass. He noted that no other work had been done since that time. The home was in need of a new roof, gutters, siding and storm doors. All of the utilities had been disconnected and it was filled with items. He indicated that the home was on the demolition list because of its condition. He passed around a copy of the inspection (Exhibit B) that had been performed on November 16, 2016. Mr. Shearer recommended denial of the appeal since there was no progress.

Mr. Williams stated that he had not occupied the property since October 2014 when he moved to another state. He explained that he was in the Army Reserves and that he was only at the home once a month. He intended to keep the home and he showed some minor issues that he had taken care of since October 2016. He indicated that he had an electrician inspect the outside of the home and that it would cost him about $980 to have it repaired. He explained that he was also looking for a better paying job that would enable him to make the necessary repairs so that he could keep the home. Mr. Williams displayed pictures that showed repairs that he made to the siding, front door and deck stairs. He wanted to know what repairs were absolutely necessary so that he could move back into the home and continue to make repairs. In response to Mr. Lang, Mr. Williams stated that it would cost approximately $5000 to repair the roof. He requested at least 6 months to get some of the repairs completed with the probability that he would need additional time in the future.

In response to Mr. Reimer, Mr. Shearer explained that before the applicant could occupy the home all of the utilities would need to be reconnected, the roof and gutters would need to be completed and the basement foundation would need to be repaired. He added that the items that were being stored on the main floor would also need to be stored in the basement.

Mr. Reimer asked the applicant if there was some steps that he could take, within his means, to show good intent. Mr. Williams responded that the first thing he could do would be to take care of the electrical issues, repair the wall and move the items being stored on the first floor to the basement. Mr. Williams stated that he would take care of the issues mentioned by the building inspector, which was to install hangars on the floor joists along with straps and washers. It was determined that the actual wall was structurally sound.

Mr. Shearer stated that he preferred that the roof, gutters and downspouts be repaired before the applicant moved back into the home. In response to Mr. Standerford, Mr. Williams stated that he would attempt to have all of the roofing and gutter work done in 6 months. He explained that he would look into some programs that could assist him with repairs.

Mr. Reimer considered staggering the extension times for certain issues to give the applicant enough time and opportunity to complete all of the necessary repairs. Mr. Davis responded that the board could choose that option; however, if work on the property stopped the City would maintain the right to continue demolition procedures. It was decided that a layover would be the better option since it would give the applicant a chance to show that at least the electrical and
other minor improvements had been made. In addition, he could present to the board a plan for the roof.

Ms. Bexten moved to LAYOVER for 60 days or until the April 6, 2017 meeting. Mr. Palu seconded the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 2, 2017, Jeff Taylor and Mr. Lempke appeared before the board. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer stated that the applicant had just purchased the property approximately 3 months prior. He explained that there were extensive issues with the property that included an addition on the front that was not to code and mold in 50% of the home. He added that the applicant had already cleaned up most of the property and poured a new driveway; however, the home needed to be gutted and fully renovated. He was in support of the board granting the applicant at least a 6-month extension.

In response to Mr. Standerford, the applicant stated that the home would be completed in 6 months.

Ms. Bexten moved to GRANT a 6-month extension until August 2017. Mr. Reimer seconded the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 2, 2017, Ben Lampman appeared before the board. Kurt Holmstrom appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Holmstrom stated that he had spoken with the applicant several times about the property. Mr. Lampman brought the property without being aware of the violations. He was working with the Rehab division of the Planning Department to secure funding for repairs.

Mr. Lampman submitted paperwork from the Rental Rehab Program (Exhibit B) and stated that the work would be completed within 6 months of City Council approval, as stipulated by those program guidelines. He indicated that he had already pulled permits and replaced the electrical and plumbing. Mr. Holmstrom was in support of a 6-month extension.

Mr. Reimer moved to GRANT a 6-month extension. Mr. Deane seconded the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: 6-0
Case No. 17-22  
Laura Brink  
Triangular Holdings, LLC  
4880 South 131st Street  
Suite 2  
Omaha, NE 68137  

LOCATION: 3019 Pacific Street  
REQUEST: Appeal Notice of Violation Extension dated May 9, 2016.

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 2, 2017, Laura Brink appeared before the board. Yvonne Barna appeared on behalf of the City. Mr. Reimer stated that he would be recusing himself from the case.

Ms. Barna stated that the current owner had recently obtained the property, gutted it and cleaned the lot. The applicant requested a 9-month extension; however, she was more comfortable with granting a 6-month extension.

Mr. Davis explained that the property had sat vacant for 4 – years. He agreed that there were many serious issues with the property and that an additional extension of time beyond what the board might grant would more than likely be necessary.

Ms. Brink explained that some demolition work and asbestos abatement had already occurred. There were also framers onsite and a building permit had been obtained.

Mr. Deane moved to GRANT a 6-month extension until August 2017. Mr. Palu seconded the motion.

AYES: Bexten, Deane, Palu, Standerford, Lang  
ABSTAIN: Reimer  
MOTION CARRIED: 5-0-1

ADJOURNMENT:

It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn the meeting at 2:24 p.m.