Mr. Steven Andersen called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. The roll was called with six (6) members being present. He further informed the public that a notice of the meeting was published in the Daily Record. Mr. Andersen stated that the Nebraska Open Meetings Law was in effect and that a copy was available in the room for review.

I. Roll Call

Steven Andersen
Kim Cowman - Absent
Shawn Deane - Absent
Joseph Dore
Jeffrey Ehler
James Lang - Absent
Jay Palu
Gerald Reimer
Jerry Standerford

Others Present:
Michael Wilwerding, Acting Superintendent of Permits and Inspections
Scott Lane, Chief Housing Inspector
Stacey Hulquist, City Law
Steve Andersen, Housing Inspector
Roger Carroll, Housing Inspector
Yvonne Barna, Housing Inspector
Wade Pease, Housing Inspector
Jesus Perez, Plans Examiner

II. Approval of Minutes: Approval of June 7, 2018 minutes.

Motion by Mr. Jeffrey Ehler to approve the minutes from the June 7, 2018 meeting. Second by Mr. Gerald Reimer.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
III. Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>LOCATION: 4606 N 56 St</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-01 <em>Layover from 01/04/2018</em></td>
<td>APPEAL: Notices dated August 21, 2017 and October 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4506N56, LLC  
Ashley Kuhn  
105 N 21 Ave Suite 100  
Omaha, NE 68131

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, no one appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Steve Andersen appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Andersen stated that the applicant did not show at the original meeting either. He stated the property seems to be secured and fenced off. He showed pictures from today that showed they could do a better job keeping up on the weeds behind the fences. He stated that no inspections have been pulled as of today. Mr. Andersen asked if he has been in touch with the applicant. Mr. Andersen stated that he has not been in contact, neither was the original inspector contacted.

Mr. Scott Lane stated that if permits were pulled or funding secured, an extension would be supported with them not being there. He continued that no permits have been pulled at this time. He stated that he would suggest giving another layover to request their presence at the next meeting.

Motion by Mr. Jerry Standerford to layover for thirty (30) days with the expectation that they are at the next meeting or pull the permits and have proof that they’ve secured the financing. Second by Mr. Reimer.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Layover to August 2, 2018 meeting
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Fernando Gonzalez appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Wade Pease appeared on behalf of the City. Jesus Perez appeared as a City provided translator.

Mr. Pease stated that the case was previously laid over with a lot of work that needed to be done. He stated that in that time three building permits have been pulled, with one being partially approved. He stated that there is only a case on the exterior so in order to release the case is to have electrical service on the outside of the house. He stated there is no current electrical permit. Mr. Andersen asked if there is power to the property. Mr. Fernando Gonzalez stated not yet. He stated the plumber and HVAC are working on the interior and the electrician will begin within a week. Mr. Reimer asked about the possibility of temporary power and how that could release him from this Board. Mr. Gonzalez stated that he was not aware that in getting pre-connected he could be released of the case. Mr. Pease stated that given the work that was done, a temporary power permit being approved would release him. There is discussion about how Mr. Gonzalez could have his case closed with a thirty (30) day extension. Mr. Gonzalez stated the delay was in financing the project. Mr. Reimer stated that they respect the work that was completed and asked if thirty (30) days would be enough time to get the temporary electric set up. Mr. Gonzalez confirmed the electrician would start Friday but it could change.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to approve a sixty (60) day extension. Second by Mr. Standerford.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved sixty (60) day extension.
Mr. Andersen stated that there was a request to lay this over to the August meeting because the applicant is out of town. He stated that the case would be laid over to the August 2, 2018 meeting.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Jesus Villezcas and Irma Villezcas appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Roger Carroll appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Andersen stated that the case was originally laid over due to exterior issues, siding and windows. Mr. Carroll stated that on July 2, 2018 a follow-up inspection was conducted, new siding was up on the north side of the building, a window was missing, there was no cap on the siding, and the photos show a number of places of electrical concerns.

Ms. Villezcas stated that the windows will be delivered on the 18th and the electrical was not completed yet because Mr. Villezcas was out of town. Mr. Villezcas stated that the west side of the siding will be done this week. Mr. Carroll stated what they need to finish. Mr. Villezcas stated they were waiting to finish the cap until the siding was done. Mr. Carroll stated there were two notices of violation, one being the fence. Mr. Villezcas stated that he has taken care of that. Mr. Carroll stated that the fence either needs to be repaired or removed.

Mr. Reimer asked how much time they would need. Mr. Villezcas stated they would need six months to complete financially. Mr. Andersen asked if the electrical panel is on the exterior of the house and if it was on. There is consensus that it is outside but is not hot.

Mr. Carroll stated he supported a six month extension as long as he kept it maintained and secure. Mr. Andersen asked if they live at the property. They stated they do not.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to grant a six (6) month extension as long as the property is kept clean and continue to make progress. Second by Mr. Jay Palu.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved six month extension
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Chris Kriegler appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Yvonne Barna appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Andersen asked if the layover was granted with stipulations. Mr. Kriegler read the minutes from the previous appearance.

Ms. Barna stated that she was at the property July 2nd and it is not being maintained and is open. She stated there was a temporary restraining order (TRO) and court was on the 18th to prevent the demo order. She stated the owner has not changed. She recommends a denial.

Mr. Kriegler stated that they mow the yard, not weekly, and secured the property earlier this week. He reiterated the ownership problem, only owning 1% of the property. Mr. Andersen asked for clarification about the partition. Mr. Kriegler stated that they are in the process of getting sole ownership to get a default judgment except for one party, Vandelay Investments LLC, that owns part of the property.

Mr. Reimer asked if Vandelay, in essence, represents the other 99% of ownership and if they are a professional real estate organization. He stated that they have experience with this type of properties and understand what is expected of them. He asked if it would be fair to infer that they have disregpected the rules and not obliged what they have been expected to do here. Mr. Kriegler confirmed. Mr. Reimer stated that the Board is voting for the 99% owners, not the 1% ownership that has appeared. Mr. Kriegler explained the process to get 100% ownership. Mr. Reimer asked who is fighting the demo order. Mr. Kriegler stated Dismas Land Holdings is, they did that to protect their investment.

Mr. Reimer stated that professional investors such as Vandelay who gain and work the system against their neighbors, he has a problem supporting that. He asked, rhetorically, if the neighborhood is better off with a vacant lot.

Mr. Kriegler stated that the end goal is for them to fix it up or sell it to someone who will instead of demoing the property. Mr. Reimer explained his position. Mr. Palu asked what a denial would impact the property. There is discussion about next steps. There is discussion about the ownership issue.

Motion by Mr. Palu to deny. Second by Mr. Reimer.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Deny
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Dorothy Engler appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Wade appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Pease stated that he started the case in August 2017. He stated that he has been in communication in the last two months and was informed by a contractor this morning that half the violations have been taken care of. Mr. Andersen asked about permits. Mr. Pease stated there have not been any pulled but he told the contractor they need to pull permits for the gutters and the roof will most likely need to be replaced. Ms. Engler stated that the roof does not leak. Mr. Pease stated that based on how the roof looks it will most likely not be passed by a building inspector.

Ms. Engler stated her husband is sick and they can’t afford many updates. Mr. Reimer asked if the home is vacant. Mr. Pease stated that there is a tenant there. He reiterated that the initial complaint was exterior. Mr. Reimer asked how long she would need to complete the work. Ms. Engler asked if the contractor gave Mr. Pease an idea of how long it would take to complete. Mr. Pease summarized the discussion with the contractor. Mr. Reimer asked if they have the money to replace the roof if that ends up being required. Mr. Andersen asked if it was a situation where insurance could help. Ms. Engler stated a previous tenant thought he could make repairs that have cost them in the long run. She stated that the current tenant stated the roof is not leaking. Mr. Andersen stated that they have no choice to get the roof fixed if the Permits and Inspections departments finds the roof deficient. Ms. Engler asked how it could be considered deficient if it isn’t leaking.

Mr. Reimer clarified the recommendation. Mr. Andersen stated that they have to be receptive to correcting the roof. Mr. Reimer clarified the objective and asked if they are committed to make the necessary repairs that the city asks for. He asked if ninety days would be enough time to complete the work. Ms. Engler stated she doesn’t think so. Mr. Pease gave her a suggestion for how to get the roof fixed and how the case would be taken off as well as the permits that would be required. Ms. Engler stated the porch is painted. Mr. Pease stated that the contractor stated that most of the violations have been taken care of, including the porch. He stated that Ms. Engler had a difficult time getting a contractor.

Motion by Mr. Palu to grant a ninety (90) day extension. Second by Mr. Reimer

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved ninety (90) day extension.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Eulalia Esteban and Victor Ramos (did not sign in) appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Wade Pease appeared on behalf of the City. Jesus Perez appeared as a City provided translator.

Mr. Pease stated that the case was started July 11, 2017, moderate repairs have been done. He stated that after established communication that repairs have been made including a deck permit. He stated the rest of the work that needs to be done is painting as well as the deck being finished. He stated that a furnace was installed by a contractor at Home Depot who did not pull a permit. He stated the inside needed to be cleaned from smoke damage. Mr. Ramos stated that the inside has been cleaned.

Mr. Reimer asked how much time Mr. Ramos needed to make the repairs. Mr. Ramos stated that he would need ninety (90) days to complete the repairs on the deck and get the contractor to pull the permit and finalize the inspections. Mr. Reimer stated they appreciate that he is updating the property and communicating with the inspector and they feel like his intention is to do the right thing.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to grant a ninety (90) day extension. Second by Mr. Joseph Dore.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved ninety (90) day extension.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Sharon Green appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Yvonne Barna appeared on behalf of the City.

Ms. Barna stated that she has worked with Ms. Green since she moved back from California about a month ago. She stated that Ms. Green has gone in and cleaned out the house and is aware of what she needs to do. She stated that given that she would recommend a sixty (60) day extension. Ms. Green stated that she would like a three to six month extension.

Ms. Green stated that she was grieving for the loss of a family member she was taking care of. She stated that the taxes have been paid ever since, she stated she has someone keep the exterior up-to-date and Dave Electric has been out for the electrical. She stated that MUD has been out and she has a plumber on board. She stated that she has a person for the foundation starting soon. She stated that given it was vacant, she is aware of what she needs to do to keep it up and is requesting additional time to get everything taken care of, but she wants the best person. She stated she has a new roof and new windows on the home.

Mr. Reimer wanted to clarify how long she’s requesting to get everything taken care of. Ms. Green stated three to six months because of all the people who have to come in to fix the house. Mr. Reimer asked if the City would support six months. Ms. Barna stated that the exterior is the only thing written up, so once those items are taken care of, the case is finished. Mr. Reimer asked if she understands what the City of Omaha is recommending. Ms. Green stated that she understands and the code violation situation causes additional stress. Mr. Reimer restated that if the exterior is prioritized then the code inspector would no longer be involved. Mr. Wilwerding suggested keeping the windows boarded up until the final day for the inspection to avoid having the windows broken again, get the exterior cleared through Housing Enforcement and then work on the interior on her how time.

Motion by Mr. Ehler to approve a three (3) month extension. Second by Mr. Reimer.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved three (3) month extension.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Nicole Johnson appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Yvonne Barna appeared on behalf of the City.

Ms. Barna stated that she’s been working with the owner who bought it with the intention of flipping it and now intends to live there. Ms. Johnson stated that she will be living at the property. Ms. Barna stated it has been gutted and the exterior has had updates to the exterior. She would recommend a ninety (90) day extension with the understanding that the exterior would be completed and Ms. Johnson could come to her to get more time on the interior. Mr. Andersen asked if ninety (90) days would be enough to get the exterior done. Ms. Johnson stated that she has focused on the interior instead of the exterior.

Ms. Johnson explained that she did not understand how quickly she needed to get the home up to code. She restated the items that she has completed on the home. She stated that she is currently collecting bids on the electric and explained her process to be able to get that financed. She hopes to have the home completed in six months. Ms. Barna stated that a building inspector has been out to make sure everything is done per code. Ms. Johnson stated that she is doing things herself. Mr. Reimer asked what the city thought of a six (6) month extension. Ms. Barna stated she would want the exterior completed before the winter. Ms. Johnson stated she could get the exterior done.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to approve a ninety (90) day extension. Second by Mr. Standerford.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, John C. Chatelain and Josh Scott appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Yvonne Barna appeared on behalf of the City.

Ms. Barna stated that she communicated with the applicant and his attorney in the hall about the zoning issues that were raised based on his comments on the application. She stated that the porch is very dangerous and that Mr. Chatelain would get his client to consult an engineer. She stated that ninety days would be her recommendation.

Mr. Chatelain stated that Mr. Scott has agreed to get an engineer involved in regards to the porch. He stated that Mr. Scott was not trying to change the zoning, he bought the house as a storage unit and intends to change it to a rental house. He stated that Mr. Scott would request a one hundred twenty day extension. Mr. Andersen asked how long Mr. Scott has owned the property. Mr. Scott stated he wasn’t too sure. Mr. Andersen asked about a 2015 case and if this was tied to it. Ms. Barna stated this is a new notice.

Mr. Reimer asked Mr. Wilwerding about the need to have a Certificate of Occupancy because the change of use. Mr. Wilwerding stated that since commercial uses are not allowed in residential areas it never would have had a Certificate of Occupancy for commercial use.

Mr. Ehler asked how long they would are requesting. Ms. Barna asked about exterior being clean. Mr. Andersen stated he doesn’t think the porch should wait one hundred twenty days. Mr. Ehler asked what was put on the porch. Mr. Scott stated that the neighbors like to throw things on the porch. There is discussion about other stipulations and if other complaints were received what would happen. Mr. Chatelain stated he suggested to Ms. Barna that a structural engineer be brought in for the porch and the roof and then Mr. Scott and Ms. Barna get together to discuss what work would need to be done. Mr. Andersen asked about needing a safety fence put up. Ms. Barna stated she thinks we’re ok for the time being.

Motion by Mr. Ehler to grant a one hundred twenty (120) day extension with stipulation that exterior is kept clean and maintained. Second by Mr. Standerford.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Standerford
NAYES: Reimer

Motion carried: 5-1, Approved for one hundred twenty (120) day extension.
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on July 12, 2018, Allen Cabrera and Maria Alcala appeared before the Board in regards to the request. Roger Carroll appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Carroll summarized the violations. He stated the repairs that have been made. Mr. Cabrera stated his intention is to renovate the property and put it on the market. He stated that it has been difficult to complete the work because of the list of violations and living six hours away. He stated that the property has new windows, the siding has been removed, and the termite damage has been repaired. He has been in touch with a building contractor to replace the roof and siding. He is requesting a six month extension. He is contacting plumbers and HVAC contractors about this property. He explained the exterior is a priority. Mr. Carroll stated that he would support a six month extension as long as Mr. Cabrera keeps in contact with him and pulls appropriate permits and has those inspections completed.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to approve a six (6) month extension. Second by Mr. Palu.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved for six (6) month extension.

IV. Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Dore to adjourn. Second by Mr. Reimer.

AYES: Andersen, Dore, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 6-0, Adjourned at 2:43 p.m.