Mr. Steven Andersen called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m.

I. Roll Call

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

Others Present:
Anna Bespoyasny, Superintendent of the Permits and Inspections Division
Scott Lane, Chief Housing Inspector
Mike Wilwerding, Chief Building Inspector
Jennifer Taylor, City Attorney
Autumn Drickey, Board Secretary
Wade Pease, Housing Inspector
Roger Carroll, Housing Inspector
Kevin Mulcahy, Housing Inspector

II. Approval of Minutes: Approval of August 1, 2019 minutes.

Motion by Mr. Gerald Reimer to approve the minutes from the August 1, 2019 meeting. Second by Mr. Jeffrey Ehler.

AYES: Andersen, Cowman, Ehler, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 5-0, Approved
III. Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17-51 <em>Layover from 6/1/17, 12/7/17, 6/7/18, and 3/7/19</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incommon Properties, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1340 Park Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha, NE 68105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1040 S 29 St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPEAL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice dated 6/27/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on September 5, 2019, Christian Gray appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Wade Pease appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Pease summarized the history of the case for the record. He stated that he has received word that funding has been approved for the project with an estimated start time of January 2020. He explained the communication that has taken place as well as inspections. He recommends a one year extension due to the size of the project.

Mr. Gray summarized the approval of funds and detailed the timeline of the project completion. Mr. Andersen asked about the project being worked on. Mr. Gray confirmed that it will be both buildings at once. Mr. Pease asked what Code Enforcement's role would be if permits were pulled. Mr. Reimer asked that since this is a major renovation project and once permits are pulled, remediing the violations, would that be a way to close a case. Mr. Mike Wilwerding stated that typically on a case like this that would be true, but sometimes permits are pulled and no work is done. Mr. Pease stated that his thought would be once the rough in inspection has been completed, then it would be done. Mr. Andersen asked about the process. Mr. Scott Lane agrees that he believes that would be his thought. Mr. Reimer expressed a waste of resources to have there be multiple inspections by different divisions.

Mr. Jerry Standerford asked about what the motion would be. Ms. Kim Cowman asked if that clarification would be necessary. Mr. Andersen stated that would make sense. Mr. Reimer expressed thoughts on having cases unresolved and having a measurable resolution to remedy the violations. He expressed a desire to have a measurable to close the case as soon as possible while still having accountability.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to grant a one (1) year extension on condition they start construction and have rough-in inspection within that timeline. Second by Ms. Cowman.

AYES: Andersen, Cowman, Ehler, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 5-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on September 5, 2019, Rigoberto Alvarado appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Wade Pease appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Pease summarized the case. He detailed his previous inspection. He stated there has not been a lot of progress in regards to the last meeting, and that progress is going slowly. His recommendation is to deny.

Mr. Alvarado stated he would like them to reconsider and get an extension because it looks better than it did. Mr. Andersen read the previous motion into the record, asking if those things have taken place. Mr. Pease stated he has had communication with the wife on some minor things. He detailed that the siding has been replaced and had a partial approval from the building inspector.

Mr. Reimer asked if the home is occupied. Mr. Alvarado stated he does not. Mr. Reimer asked if he has money to fix it. Mr. Alvarado stated he does not. Mr. Reimer asked how long he’s owned the property. Mr. Alvarado stated eight years. Mr. Reimer summarized the options the board has and what role the board would have. Mr. Lane stated this property was previously on a demolition list and it will most likely find its way back to that list. Mr. Andersen asked if he has a timeline of completion. Mr. Alvarado stated he does not have that today.

Mr. Pease stated it will not be on this fall’s demolition list, but it will be on the spring list if significant progress is not made. Mr. Lane clarified it will be on the earliest list possible, possibly sooner than the spring.

Mr. Reimer expressed that Mr. Alvarado should still work on the property even if they deny the request. He expressed the role of the board.

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

AYES: Andersen, Cowman, Ehler, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 5-0, Denied
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on September 5, 2019, David Hengen appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Wade Pease appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Pease summarized the case for the board. He stated that not much work was done on the property initially when the case was opened, but within the last sixty days substantial work has been completed. He summarized the inspections that still need to take place and read an inspection report into the record. Mr. Reimer expressed confusion about the types of permits needed. Mr. Pease explained the permits that have been pulled.

Mr. Andersen stated it looked like a lack of communication and a lot of different factors. Mr. Hengen explained the work that was done and how the retraining wall had to be redone. Mr. Reimer asked if he intends to fix the violations. Mr. Hengen explained that it sounds like the final inspections just need to take place. Mr. Wilwerding stated that it is a siding permit and the inspection could have just been for one part. Mr. Andersen asked if there are still violations. Mr. Pease stated that until the permits are completed the case is open.

Mr. Reimer asked about the process and how the pulling of permits can resolve the code violations, with the most qualified inspector class they have to final the permits pulled, with another inspector to be sent out to check the things that have been closed. Mr. Wilwerding explained that they are often looking at different codes on their inspections. Mr. Lane explained that he understands the confusion, but that this is appropriate. He explains that once permits and inspections are completed, the cases are being closed in Housing Enforcement with communication between that division and other division inspectors that certain aspects were still open for their open cases. Mr. Pease explained why this case still appeared before the board. Mr. Reimer stated he was happy to hear that the process is being streamlined.

Mr. Andersen asked about the timeline. Mr. Hengen stated he wasn’t aware of the inspections until yesterday. He stated he was in touch with the contractors to get things complete.

Mr. Standerford asked what the violations were. Mr. Pease explained stating they are just waiting for the final inspections.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to grant a sixty (60) day extension. Second by Ms. Cowman.

AYES: Andersen, Cowman, Ehler, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 5-0, Approved for a sixty (60) day extension.
19.22
Thomas P McNally
1323 William St
Omaha, NE 68108

LOCATION: 4741 S 19 St
APPEAL: Notice dated 7/18/19

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on September 5, 2019, Patrick McNally and Shirley McNally appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Roger Carroll appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Carroll summarized the history of the case and stated that he has not had communication. He stated that the owner of record, Thomas McNally, is deceased. He stated it is secured and has been mowed by the City.

Mr. McNally stated they are here to appeal the demo order because the list was not clear to the owner. He stated they have a purchase agreement and they want it off the demo list so they can sell it. Mr. Carroll stated that he has been in touch with someone who has a verbal agreement to purchase the home with intents to remedy the code violations.

Mr. Reimer asked if the current owner intends to remedy the code violations. Mr. McNally stated they intend to sell it and have the new owner fix the violations. Mr. Reimer explained the process and the board's options. Mr. McNally stated that the City has an affinity to rip the house down, and fear that may happen before they can sell the house. Mr. Reimer stated he is hearing a hostile tone. Mr. Standerford stated that they could hear this request, possibly. Mr. Carroll stated this property is not on the current demo list. Mr. Reimer stated that this is a moot point because it will not be torn down before the sale goes through. Mr. McNally states that there is a belief that the City could tear the home down before they are able to sell the property. Mr. Reimer expressed his opinion and that he does not see the hurry. He expressed the feeling of hostility.

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

AYES: Andersen, Cowman, Ehler, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 5-0, Denied
IV. Adoption of Rules and Regulations

Ms. Jennifer Taylor presented the rules that were adopted from the Building Board of Review. Mr. Andersen asked if they were written on inception of the board or later. Ms. Taylor explained that it was a mixture. She stated that they are not officially the rules and regulations because they have not been adopted. She stated that she, Mr. Wilwerding, and Mr. Lane would need to get together to finalize. She expressed a need to hear feedback from the board members to be adopted in a following meeting.

Mr. Andersen asked about the rules as they are. Ms. Taylor stated that these have not been adopted. Mr. Andersen asked about some sections proposed, specifically with the City Attorney backing the board.

Mr. Ehler asked about a section on removing tenants and/or demolishing a building. Ms. Taylor stated she believes that it is in accordance with the lawsuit. She explained the process, to her understanding, and how it impacts that section of the proposed rules and regulations. She expressed the desire to avoid those cases going to district court and appearing before this board again.

Mr. Ehler asked about section two and being consistent with the application. Mr. Reimer stated he wouldn’t want that to be on the applicant when there are professionals in house. He expressed a desire to know what the use is. Ms. Taylor expressed that the intent was to get some information about the intent with the property. Mr. Reimer expressed the desire to have that differentiated. Ms. Taylor stated that having more information from the applicant gives the board a better picture of the case. Mr. Reimer asked about including information on occupancy and how long the owner has owned the property.

Mr. Ehler asked about a section about the disposition of the board that could be clarified better. Mr. Andersen asked if the application could have a section where the applicant details what they want from the board. Ms. Taylor stated that the application could be added. She stated they can work to get the application updated.

V. Review Board Policy and Procedures

VI. Discussion

Mr. Reimer expressed an interest in how we are able to report data that the advocacy groups might want. Ms. Taylor stated that the decrees need to be considered as well.

Ms. Erin Feichtinger with Together Omaha, expressed some concerns. She stated that one thing she’s noticed that it would be good to know if the property is occupied. She stated that the types of violations being appealed used to be listed in the minutes. She stated the type of property would be helpful to know, single- or multi-family. She stated that knowing the time from the case coming to this board and where the case is closed is currently long. She summarized her research of the cases that have appeared before this board.

Mr. Reimer asked how many new cases were created this month, how many were closed, what is the average number of days to close the case, that it would be good for the board to know that contextual information.

There is discussion about putting the Accela case number onto the agenda. Mr. Kevin Mulcahy stated that Accela case number is on the case analysis completed by the Housing Inspector and the application.

VII. Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Reimer to adjourn. Second by Ms. Cowman.

AYES: Andersen, Cowman, Ehler, Reimer, Standerford

Motion carried: 5-0, Adjourned at 2:38 p.m.