Mr. James Lang called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

I. Roll Call

Steven Andersen  
Jeffrey Ehler  
James Lang  
Jay Palu, Vice-Chair  
Gerald Reimer  
Jerry Standerford

Others Present:  
Anna Bespoyasny, Assistant Director Planning Department  
Scott Lane, Chief Housing Inspector  
Jennifer Taylor, City Law  
Dillon Shearer, Housing Inspector  
Todd Shearer, Housing Inspector  
Kevin Mulcahy, Housing Inspector  
Steve Andersen, Housing Inspector  
Timothy Kerkhove, City Planner  
Wade Pease, Housing Inspector  
Autumn Drickey, Board Secretary

II. Approval of Minutes: Approval of January 9, 2020 minutes.

Motion by Mr. Steven Andersen to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2020 meeting. Second by Mr. Jeffrey Ehler.

AYES: Andersen, Ehler, Palu, Reimer, Standerford  
ABSTAIN: Lang

Motion carried: 5-0-1, Approved
III. Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 19-02 <em>Layover from 2/7/19, 3/7/19, 5/2/19, and 8/1/19</em></th>
<th>LOCATION: 2400 N 34 Ave</th>
<th>APPEAL: Notices dated beginning 9/26/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB Realty LLC</td>
<td>2400 N 34 Ave #24</td>
<td>Omaha, NE 68111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 6, 2020, Robert Sherrets and Kay Anderson appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Dillon Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer summarized the case stating that there are now three buildings remaining with ten having been completed. He gave his updated recommendation. He stated that the applicant has been in communication and has done everything that the City has asked.

Mr. Anderson explained that the remaining buildings are the larger buildings in the complex and while they hope to have those buildings complete before needing to return, but that he would prefer to be cautious in the requirement of what needs to be completed before coming back. Mr. Lang asked if the City’s recommendation was acceptable. Mr. Anderson confirmed.

Mr. Gerald Reimer restated what he is hearing and asking the board what measurables to require. He asked if what Mr. Anderson was asking of the board. Mr. Anderson stated he thought the recommendation was to be complete in six months. Mr. Reimer detailed the difference between an extension and a layover. He offered questions of the board. Mr. Scott Lane explained the reason for the layover request, that they were not giving specific measurables because of the work that had been completed previously.

Motion by Mr. Andersen to grant a six (6) month layover. Second by Mr. Reimer.

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 6, 2020, Brooke Geiger appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Dillon Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer detailed the communication between himself and the applicant and his recommendation. Ms. Geiger stated that they have made excellent progress since the last time they were before this board. She detailed where they are in the process and the contractors that have been selected. She stated she believes they will be done in three months.

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

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 6, 2020, James Madison appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Todd Shearer appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Shearer summarized the case history and the amount of work that was completed. He stated that there was a permit approved Monday. He detailed that there was work done without inspections. He stated that there were three contractors who have pulled permits. He detailed that there is still debris on the property. He gave his recommendation of a three month extension.

Mr. Madison stated he has been out of town and was told by the tenants that the debris had been cleaned. He detailed there was an inspection this morning. Mr. Shearer stated he did not see an inspection completed at noon. Mr. Reimer asked if tenants are living there. Mr. Madison confirmed and detailed their means of egress. He detailed permits that were pulled and the hold up. Mr. Reimer gave suggestions for the contractor to board up the front door. Mr. Madison stated that he believed they could be done in three months. Mr. Reimer stated that he hesitates because not everything has been kept up on since the last meeting.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to approve a three (3) month extension with the condition that he keeps the trash picked up and the appropriate safety barriers are put up during times of construction to protect the existing residents. Second by Mr. Jay Palu.

Mr. Palu made a comment about the snow not being shoveled and the street view of it not being safe and secure. Mr. Reimer asked if the tenant is responsible for the snow. Mr. Madison confirmed. Mr. Reimer encouraged him to encourage they keep up on it or take care of it.

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 6, 2020, Shawn Ilg appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Kevin Mulcahy appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Mulcahy summarized the history of the case and the communication. He stated he was given new information today. He revised his recommendation of a two month extension to a three month extension. He presented pictures from today to the board, Exhibits 2-5. Mr. Reimer asked about the wrap around porch being under violation. Mr. Mulcahy confirmed.

Mr. Reimer asked how the applicant felt about a two month extension. Mr. Ilg confirmed that it could be completed and that they would need until April 2020 to get the work completed. Mr. Reimer asked about financing. Mr. Ilg confirmed it is in place. Mr. Palu asked if it is occupied. Mr. Ilg confirmed. Mr. Palu offered the same advice about keeping things safe and secure. Mr. Reimer asked about the means of egress. Mr. Ilg detailed the issues with the tenant. Mr. Reimer gave feedback about the entrance that could be a safety hazard and wanting to ensure the safety of the property. Mr. Ilg stated they would address it.

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

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 6, 2020, David Zimmerman appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Steve Andersen appeared on behalf of the City.

Mr. Andersen summarized the history of the case and the fire that occurred. He detailed the communication. He detailed the permits that have been pulled and work that has been done. He explained what has been communicated with him about discussions with the insurance company. He stated he has worked with this owner and property manager on another fire and it took a year, but everything was repaired properly at that time. He gave his recommendation of a four month layover.

Mr. Reimer asked about the insurance issue. Mr. Zimmerman detailed the bids that the insurance company got and the difference in the bid amount, but that he is in process of hiring an attorney and a third party adjuster. Mr. Standerford asked where they are at on the work. Mr. Zimmerman stated the owner was inclined to put a roof on to prevent other damage, but there is other work that needs to wait for the funding from the insurance company. Mr. Reimer asked about occupancy. Mr. Zimmerman detailed the occupancy. Mr. Reimer asked about means of egress. Mr. Zimmerman detailed. Mr. Palu asked about the heating to the occupied units and the water damage. Mr. Zimmerman detailed what has been put in place.

Mr. Reimer asked about occupancy. Mr. Palu asked if an inspector has been through the units. Mr. Andersen stated that he may not have been in every unit, but was not able to get into the lower units.

Mr. Palu asked about the City’s recommendation to allow the occupancy of the other units. Mr. Andersen detailed access and him being comfortable with continuing to allow occupancy. Mr. Andersen, board member, asked about total units and occupancy. Mr. Zimmerman responded. Mr. Palu voiced concern about a half occupied building with water damage and fire damage and how that impacts residents. He stated he would want the City to thoroughly inspect the entire building. Mr. Zimmerman stated he would be good for that. There is discussion about what could be required in a layover. Mr. Ehler asked what the recommendation would be. Mr. Lane detailed their thinking of a four month layover due to insurance and past experience. There is discussion about the timeline. Mr. Palu stated that he would prefer that any units that are occupied and adjacent to be inspected.

Mr. Lane asked if they have received any complaints from any tenants. Mr. Zimmerman detailed that there have been comments of it having a musty smell by an Airbnb unit. Mr. Lane stated they have received no other complaints. Mr. Reimer detailed where Mr. Palu’s concern is coming from as far as the water from the fire department given there is most likely no sprinkler system. Mr. Zimmerman stated that a licensed electrician installed the heaters.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to approve a four (4) month layover based on the condition that they give the City access to ensure the safety of the occupied units. Second by Mr. Andersen.

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved
At the Property Maintenance Appeals Board meeting held on February 6, 2020, Tita Rivera de Menjivar appeared before the Board in regards to the request at the above address. Wade Pease appeared on behalf of the City. Timothy Kerkhove acted as an interpreter.

Mr. Pease detailed the case history and communication with the applicant. He stated he recommends a thirty (30) day layover to see what is and is not completed. He detailed permits that still need to be pulled and work that needs to be inspected.

Mr. Reimer asked who owns the property. Ms. Rivera stated that she owns it. Mr. Reimer asked if it is in a business name or in the applicant’s name. Ms. Rivera stated that she has the ownership. Mr. Reimer asked if all plumbing permits would need to be pulled if there is work done by a homeowner. Mr. Pease stated that he thought that any plumbing work would need to be permitted. Mr. Reimer asked what plumbing work was done. Mr. Pease stated that it was the PVC piping in the basement. He stated that he withdraws his concern as that work needs a permit.

Mr. Standerford asked about what was originally written up and if that list would increase. Mr. Pease stated that he would not add to the original list of violations. There is discussion about what was written up originally.

Mr. Reimer asked if she is prepared to get a licensed plumber. Ms. Rivera stated that she used Southside Plumbing and they gave her an invoice for the work. Mr. Reimer stated that the invoice was for $344. He asked what was needed to be complete. Mr. Lane stated that since there is an invoice from a plumber, this does give her more leverage. Mr. Standerford asked if the property is occupied. Mr. Pease stated that one side of the duplex is and the basement is continuous, but he has a lock out so there is no heat. He stated this is the first day she’s been to the office. Mr. Palu asked for a general statement from the owner.

Mr. Kerkhove detailed what Ms. Rivera told him. He stated she thought the work was completed. He asked if they would be able to pull the permit for the work still. This was confirmed. She asked about the electrical work, the lighting. Mr. Pease answered what work could be done without a permit. Mr. Andersen asked what the scope was for the plumbing invoice. Mr. Lane stated they would get a copy after.

Motion by Mr. Reimer to approve a thirty (30) day layover to give the City and the applicant time to come back to the board with plan and a recommendation. Second by Mr. Andersen.

Mr. Palu stated he would still want to hear from Ms. Rivera. He summarized what to do moving forward.

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Approved

IV. Adjournment

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

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

Motion carried: 6-0, Adjourned at 2:16 p.m.