

CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD

Wednesday, January 4, 2023 at 10:00 a.m.

Intracoastal Room

Palm Coast City Hall

160 Lake Avenue, Palm Coast, Florida

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Norman Mugford, Dean Roberts, Vincent Sullivan, Andrew Dodzik,

Geraldine Wright, Gennaro Arcamone

BOARD MEMBERS EXCUSED: Larry Pulos

BOARD COUNSEL PRESENT: J. Giffin Chumley

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Code Enforcement Manager Grossman, Code Compliance Supervisor

Mendez, Code Enforcement Lead Officer Romeo, Code Enforcement Officers Reilly, Lott, Nunez, MacDonald, Risch, Olivarria, Code

Enforcement Clerk Filipe, City Counsel Jennifer Nix

A. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance.

The meeting was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Mr. Mugford, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum.

Roll was called. A quorum was met with six (6) members present.

C. Approval of the December 7, 2022 Meeting Minutes

The Minutes were unanimously approved.

D. Disclosure of Ex-Parte Communications.

None.

E. Swearing in of Respondents and Staff

The respondents and staff who were present were sworn in by J. Giffin Chumley, Counsel for the Code Board.

F. Withdrawn Cases

AI #1 CASE #2021100992 - 6 Wainbush Place

AI #2 CASE #2022041707 – 12 Blyth Place

AI #6 CASE #2022090542 – 836 Belle Terre Parkway

AI #7 CASE #2022090970 – 836 Belle Terre Parkway

AI #8 CASE #2022091152 - 21 Eastwood Drive

AI #11 CASE #2022100667 - 24 Bassett Lane

AI #12 CASE #2022100915 - 32 Boulder Rock Drive

AI #13 CASE #2022100675 – 29 Bressler Lane

AI #15 CASE #2022081343 - 1 Claridge Court South

AI #16 CASE #2022090286 - 37 Cleveland Court

```
AI #19 CASE #2022100783 - 214 Coral Reef Court North
```

AI #21 CASE #2022101251 – 21 Fernmill Lane

AI #23 CASE #2022080748 - 36 Westford Lane

AI #24 CASE #2022101244 - 185 Westhampton Drive

AI #25 CASE #2022100662 - 23 Westridge Lane

AI #28 CASE #2022100544 - 17 Ranwood Lane

AI #32 CASE #2022100532 - 26 Riverdale Lane

AI #33 CASE #2022100527 - 8 Riverside Lane

AI #34 CASE #2022060518 - 24 Royal Palm Lane

AI #53 CASE #2022091061 – 225 Cypress Edge Drive

AI #57 CASE #2022090812 – 9 Plateau Place (B)

F. Continued Cases:

AI #9 CASE #2022091243 - 10 Laguna Forest Trail

AI #18 CASE #2022081398 - 41 Club House Drive

AI #43 CASE #2022100374 - 22 Sea Serpent Trail East

AI #44 CASE #2022100376 - 22 Sea Serpent Trail East

AI #59 CASE #2022081914 - 12 Puritan Lane

1. AI# 58

City of Palm Coast vs. Nikolai & Olga Lagountchik-Lagunchik

24 Poplar Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Lead Officer Romeo presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Lead Officer Romeo testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. James Smith, tenant, and Olga Lagunchik, Respondent, presented their side.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

2. AI# 31

CASE NO. 2022081448

City of Palm Coast vs. Nathan Alan Prince

26 Riverdale Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(d)(2) Parking Boat/Trailer/RV)

Code Enforcement Officer Reilly presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Reilly testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs. Nathan Prince, Respondent and Ariel Curtis, occupant, presented their side.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that the Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent correct the violation no later than thirty (30) days after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$50.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforestated date. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

3. AI# 17

CASE NO. 2022070095 RL

City of Palm Coast vs. Timothy & Kimmy T Doan

12 Cloverdale Court South

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(g) Shed/Fence/Wall Maint.)

Code Enforcement Officer Lott presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Lott testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs. Timothy Doan, Respondent presented his side.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that the Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent correct the violation no later than thirty (30) days after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$50.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforestated date. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

4. AI# 46

CASE NO. 2022101094 RECURRING (3) AN

City of Palm Coast vs. Rubesh Paulraj

9 Second Path

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. Cyd Weeks, property manager and Ashley Moore, tenant, presented their side.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

5. AI# 4

CASE NO. 2022100505 RECURRING (3) BMD
City of Palm Coast vs. Carter D & Delores I Kelley Trustees
44 Bunker View Drive (A)
(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(f) Improper Parking)

Code Enforcement Officer MacDonald presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer MacDonald testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. Raenell Wilkison, property manager, presented her side.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

6. AI# 39

CASE NO. 2022061723 RECURRING (1) AN

City of Palm Coast vs. Adelino S & Candida A Dos Santos

35 Pine Hill Lane (B)

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. Gina DosSantos, daughter of Respondent, presented her side.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

7. AI# 10

CASE NO. 2022101059 RECURRING (3) HO

City of Palm Coast vs. William R & Amy M Olszowka

3 Barley Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(f) Improper Parking)

Code Enforcement Officer Olivarria presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Olivarria testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. William Olszowka, Respondent, presented his side.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

8. AI# 51

CASE NO. 2022100264 RECURRING (2) AN City of Palm Coast vs. Alan & Lisa Howell

79 Utica Path

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(i) Parking in Median)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. Lisa Howell, Respondent, presented her side.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

9. AI# 40

CASE NO. 2022070938 RECURRING (1) AN

City of Palm Coast vs. Bozena Kajewska-Pielarz

21 Raleigh Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Nunez testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs. Bozena Pielarz, Respondent, presented her side.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent correct the violation no later than one (1) day after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$50.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforestated date. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

10. AI# 50

CASE NO. 2022070045

City of Palm Coast vs. Rosa Worsley Christian

6 Squire Court

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order and Administrative Costs. Latasha Christian, occupant, presented her side.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation is now corrected; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

11. AI# 22

CASE NO. 2022100622 RECURRING (3) CR

City of Palm Coast vs. Jacqueline I & Robert E Arnold

7 Fifer Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Officer Risch presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Risch testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs. Robert Arnold, Respondent, presented his side.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

12. AI# 14

CASE NO. 2022051129 MASSEY HO

City of Palm Coast vs. Christina Rose Fredricks

30 Brice Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 35-76(d)(2)f. Nuisance - Stagnant Pool)

Code Enforcement Officer Olivarria presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Olivarria testified this is a Massey case and the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs. Christina Fredricks, Respondent, presented her side and testified the property is in compliance.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Board in the Board's Order entered into evidence in this case; that Respondent has not brought the property into compliance; that a \$250.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance from October 18, 2022 to January 3, 2023; totaling \$19,500.00; that the \$250.00 per day fine will be placed on hold for five (5) days to check for compliance. If after five (5) days the property is not in compliance, the fine shall continue to run until the property is brought into compliance and an Affidavit of Compliance has been filed by the Code Enforcement Officer. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. When Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

13. AI# 38

CASE NO. 2022061725 REPEAT (4) AN
City of Palm Coast vs. Kurt Lawrence
24 Pine Hill Lane
(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The evidence was shown to the Respondent. Officer Nunez testified this is a Repeat case and the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs. Kurt Lawrence, Respondent, presented his side.

Mr. Arcamone moved to find in this case that Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that the Respondent has not brought the property into compliance as of December 21, 2022; that a \$450.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance between June 24, 2022 and December 21, 2022; totaling \$6,300.00; that a fine of \$450.00 per day shall continue to run until the property is brought into compliance and an Affidavit of Compliance has been filed by the Code Enforcement Officer. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$71.00. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes

Mr. Arcamone - Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

14. AI# 3

City of Palm Coast vs. Lucio R & Nelly A Robayo

241 Birchwood Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(d) Weeds/Overgrowth)

Code Enforcement Officer MacDonald presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer MacDonald testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

15. AI# 5*

CASE NO. 2022100201 BMD

City of Palm Coast vs. Sfr Owner LLC

38 Buttermill Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(d) Weeds/Overgrowth)

Code Enforcement Officer MacDonald presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer MacDonald testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation is now corrected; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

16. AI# 20

CASE NO. 2022100784 REPEAT (1) RL

City of Palm Coast vs. Virgilio & Rose Pereira

214 Coral Reef Court North

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Officer Lott presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Lott testified this is a Repeat case and the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on December 1, 2022; that a \$100.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance on October 13, 2022 and October 20, 2022; totaling \$200.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

17. AI# 26*

City of Palm Coast vs. Acl Realty LLC

67 Westrobin Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-114 Rubbish and Garbage)

Code Enforcement Officer Risch presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Risch testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Sullivan moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement

Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes Mr. Mugford - Yes

Ms. Wright – Yes Mr. Roberts – Not present Mr. Dodzik – Yes Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

18. AI# 27*

CASE NO. 2022100905 REPEAT (1) CR

City of Palm Coast vs. Acl Realty LLC

67 Westrobin Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 24-76(d)(2) No Silt Screen)

Code Enforcement Officer Risch presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Risch testified this is a Repeat case and the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on December 2, 2022; that a \$150.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance from October 14, 2022 to December 1, 2022; totaling \$7,350.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. Ms. Wright seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

19. AI# 29

City of Palm Coast vs. Daniel Lusinski

22 Renn Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Officer Risch presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Risch testified this is a Repeat case and the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on September 12, 2022; that a \$100.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance on September 11, 2022; totaling \$100.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

20. AI# 30

CASE NO. 2022090487 RECURRING (3) DR

City of Palm Coast vs. Annete L Lumpkins

7 Richland Place

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(h) Inoperable Vehicle

Code Enforcement Officer Reilly presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Reilly testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that the Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent correct the violation no later than three (3) days after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event the Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$50.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforementioned date; that the Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

21. AI# 35

CASE NO. 2022081885 RECURRING (1) DR

City of Palm Coast vs. Alexander E Smith

14 Ryecroft Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 35-76(d)(2) Nuisance - Broken Elements)

Code Enforcement Officer Reilly presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Reilly testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Arcamone moved to find in this case that Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent correct the violation no later than five (5) days after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$50.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforestated date; that respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

22. AI# 36

CASE NO. 2022090576 REPEAT (1) DR

City of Palm Coast vs. Christopher A & Carolyn E Loveman & Austin H Moore 80 Rymshaw Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Officer Reilly presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Reilly testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Sullivan moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on September 14, 2022; that a \$100.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance on September 13, 2022; totaling \$100.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes

Mr. Dodzik – Yes

Mr. Arcamone - Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

23. AI# 37*

CASE NO. 2022100444

City of Palm Coast vs. Endrju Tabaku & Catherine Sinishtaj

33 Eagle Harbor Trail

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation is now corrected; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Sullivan seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

24. AI# 41

CASE NO. 2022071188 RECURRING (1) AN

City of Palm Coast vs. Jeramy Nichols

45 Reidsville Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

25. AI# 42

CASE NO. 2022061729 RECURRING (2) AN

City of Palm Coast vs. Sct Holdings LLC & V3 Ventures LLC

14 Sea Flower Path

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(c) Parking of Commercial Veh./ Trailer in Residential District)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Fine Standing Order – Recurring Violation and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Sullivan moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation was corrected; that the violation recurred; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

26. AI# 45

CASE NO. 2022070179 REPEAT (8) AN City of Palm Coast vs. Joseph G & Christal Casanova 53 Seattle Trail (Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(i) Parking in Median)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on July 11, 2022; that a \$1,450.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance on July 5, 2022; totaling \$1,450.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$73.00. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

27. AI# 47

CASE NO. 2022070044

AN

City of Palm Coast vs. V3 Ventures LLC & Sct Holdings LLC

8 Seward Trail East

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that the Respondent correct the violation no later than one (1) day after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$50.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforestated date. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Roberts - Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

28. AI# 48

CASE NO. 2022070826

AN

City of Palm Coast vs. John H Smith & Rabeth Nescio

26 Seward Trail East

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a No Find Standing Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in violation of the City Code as charged and failed to correct the violation by the time specified for correction by the Code Enforcement Officer; that the violation is now corrected; that any violation of the same Code by Respondent within five (5) years of the date of the Order shall be treated as a repeat violation as defined by State Law for which a fine of up to \$5,000.00 per day may be imposed. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$53.50. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

29. AI# 49

CASE NO. 2022070816 REPEAT (2) AN
City of Palm Coast vs. Erika L Clark & Coleman L Robinson
68 Smith Trail
(Palm Coast Code Section 44-33(b) Parking in Swale Between 1 AM & 6 AM)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the this is a Repeat case and the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on July 29, 2022; that a \$150.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance on July 15, 2022 and July 21, 2022; totaling \$300.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$70.00. Mr. Arcamone seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

30. AI# 52

CASE NO. 2022090856 REPEAT (1) BR

City of Palm Coast vs. Ck Properties of Naples LLC

185 Cypress Edge Drive

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(d) Weeds/Overgrowth)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified this is a Repeat case and the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent has not brought the property into compliance as of January 3, 2023; that a fine of \$50.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance from September 16, 2022 until January 3, 2023; totaling \$5,500.00 and that a fine of \$50.00 per day shall continue to run until the property is brought into compliance and an Affidavit of Compliance has been filed by the Code Enforcement Officer. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. Mr. Dodzik seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

31. AI# 54

CASE NO. 2022100821 REPEAT (1) BR

City of Palm Coast vs. Laurie & Ernest Mikos

23 Pickcane Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 44-34(f) Improper Parking)

Code Enforcement Lead Officer Romeo presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Lead Officer Romeo testified this is a Repeat case and the property is in compliance. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Dodzik moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent brought the property into compliance on October 15, 2022; that a \$100.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance from October 13, 2022 to October 14, 2022; totaling \$200.00. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.50. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

32. AI# 55

CASE NO. 2022100817 REPEAT (3) BR

City of Palm Coast vs. Fred Wohlfarth

22 Pillory Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(d) Weeds/Overgrowth)

Code Enforcement Lead Officer Romeo presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Lead Officer Romeo testified this is a Repeat case and the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Roberts moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent has not brought the property into compliance as of January 3, 2023; that a fine of \$200.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance from October 13, 2022 until January 3, 2023; totaling \$16,600.00 and that a fine of \$200.00 per day shall continue to run until the property is brought into compliance and an Affidavit of Compliance has been filed by the Code Enforcement Officer. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$70.50. Ms. Wright seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

33. AI# 56

City of Palm Coast vs. Fred Wohlfarth

22 Pillory Lane

(Palm Coast Code Section 35-76(d)(2) Nuisance-Accumulations)

Code Enforcement Lead Officer Romeo presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Lead Officer Romeo testified this is a Repeat case and the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a fine for the period of non-compliance and Administrative Costs.

Ms. Wright moved to find in this case that the Respondent was in repeat violation of City Code as charged based on the Board's prior Order entered against the same Respondent for the same violation; that Respondent has not brought the property into compliance as of January 3, 2023; that a fine of \$100.00 per day fine is imposed for the period of non-compliance from October 13, 2022 until January 3, 2023; totaling \$8,300.00 and that a fine of \$100.00 per day shall continue to run until the property is brought into compliance and an Affidavit of Compliance has been filed by the Code Enforcement Officer. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$70.00. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – YesMr. Mugford - YesMs. Wright – YesMr. Roberts - YesMr. Dodzik – YesMr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

34. AI# 60

CASE NO. 2022030567

City of Palm Coast vs. Daleko Group LLC
91 Sea Trail
(Palm Coast Code Section 15-108(g) Shed/Fence/Wall Maint.)

Code Enforcement Officer Nunez presented case history, paperwork and photos into evidence. The Respondent was not present. Officer Nunez testified the property remains in violation. Staff recommends a Fine – Violation Order and Administrative Costs.

Mr. Sullivan moved to find in this case that the Respondent is in violation of City Code as charged; that Respondent correct the violation no later than three (3) days after this Order is entered in writing; that in the event Respondent does not comply with the Order, a fine in the amount of \$25.00 will be imposed for each and every day the violation continues past the aforestated date. Respondent is further ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to verify compliance with this Order. Respondent shall pay Administrative Costs to the City in the amount of \$69.00. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Roll was called:

Mr. Sullivan – Yes
Ms. Wright – Yes
Mr. Dodzik – Yes
Mr. Arcamone – Yes

Motion unanimously carried.

OLD BUSINESS:

None to report.

NEW BUSINESS:

None to report.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Code Enforcement Board will be held on February 1, 2023 at 10:00 am.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Yvonne Robinson Yvonne Robinson Secretary to the Board

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk, at 386-986-3709 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting or visit Palm Coast City Offices, 160 Lake Avenue, Palm Coast, FL 32164. If any person decides to appeal a decision made by the Code Enforcement Board with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he/she will need a record of the proceedings including all testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. To that end, such person will want to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made. The City of Palm Coast is not responsible for any mechanical failure of recording equipment.

All pagers and cell phones are to remain OFF while the Code Enforcement Board hearing is in session.