Pamela Boose
CENB CLERK
PHONE: 270.393.3102
EMAIL: Pamela.Boose@bgky.org

COUNSEL: DAVID BRODERICK

ANTHONY LAPOINTE, CHAIR
BEN BRUNI, CO-CHAIR
JOSE GONZALEZ
JEFF HOLMAN
KENAN MUJKANOVIC

SUSAN OLIVER LEWIS
RACHEL CRAWFORD

CITY OF BOWLING GREEN
F O U N D E D 1 7 9 8

CODE ENFORCEMENT AND NUISANCE BOARD
ADOPTED MINUTES
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
September 22, 2026 @ 4:30 PM CST/5:30 PM EST

CALL TO ORDER – The hearing was called to order at 4:28 PM, CST/5:28 PM EST by Chairperson, Anthony LaPointe.

ROLL CALL - The roll was called for Board members.

MEMBERS PRESENT – Anthony LaPointe, Jose Gonzalez, Jeff Holman, Kenan Mujkanovic, Susan Oliver Lewis

MEMBERS ABSENT – Ben Bruni.

STAFF PRESENT – Brad Schargorodski, Pam Boose, James Heady, Sanja Dudaric

CENB LEGAL COUNSEL – David Broderick

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ***Gonzalez made a motion to approve the minutes.***
LaPointe seconded the motion.
The motion passed with a five votes.

VOTE: Yes – LaPointe, Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – None.

The minutes for August 25, 2026, were approved as written without revisions.

SWEAR IN STAFF – Staff was sworn in.

HEARING AGENDA

- **APPEALS**

Agenda Item 2026-39 Code Compliance
Case #2026-7183, Citation #2026-10996.3
Location: 416 Columbia Way
Owner: Miller & York LLC
Respondent: Walter York & Emily Priddy
Officer: Brad Schargorodski for McKenna Tabor
Citation Fine $106.33
Mowing Fee $130

Officer Schargorodski presented the case.
The case is the result of a proactive inspection conducted on 8/4/2026. A violation of overgrown grass was observed on the property. A courtesy letter was mailed to the PVA-listed property owner and the property in violation. On 8/10/2026, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Officer Tabor was unable to leave a door tag at the property due to a large dog being on the porch, however a Notice of Violation was mailed to the PVA-listed property owner with requested compliance date of 8/17/2026. The property was inspected on 8/21/2026 and remained in violation. A text message was sent to one of the property owners/managers requesting the grass be mowed. The property was inspected on 8/27/2026 and remained in violation. A time extension was given over the weekend in hopes the grass would be mowed at the beginning of the following week. The property was inspected on 8/31/2026 and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed property owner. The grass was over twenty inches in height, so a work order to have a city contractor mow the property was submitted. At the time of the citation, the case was active for 27 days and there have been three other grass cases for the property this year. LaPointe asked if there were citations for the other three cases and Schargorodski replied he did not believe citations were issued for the other three cases, but he could verify that. Holman asked, "is it the responsibility of the property owner?" and Schargorodski responded that statutorily the owner of the property is required to ensure the property is compliant.
The respondent Walter York was sworn in at the podium.
York stated he is one of the owners of the property at 416 Columbia Way. York stated everything Brad said is probably true except the tenant is undergoing eviction. York stated they have a great working relationship with Code Compliance and do a great job. York said they are present to ask for mercy because when evictions are filed it can be difficult dealing with the tenant. Tenants do not allow you onto your own property. They were advised not to bother the tenant until after the court date. Mujkanovic asked if the eviction had been filed and if they had a copy of the notice. York confirmed the eviction has been filed.
Emily Priddy, the property manager, was sworn in at the podium.
Priddy stated the tenant vacated the property and turned in the keys on 8/31/2026, and that was the date they were first notified via certified mail. They weren't aware of the violation and did not get the citations. Priddy was unsure if the citations were lost in the mail and stated they do not let their properties get to this point. Priddy stated she monitors all of this, and they were unaware. They were waiting for the court process to proceed, and the tenant did vacate before the court date. Once the tenant turned in the keys, they immediately had a dumpster placed at the property and saw it was already mowed. Priddy stated they do not allow this to happen and since the tenant left they have cleaned up everything. York added they have a great relationship with Code Compliance and when contacted, they try to get it done immediately. LaPointe asked Broderick if it is typical that an owner is asked to stay off the property and Broderick responded by stating the owner has a right to inspect the property, but the tenant does have a right to be notified 24 to 48 hours in advance. The owner may be told to keep off the property. LaPointe asked if the property was mowed after the tenant vacated and Priddy replied, it all happened at the same time. Priddy stated that when they got the certified mail, the tenant had just turned in the keys and when they did a drive by, the grass was not mowed. The citation was received in the mail and Code Compliance was contacted to stop the city contractor from mowing so the owners could take care of it, but it was already mowed at that point.
Schargorodski stated the city is not subject to the same due process as the property owner regarding an eviction. The city is not an involved party and most times unaware an eviction is taking place. The ordinance allows the city to send a contractor to enter a property and to abate the nuisance regardless of whether the violation is a dangerous/vacant building or for grass and/or weeds. As was stated previously by Priddy, this all occurred the same day if not within hours of the tenant vacating the property. There is nothing in the ordinance that requires Code Compliance to delay abatement unless there is a court order stating no one is allowed on the property. Gonzalez said there was a text message sent on the 21st and asked if that was sent to the owner. Schargorodski stated it was sent to Mr. Miller, one of the partners. Priddy advised she was sent a copy of the text from Miller. Priddy stated everything was overlapping at the same time and going back to the beginning of August, they never received a notice. Priddy said she was not saying the notices weren't sent, just that they never got them and they always respond. Priddy stated they take care of their properties, so they never escalate to this situation.
Oliver Lewis asked Priddy to confirm the property was mowed and Priddy stated it was mowed.

Holman asked if they were under the impression they could not cut the grass due to the eviction process and Priddy stated they were advised by their attorney that if they went onto the property and damaged anything they may be held liable and the tenant had stuff lying in the front yard. Normally the eviction process doesn't take long but this tenant drug her feet, and it took longer to get a court date. Holman asked Priddy if she thought it fair that the city had to mow the yard and Priddy responded no, had they been aware, it would not have happened, but it did and they did try to stop it.

Holman made a motion to uphold the citation and mowing fee and waive the fine.
Gonzalez seconded the motion
The motion passed with three votes.

VOTE: Yes – Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic
No – None.
Abstain – Lapointe, Oliver Lewis

The citation #2026-10996.3 and mowing fee of $130.00 are upheld, the fine of $106.33 is waived.

Agenda Item 2026-40 Code Compliance
Case #2026-7550, Citation #2026-11576.2
Location: 416 Webb Drive
Owner: Miller & York LLC
Respondent: Walter York
Officer: Brad Schargorodski for McKenna Tabor
Citation Fine $106.33
Mowing Fee $65

Officer Schargorodski presented the case.
The case is the result of a proactive inspection conducted on 8/17/2026. A violation of overgrown grass was observed on the property. A courtesy letter was mailed to the PVA-listed owner and the property in violation. The property was inspected on 8/24/2026 and remained in violation. A door tag was posted on the property, and a Notice of Violation was mailed to the PVA-listed owner with a requested compliance date of 8/31/2026. The property was inspected on 9/1/2026 and remained in violation and a citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed property owner. The grass was over two feet tall, so a work order was submitted the same day for a city contractor to mow the grass. LaPointe asked a couple of questions; what is the typical length of time given for compliance, and is this just bad timing? Schargorodski replied the case was open 17 days once cited. The internal city policy staff follows is 5 days following a courtesy letter. If the property is still in violation at that point, a Notice of Violation is issued and another five days is given before the next inspection, so that is ten days. Then a door tag is left for another two days, so there's now a total of twelve days. Both cases for these owners were beyond the twelve days.
The same respondents as the previous case remained at the podium to respond.
Priddy stated this was a similar situation. The tenant was pending eviction, and the court date was the following Tuesday. Priddy stated they did not get the notices, but they did mow the property and said they do not want this to happen again. They own a property next door and normally both are mowed at the same time. LaPointe asked a series of questions; how is this property overgrown but the property you own next door is not, were both properties cited, and is the property next door under eviction as well? Priddy said the property they own is on the other side and is vacant. It was not explained why one property was mowed and the other was not. Holman commented it was surprising there were no neighbor complaints. Priddy stated they have their own mowing crew, and they mow every 7 to 10 days depending on the weather.

Holman made a motion to uphold the citation and mowing fee and waive the fine.
Mujkanovic seconded the motion
The motion passed with three votes.

VOTE: Yes – Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic
No – None.
Abstain – Lapointe, Oliver Lewis

The citation #2026-11576.2 and mowing fee of $65.00 are upheld, the fine of $106.33 is waived.

Agenda Item 2026-41 Code Compliance
Case #2026-7391, Citation #2026-11322.3
Location: 429 Woodford Avenue
Owner: Dawn Marie Owens
Respondent: Ralph A. Porter - ***Video Respondent***
Officer: Brad Schargorodski for McKenna Tabor
Citation Fine $206.33

Officer Schargorodski presented the case.
The case is the result of a proactive inspection conducted on 8/11/2026. During the inspection, the following violations were observed on the property: duty of maintenance of private property, exterior use and storage of indoor furniture, accumulation of rubbish and garbage. A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed property owner. The property was inspected on 8/19/2026 and remained in violation. A citation was issued and posted on the property and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed property owner. There were mattresses, furniture and what appears to be the entire contents of the house piled up in the backyard. The property was inspected on 8/31/2026 and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed property owner. The property was compliant on 9/3/2026 and the case was active for 22 days.
The respondent was in attendance via Lifesize video, and was sworn in.
Porter commented on 7/11/2026 his daughter, owner of the property passed away and they live in Indiana. At the time they were in California on vacation and planned to return so they could travel to Bowling Green. Once in Bowling Green, they contacted the coroner, and the coroner informed them the house was in bad condition. They discovered their daughter had become a hoarder. Several family members assisted with getting the house cleared out. Things progressed quickly and they did not have time to find someone to haul away the trash. There was a pool in the back yard so they decided to place everything in there until they could find someone to clean it up. They had only two days after the cremation to work on the property and then had to return to Indiana. After returning to Indiana, they continued trying to find someone to clean the trash out of the pool. In the interim, someone came onto the property, removed the sides of the pool to take anything of value. They could not return right away but found someone to do the work. They ended up with 2.5 to 3 dumpsters full of junk from the yard and inside the house. The contractor came back to clean out the cellar. The house was finally cleaned out. Porter stated he understood the citation would have to stand but respectfully requested the fine be waived. Gonzalez asked Porter why they did not secure a dumpster for the debris before cleaning out the house and Porter responded by saying they were on a time crunch and did not know the legal aspect. Cleaning out the house and getting it ready to sell was based on the short amount time spent in Bowling Green. Holman asked Schargorodski to confirm the property is now compliant and Schargorodski stated it is.

LaPointe made a motion to uphold the citation and waive the fine.
Oliver Lewis seconded the motion
The motion passed with four votes.

VOTE: Yes – Lapointe, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – Gonzalez.

The citation #2026-11322.3 is upheld, the fine of $206.33 is waived.

Agenda Item 2026-42 Code Compliance
Case #2026-7695, Citation #2026-11858.2
Location: 635 Woodford Avenue
Owners: An & Tracy Nguyen
Respondent: An Nguyen – ***Video Respondent***
Officer: Brad Schargorodski for McKenna Tabor
Citation Fine $1,206.33
Mowing Fee $130.00

Officer Schargorodski presented the case.
The case is the result of a proactive inspection conducted on 8/21/2026. During the inspection, the following violations were observed on the property: tall grass and overgrown weeds. A courtesy letter was sent to the PVA-listed owner and the property in violation. The property was inspected on 8/27/2026 and remained in violation. A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed owner. The property was inspected on 9/2/2026 and remained in violation. A Repeat Offender citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed property owner. Research into property records at the time confirmed the property was owned by an LLC having an address affiliated with Tai Nguyen who was designated as a repeat offender by this Board. Additional research of the business through the Kentucky Secretary of State website confirmed Tai Nguyen is affiliated with the LLC. The average height of the grass on the property was over 25 inches, and a work order was submitted for a city contractor to mow the property. When the citation was issued, the case had been open for 12 days. There have been three other grass cases at this property. As a reminder for the Board regarding a Repeat Offender, the Board designated this person to be a repeat offender for 24 months and all citations for any violation for any property affiliated with this person are $1,200.00 for that period, so long as the person is affiliated with this property through an LLC or otherwise.
An Nguyen was in attendance via Lifesize video, and was sworn in.
Nguyen stated he has a tenant living on the property and they were told to take care of the grass. Nguyen is living in Missouri and did not know anything about it until he got an email, and he told the tenant to take care of it.

LaPointe made a motion to uphold the citation and fine.
Holman seconded the motion
The motion passed with five votes.

VOTE: Yes – Lapointe, Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – None.

The citation #2026-11858.2, fine of $1,206.33 and mowing fee of $130.00 are all upheld.

Agenda Item 2026-43 Code Compliance
Case #2026-1798, Citation #2026-3153.9
Location: 2336 Russellville Road
Owner: Saad Alhashimy & Samaa H Alabbas
Respondent: Saad Alhashimy
Officer: Sanja Dudaric
Citation Fine $206.33

Officer Sanja Dudaric presented the case.
The case is the result of a proactive inspection conducted on 3/25/2026. During the inspection it was observed there were vehicles parked on the grass. A courtesy letter was sent to the PVA-listed property owner and the tenant. The property was inspected on 4/7/2026 and remained in violation. A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed owner. The property was inspected on 4/15/2026 and remained in violation. Contact was made with the property owner who stated the tenant requested a meeting with staff. On 4/20/2026, contact was made with the owner, and he was advised to speak with the tenant about vehicles blocking the entrance each time staff attempted to visit the property. On 4/23/2026 staff met on site with the owner and tenant, and multiple violations were observed. The owner requested additional time to address the violations and was advised 30 days would be allowed to bring the property into compliance. The owner stated he would ensure the property would be compliant. The owner was informed if the property was not in compliance by the 30 days, a citation would be issued. The property was inspected on 5/27/2026 and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed owner. The requested compliance date on the citation was 6/6/2026 and the following violations were listed: parking on yards, accumulation of junk/scrap metal and rubber, scattered garbage, outdoor storage of tires. While posting the citation on the property, the owner called staff to express his discontent about the citation. The owner stated all the work could not be done in one month since it had taken years to reach the current condition. Staff reminded the owner of similar issues with the property addressed approximately four years ago when staff were working on a similar case back then. At that time the property had junk vehicles, trash and other violations and he was advised then that junk vehicles could not be stored at the back of the property without proper screening and a paved surface. Despite having been informed of the requirements the same violations have continued to occur on the property. On 6/6/2026 the owner called to request an additional ten days. The property was inspected on 6/22/2026 and remained in violation. Staff met with the tenant on site and a wrecker company was on site removing some vehicles. On 7/2/2026 staff met on site with the tenant and a significant amount of clean up was completed. A two-month extension was requested to complete the work. It was decided the extension would be given but there would be no further extensions. The owner and tenant both assured staff it would get done. The property was inspected on 9/4/2026 and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed owner. The requested compliance date on the citation was 9/14/2026. The owner has contacted the compliance office multiple times requesting additional time, asking staff to continue working with him, stating he is trying to make money and paying city fines is making that more difficult. The owner requested staff to meet at the property to review what work was still needed to bring the property to compliance. No additional on-site meetings were needed as the owner was advised the same violations from the previous inspection were not resolved. The owner informed staff it was difficult to find people to work in the extreme heat and it was preventing him from completing the work. Staff reminded the owner of similar circumstances that occurred several years ago, and 600 days were afforded back then to allow for compliance, and the property is once again in a similar condition. Staff informed the owner the current violations are not new, and the owner has been aware of them for several years. The case has been active for 181 days. While significant work has been completed, there are still tires, trash, junk vehicles and vehicle parts throughout the property.
The owner Saad Alhashimy was sworn in at the podium.
The owner stated this is a business not residential. The owner has proof they worked hard to clean up the property. The owner stated during the first inspection there were 67 vehicles on the property.

The owner agreed there was trash and junk on the property. The owner said he has been working with Parish Towing to remove the cars, but they keep pushing him off.
The owner said he cleaned for 2 or 4 hours with no one helping so the owner asked for more time since it has taken years for the property to get into the current condition, and it cannot be cleaned up in just a few months. The property is 2 almost 3 acres, and the tenant does not know the law for the city and is losing a lot of money. The lot in the back is empty and is ready to be inspected. The owner asked for more time since he is trying his best and cannot do it all at one time. The owner said he continues to call Parish Towing, but they have accidents and cannot come. The owner also called Shelby Recycling and A-1 Towing and there is always a reason they cannot come. The owner said they have been unable to hire someone to work, and it is hard to breathe in this weather, but he is out there cleaning it himself. LaPointe asked if there is a record of the last fine for the property. Schargorodski stated there was a case in 2022 that was resolved in 2024. There were 66 corrective actions documenting either face-to-face meetings, or phone contact during those 600 days. There was a grass case in 2026. All this is not new to the property or property owner. Holman commented that seeing a case like this drag on makes it appear to be a lack of willingness on the owner's part. The owner stated he spoke with the tenant and the tenant said he no longer cares. The owner said now he is between the city and the tenant. The tenant will no longer help. The contract for the tenant expires in two months so the owner requested more time to clean up the property. Gonzalez asked the owner how long the current tenant has been at the property and the owner said since January or February 2024.

LaPointe made a motion to uphold the citation and fine.
Oliver Lewis seconded the motion
The motion passed with five votes.

VOTE: Yes – Lapointe, Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – None.

The citation #2026-3153.9, fine of $206.33 are upheld.

Agenda Item 2026-44 Code Compliance
Case #2026-6979, Citation #2026-10677.2
Location: 1519 KY Highway 185
Owner: Abdalkadar H Mubark & Sawsan A Turky
Respondent: Sawsan A Turky
Officer: Brad Schargorodski for McKenna Tabor
Citation Fine $106.33
Mowing Fee $65

Officer Schargorodski presented the case.
The case is the result of a proactive inspection on 7/28/2026, for tall grass/weeds. A courtesy letter was mailed to the PVA-listed owner. The property is a vacant lot. The property was inspected on 8/3/2026 and remained in violation. A Notice of Violation was mailed to the PVA-listed owner with a requested compliance date of 8/10/2026. The property was inspected on 8/13/2026 and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed via first class and certified mail to the PVA-listed property owner. The grass was over 24 inches tall, and a work order was submitted to a city contractor to mow the property. The property had three previous grass cases in 2026 that included citations and work orders. This is the second citation for the property and the second time the city has mowed the property.
The respondent Sawsan Turky was sworn in at the podium.
Turky stated the first citation was paid. Turky then stated there have been many problems.

Turky's home has water damage, and she moved into an Airbnb, working two jobs and getting home at 11:30 PM, so there was no time left to check on the property. Turky is trying to sell the land because it is too expensive to build on.

The property has been listed for six months but has not sold. Turky thought the property was being cared for during that time. After the first citation was issued Turky went to the Code Compliance office to see about payment arrangements. The citation fee was $106 and a mowing fee of $350.00. Turky said the fines come quickly and is unable to pay the fines without sacrificing basic needs like rent and daily expenses. LaPointe asked if she thought the real estate agent was going to mow, and Turky said yes for the six-month period but after receiving the first citation then realized it's her responsibility. Contractors were hired to mow but each time they went it was already cut. Turky went to the Code Compliance office to inform staff a contractor mows every two weeks. Staff suggested having them shorten the time between mowings to keep the grass getting too long. The contractor was asked to go every 10 days, but said the grass was too short to cut. There is all proof of this documented with messages to the contractor. Turky stated she is unable to pay the $350, $106 and $65 because the daily needs are more than what she makes. Turky plans to sell the land because it is too expensive to pay it. LaPointe wanted clarification if the property has been cited before and paid. Schargorodski was unsure about payment, but the property was cited in the spring, and the grass was so tall it could not be mowed. It had to be bush hogged. In addition to that citation the mowing fee was $350. LaPointe asked Turky if she understood she still owes money on top of the current citation and mowing fee. Turky received a paper saying she owes $460.00, and she is on a payment plan for this. Lapointe asked if someone cares for the property, how did it get to this point? Turky has owned the property since 2022, and the contractor was hired after the citation. Schargorodski explained the citation in front of the Board was issued 8/13/2026 and it's now 9/22/2026. The property may have been maintained for the last month, and we do not have an active case there. Gonzalez asked if the size and approximate value of the property is known. Schargorodski looked at the PVA website and the parcel was listed as 1.28-acre lot and PVA valued approximately at $300,000.00

LaPointe made a motion to uphold the citation and mowing fee and waive the fine.
Holman seconded the motion
The motion passed with five votes.

VOTE: Yes – LaPointe, Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – None.

The citation #2026-10677.2 and mowing fee of $65.00 are upheld, the fine of $106.33 is waived.

Turky was encouraged by the board to continue making payments on what is already owed for the first citation and mowing fee and now for the second citation, the fine will be waived but not the mowing fee of $65. She owes that mowing fee as well. Turky was asked to keep the property mowed so no more citations are issued. Each time a citation is issued the fee increases.

➢ OLD BUSINESS

Agenda Item 2026-45 Zoning Compliance
Case #2026-7350, Citation #2026-00011255
Location: 1310 US 31W By-Pass
Owner: Jai Sai Malik LLC
Respondent: Paresh Desai
Officer: James Heady
Citation Fine $200.00

Officer Heady presented the case.
There were three options for this case.

- Remove the freight container.
- Pave under the container then add one deciduous tree and 5 shrubs.
- Pave under the container and plant one deciduous tree and install a six-foot tall, opaque fence.

The property was inspected on 9/16/2026 and the third option has been completed. The property is compliant.
The respondent Paresh Desai was sworn in at the podium.
Desai stated what was needed for compliance is done and asked if it applies to everyone equally. Desai explained he felt discriminated against due. The property across the street has a freight container with screening that is visible. There are three containers that look new from the street, and they are on gravel. Desai asked why they get to keep their containers, and he is targeted. Holman responded, saying staff tends to roughly 1,000 cases a month, sometimes more, sometimes less. He cannot know all the cases they are working on in the background. They may be working cases for the places he is complaining about. He said this Board votes on what is brought before them, that's it. They make decisions based upon what is presented. In this case, one container was in place for 10 years, the other for 5. He said it appears he had already been given favorable treatment. Desai was concerned there was no action taken against the other properties and Holman responded there may be, he doesn't know if action is being taken.

LaPointe made a motion to uphold the citation and waive the fine.
Mujkanovic seconded the motion.
The motion passed with five votes.

VOTE: Yes – LaPointe, Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – None.

The citation #2026-11255 is upheld, the fine of $200.00 is waived.

- **NEW BUSINESS**
- **COMMENTS / ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Donna Richter was introduced and welcomed as the newest Code Officer

The next hearing will be on Tuesday, October 27, 2026, at 4:30 PM CST/5:30 PM EST

- **ADJOURNMENT** - Motion to adjourn.

Holman made a motion to adjourn the hearing at 5:36 PM CST/6:36 PM EST
LaPointe seconded the motion.
The motion passed with five votes.

VOTE: Yes – LaPointe, Gonzalez, Holman, Mujkanovic, Oliver Lewis
No – None.

ADOPTED: October 27, 2026

APPROVED: _____
Code Enforcement and Nuisance Board Chairperson

ATTEST: _____
Code Enforcement and Nuisance Board Clerk