



COUNSEL: DAVID BRODERICK

CITY OF BOWLING GREEN
F O U N D E D 1 7 9 8
CODE ENFORCEMENT AND NUISANCE BOARD
SPECIAL CALL MINUTES
CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER
NOVEMBER 17, 2025 4:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER – Co-Chairman Bruni called the hearing to order at 4:57 PM

ROLL CALL – The roll was called for Board Members.

MEMBERS PRESENT – Ben Bruni, Jose Gonzalez, Jeff Holman

MEMBERS ABSENT – Anthony LaPointe, Kenan Mujkanovic

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – The October 20, 2025 minutes were approved as written.

Gonzalez made a motion to approve the October 20, 2025 minutes as written.

Holman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman

No – None

STAFF WAS SWORN IN

➤ APPEALS

Agenda Item 2025-56 Code Compliance

Case #2023-4164, Citation #2023-8155.55

Location: 1002 State Street

Owner: Tina M. Hutchison

Respondent: Simpson Firm/Alan Simpson

Officer: Sanja Dudaric

Citation Fine: \$1,006.04

Officer Dudaric presented the case. The case is the result of violations observed by the officer on 7/21/2023. The following violations were observed during the initial inspection; masonry and exterior walls and falling bricks. A citizen complaint about the property was received on 8/17/2023. A Notice of Violation was mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address on the inspection date, having a compliance date of 8/25/2023. The property was inspected on 9/5/2023, and remained in violation. The property owner contacted staff on 9/6/2023, and the Code Compliance Manager spoke with the property owner at length about the owner having multiple properties out of compliance. A meeting was scheduled for 9/11/2023, to come up with a plan of action for all the properties owned that are out of compliance. The meeting did not take place. The property was inspected on 2/14/2024, and remained in violation. The property was inspected on 2/15/2024, remained in violation and a citation was issued. The citation was posted on the property and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address.

The following violation was added to the citation; unmaintained/inadequate roof and drainage. The property was inspected on 2/27/2024, and remained in violation. A citation was issued and the following violation was added: accumulation of construction/demolition/landscaping debris. The citation was posted on the property, mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address and the compliance date on the citation was 3/8/2024. Over the past year, staff has conducted multiple inspections, and attempted to maintain communication with the owner in an effort to develop a plan to attain compliance. The owner stated a contractor was contacted to perform necessary repairs but no proof has been submitted to confirm such arrangements. There has been no observable movement toward compliance. The property was inspected on 8/15/2025, and remained in violation and a citation was issued. The citation was posted on the property, mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address and the compliance date on the citation was 8/25/2025. The following violations were listed on the citation: accumulation of construction/demolition/landscaping debris, accumulation of rubbish, garbage, broken window, insufficient/inadequate protective treatment, roof drains/gutters/downspouts in disrepair, masonry disrepair, exterior wall disrepair and window sills/frames in disrepair. The case has been open for 850 days and the property remains in violation.

Attorney Alan Simpson from the Simpson Firm was present to represent and speak on behalf of the owner. Mr. Simpson proceeded with questions for the Code Officer. Mr. Simpson asked if structural testing had been completed to determine if the wall in the displayed photo is structurally sound. The officer replied, no. Mr. Simpson asked if there have been citizen complaints regarding falling bricks causing injuries. The Code Officer replied, the case was started as a result of staff observing the violations and later there were complaints of homeless persons on the property. Mr. Simpson commented Ms. Hutchison is concerned about homeless persons on her property. Mr. Simpson then asked if staff had contacted the police to request frequent patrols, and staff replied that would be the owner's responsibility. The condition of the alley behind the property was discussed, saying there was at one time gutters, trash, fallen tree limbs and bricks in the alley but has been cleaned up. Mr. Simpson asked if staff was aware Ms. Hutchison obtained an estimate of repairs for the roof in the amount of \$135,006.00. The officer stated she was not aware of the arrangement. Mr. Simpson asked if there had been any tenant complaints regarding the cited issues. The officer replied she had not spoken to the tenant. Mr. Simpson asked if staff was aware of health issues having left Ms. Hutchison in a financially strapped situation. The officer replied the owner had mentioned some health issues. Mr. Simpson stated since Ms. Hutchison owns several properties and is financially strapped, she is now prioritizing which property has immediate needs. Bruni stated he read where the owner stated there was a contractor lined up to make the repairs, but no documentation was provided to confirm this claim. Bruni asked why those documents were not shared. Mr. Simpson replied he would have to ask Ms. Hutchison. Mr. Simpson stated he has spoken with the contractor himself and the quote was over \$136,000.00 and Ms. Hutchison does not have the funds.

The owner, Ms. Hutchison was called to the podium and sworn in.

Ms. Hutchison was asked if she owns the property located at 1002 State Street. The owner replied, yes. Mr. Simpson asked the owner if she was presented with an opportunity to sell the property. The owner replied yes. Mr. Simpson asked the owner why the property has not been sold. The owner replied, because all the purchase offers made included kicking out the current tenants. The owner told the tenants they would not be kicked out. Mr. Simpson asked Ms. Hutchison if she understood the complaints and pictures seen and agree this is not the first time she has been made aware of the issues. The owner replied, yes. Mr. Simpson asked the owner if she has the money to make needed repairs. The owner replied, no. The owner stated some of the brick was repaired but the contractor did not do a good job. The owner continued saying, since the old Sears & Roebuck building was torn down, there is no longer access to the roof for the building. Access to the roof of the building came from the old Sears building. It now takes a thirty-foot ladder or a boom to reach the roof. Mr. Simpson asked the owner if to the best of her knowledge, the wall seen in earlier photographs is structurally sound. The owner replied, yes the contractor from SOKY Elite told her it was. The owner stated she purchased the building in 2015 and there had been three different opportunities to sell the property but the owner refused the offers since all offers made stated they would remove the current tenant. In 2017 when the old Sears building was torn down it damaged the wall of the building in the back and caused the back wall to collapse. An insurance claim filed but was denied. An attorney was hired to dispute the denial, and some money was recovered and then the wall was rebuilt.

During Covid of 2020, the owner was ill and lost several family members, and there were tenants in some of the properties who did not pay rent. The owner had no recourse for non-payment, and they could not be evicted. The owner stated she broke her ankle in November 2021 and then tornados hit in December 2021. The owner acknowledged getting insurance money for her property located on Cedar Ridge. Most other properties the owner was in possession of at the time of the tornadoes had little to no insurance. The owner said she endured another broken foot in June 2022. The roof was replaced on the Cedar Ridge property. Her property on West 15th was broken into multiple times by homeless persons. Funds were spent to clean up the property over thirty times. A few properties were fixed up, sold and some funds from those sales were applied to the back taxes owed, and toward repairs to other properties. In August 2025, the owner received a bid of \$135,000.00 for the State Street property repairs and the contractor said the building only needed cosmetic repairs, nothing structural. The owner admitted getting behind on everything due to Covid, loss of family members, health issues and being a 24/7 caregiver for her mother. The owner stated she feels she is doing all she can to catch up, including selling a personal vehicle. The owner stated she has sold seven properties and used some of those funds to make some repairs. Mr. Simpson asked the owner if some of the cosmetic repairs could be made in the next 90 days. The owner replied yes. A handy man has been contacted and may be able to start in two to three weeks. Code Compliance Manager, Brad Schargorodski asked the owner if there have been tenant complaints regarding leaks in the building. The owner replied maybe at the beginning of the year, but was uncertain of the date. The owner was asked if the man that gave the owner the quote of \$130,000.00 is a structural engineer. The owner responded she did not know. Mr. Simpson explained the contractor, whose name was determined to be Andy Martin, works for a brick/masonry company (SOKY Elite), but Mr. Simpson was not able to confirm the contractor is a State licensed and stamped structural engineer. The owner was asked if she recalls if there were tenant complaints about leaks inside the building in 2018 or 2019. The owner replied that is when the back wall of the property fell. The owner was asked if she had any indication the wall was going to fall. The owner replied no, according to what she was told, the wall fell due to shifting from the removal of the Sears building. A photo was displayed of the wall that collapsed in 2019. The photo depicted an area showing where the wall was several bricks thick. The owner was asked when looking at the photo, if she is claiming the concurrent damage was theoretically caused by the removal of the Sears building, and there was at that point no tenants complaints and no structural engineering surveys done. The owner replied, she believes so, yes. Mr. Schargorodski stated, while staff are sympathetic for Ms. Hutchison's life situation, the City's concern is not to have another collapse happen again. If water is getting in between those bricks, and then water freezes and thaws in those areas, that creates a potential for the wall to fail. The main concern in this case is safety. It has been 850 days since this case was opened. There is a small amount of woodwork on the front of the building that could have been repaired in the last 850 days with some new wood and paint. Code Compliance Manager Schargorodski stated, hopefully the owner and the Board Members would agree Code Compliance has attempted to work with the owner for an extended amount of time. There is a point where the intent of Code Compliance is for the safety of the public and enforcing the Code. The owner commented how she has been working with Officer Dudaric regarding other properties. While staff recognizes the owner's effort to work on other properties, it does not put bricks back in the wall of this property that is in front of the Board to discuss. The focus is on the case currently in front of the Board, and the current citation and the concern is for the safety of the public. Mr. Simpson stated there has been no proof before this Board the wall is not structurally sound. Equally so, no proof has been presented the wall is sound. The property does not meet code. Bruni commented, aside from the structural integrity of the walls, there is a list of violations that would be relatively doable fixes and from what has been presented, he does not see movement toward compliance. Bruni asked what the reason was for that. The owner responded saying, the back was cleaned up multiple times. Bruni expressed concern about the owner's claim of having no money to make repairs and this would be a persistent problem. The owner commented that Andy, the contractor, said the wall isn't going anywhere. Holman stated some of it is going somewhere, and asked if there is a sidewalk at the base of the building. Holman stated the photo displayed is horrifying. Structural integrity aside, bricks do not fall out of a building if it is perfectly ok. Holman recalled the owner said the property was purchased in 2015 and asked the owner if she collected rent or was this one of the properties that did not pay due to Covid. The owner replied the tenant has paid. Holman asked if the tenant has paid rent every month for ten years. The owner replied she believes so.

Holman asked the owner if she has collected rent at a price she set forth, and has put little to no money into the repairs and upkeep of the building. The owner disagreed. Holman stated that for 850 days it gives the appearance of having no plan, just appears to be evasive. The owner commented there was a plan of working on one property at a time. Mr. Simpson asked Officer Dudaric if the owner has made progress on other properties and if she was able to close out some cases. The officer replied the owner made progress on other properties, but no progress or documentation to support effort on this property was given. The officer stated during the times progress was evident on the other properties, no citations were issued for those properties. Mr. Simpson stated this is a financial problem not a lack of wanting to make the repairs. Fines only cause the owner more financial problems. Granting the owner more time would be more beneficial. The owner was asked if any of the code violation fees were paid. The owner responded no. The owner stated, she was advised to pay the back taxes owed first, then focus on the citation fees. Mr. Schargorodski stated, since none of the fines have been paid, it would not seem necessary to waive the fines in this case since the fines are not being paid anyway. The owner said she had negotiated with someone to reduce the fines. Rachel Danner, Paralegal to the City Attorney stated the negotiation the owner was referring to was the payment plan arranged between the owner and the City Law Department. The agreement was all taxes would be paid first, by the deadline of end of January 2025. The next payment would be due in February 2025, and applied toward code violations. The taxes were paid but no other payments have been received. Mr. Simpson asked if the agreement is in writing. Danner replied yes. The owner stated she did not understand the agreement. The owner stated she owed back taxes from the years, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023 and 2024. The back taxes owed were paid by fixing some properties and selling them as well as refinancing the State Street property. The owner stated she cannot borrow any more money for the State Street building and the current mortgage for the property is \$800,000.00. Holman commented the property is not in compliance, but he will make a motion to uphold the citation, and waive the fine of \$1,006.04.

Holman made a motion to uphold the citation but waive the fine.

Gonzalez seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

*ROLL CALL: Yes –Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None*

The Citation is upheld, the fine of \$1,006.04 is waived.

Agenda Item 2025-57 Code Compliance

Case #2025-9988, Citation #2025-14830.2

Location: 750 Park Street

Owner: Harry A II & Sarah Nuse

Respondent: Joseph Hodges-Garza

Officer: Heather Lashley

Citation Fine: \$406.04

Officer Lashley presented the case. The case is the result of a proactive inspection on 9/29/2025. A courtesy letter listing a violation of overgrown weeds/grasses was sent to the PVA-listed owner and address. The property was inspected on 10/7/2025, and remained in violation. A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed owner and address, having a compliance date of 10/13/2025. The property was inspected on 10/14/2025, and remained in violation. A Citation was posted on the property, and sent to the PVA-listed owner and address, and a work order was submitted to have a City Contractor mow the property. The property was already mowed upon the arrival of the contractor. There have been nine Code Compliance cases for this property in the last two years, as well as two previous citations and work orders. This case was active for fifteen days.

The respondent, Joseph Hodges-Garza was sworn in. The respondent admitted to being bad about procrastination. The respondent stated he has lived at the property with a friend since March of 2024. The friend moved out in August of 2024 leaving him to take over the lease alone. The respondent does not own equipment to maintain the grass. The respondent has been borrowing equipment from others on their schedule. The respondent accepted responsibility for the procrastination. On the date the citation was issued, the respondent explained his situation to a neighbor and was able to borrow equipment and mow the grass. The respondent now says there is an arrangement in place to access the equipment in a more timely fashion so the grass may be maintained.

Bruni made a motion to uphold the citation and fine.

Holman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

ROLL CALL: Yes –Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman

No – None

Citation #2025-14830.2 and fine of \$406.04 are upheld.

Agenda Item 2025-58 Code Compliance

Case #2025-2811, Citation #2025-4628.8

Location: 1618 Parkside Drive

Owner: Owner & respondent: Terrez DeWalt

Officer: McKenna Tabor

Citation Fine: \$1,006.04

The case is the result of a proactive inspection on 4/17/2025. The violation observed on the property was for a damaged roof. A Notice of Violation with a compliance date of 5/19/2025, was sent to the PVA-listed owner and address. On 6/2/2025, the property was inspected, and remained in violation. An attempt to contact the property owner was made without success. On 7/17/2025, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Staff made contact with the owner. The owner asked staff why the City would care about roof damage. Staff provided information about the property maintenance code and how the lack of maintenance causes property to become a blight in the area. The owner was asked to provide a timeline for compliance and the owner responded he would make contact when he could. The property was inspected on 8/5/2025, and 8/29/2025. Contact was made with the owner and he requested proof of the roof damage claimed by staff. Photographic evidence was sent to the owner. The property was inspected on 9/15/2025, and the property remained in violation. No contact or updates from the owner were received. On 10/7/2025, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued listing the following violations; broken/boarded/missing windows, uncovered opening to basement/crawl space, missing/damaged siding, damaged roof, damaged gutters, accumulation of construction/demolition/landscaping debris, failure of duty of maintenance. The citation issued on 10/7/2025, was appealed but the owner did not show up for that appeal. A citation was issued on 10/30/2025, and was posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address. The roof on the property has been repaired, so the violation for a damaged roof was not included on the 10/30 citation. The case has been open for 215 days and the property remains in violation.

Mr. Terrez DeWalt came to the podium and was sworn in. Holman asked the owner if the property is occupied. The owner replied, no. The owner stated he thinks homeless persons have been trying to break into the property and that is how the window was broken. The owner stated he wanted to appear before the Board to request more time to make the repairs. The roof was repaired, the hole to the crawl space was covered up and the debris in the back has been cleaned up.

Bruni asked the owner if there is a timeline for the remaining repairs. The owner stated putting in a new window is expensive and requested a two month extension to make the remaining repairs. Bruni asked if it takes two months to replace a window and put gutters up. The owner replied yes.

Officer Tabor stated, the owner commented about homeless persons on the property. If the building has been vacant for very long, then homeless persons may already know it is vacant. If that is the case, and a broken window remains open and exposed, there is concern homeless person(s) may gain entry to the property and take up residence. The officer asked the owner if he could get plexi-glass or a board, just something to cover the window in order to deter people from getting into the building. The owner replied yes, a board could be put up. The officer stated leaving the window open exposes the building to trespassers and makes the property vulnerable to the elements, which could cause problems later. Bruni asked the owner if he could get the repairs done in the next few days. The owner replied, it is possible, but two months would allow more time in case it cannot be done. Bruni stated two months seems like more than what the Board may be willing to approve. Gonzalez stated he would like to see the window boarded up tomorrow or within one week, and then then he would be willing to make a motion to uphold the citation and waive the fine. Gonzalez said there will be no Code Board until January, so the owner may get 60 days, but the officer will continue to follow up per the regular inspection schedule.

***Gonzalez made a motion to uphold the Citation, but waive the fine of \$1,006.04
Bruni seconded the motion.
The motion passed with a three to zero vote.***

***ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None***

Citation #2025-4628.8 is upheld, the fine of \$1,006.04 is waived.

Agenda Item 2025-59 Code Compliance

Case #2025-7880, Citation #2025-11637.9

Location: 2608 Mohawk Drive

Owner: Andy & Sherri Ballinger

Respondent: Jennifer Hill

Officer: Sanja Dudaric

The case was moved to the January hearing.

- OLD BUSINESS – None

- NEW BUSINESS

Agenda Item 2025-60 Code Compliance

Owner: Tai Nguyen (and associated LLCs as listed herein)

Officer: Brad Schargorodski

Request for Repeat Offender Designation

- Category A** – Received a 4th Citation for violations involving any properties owned by the violator within two years. **-YES**
- Category B** – Received a 3rd Citation for any violations involving any properties owned by the violator within one year. **-YES**
- Category C** – Has outstanding unpaid citation fines and/or remedy charges on properties where a 2nd citation has been issued within the last two years – **YES**

- 1956 Stonehenge – 5 citations, 2 work orders in the last two years - **3 citations** count towards Repeat Offender: 05/02/25, 10/15/25, 10/29/25
- 1960 Stonehenge – 5 citations, 2 work orders in the last two years - **3 citations** count towards Repeat Offender: 05/02/25, 10/15/25, 10/29/25
- 1724 Catherine Dr – 1 citation, 1 work order in the last two years – **1 citation** counts towards Repeat Offender: 04/25/24
- 229 W 14th Ave – 9 citations, 3 work orders in the last two years - **8 citations** count towards Repeat Offender: 05/17/24, 06/07/24, 06/20/24, 07/30/24, 06/02/25, 06/17/25, 08/29/25, 11/05/25
- 1245 Shannon Dr. – 6 citations, 2 work orders in the last two years - **6 citations** count towards Repeat Offender: 06/07/24, 06/20/24, 06/20/24, 07/03/24, 08/09/24, 08/09/24
- 473 Glen Lily – 1 citation, 1 work order in the last two years - **1 citation** counts towards Repeat Offender: 06/04/25
- 5402 Bakers Spring St – 6 citations in the last two years – 0 citations count towards Repeat Offender
- 635 Woodford Ave – 2 citations in the last two years – 0 citations count towards Repeat Offender

Unpaid fees/fines amount counting towards Repeat Offender: \$48,787.88 [\$43,505.56 (Taibo’s Home LLC) + \$5,062.36 (Go Big or Go Home LLC) + 219.96 (Tai Nguyen)]

Notes:

- Due to multiple and significant violations at several of Mr. Nguyen’s properties, and continued non-compliance across multiple city agencies, the Public Works Department issued Stop Work Orders at nine of the respondent’s properties on May 2nd, 2025.
- The Bowling Green-Warren County Contractor’s Licensing Board brought an Intent to Revoke License motion against Mr. Nguyen before their Board in June, 2025. The Revocation of Mr. Nguyen’s contractor’s license was approved by the Board by Default, and was effective on June 4th.
 - Mr. Nguyen later violated the license revocation and continued to engage in unlicensed contracting activity. A civil complaint was filed in district court against Mr. Nguyen on July 16th by the Contractor’s Licensing Board, later resulting in a permanent court-ordered injunction against Mr. Nguyen, any current LLCs owned by Mr. Nguyen, his agents, employees or anyone acting in concert with Mr. Nguyen.
- Mr. Nguyen owns multiple properties in the city, which continue to be in violation of city ordinance across multiple agencies on an ongoing basis.

Staff requests Tai Nguyen, and all current or future associated LLC, (including but not limited to: Bluegrass Builders LLC, Go Big or Go Home LLC, Taibo’s Landing LLC, Taibo’s Home LLC, Black Diamond Property LTD, Prime Investment Group LLC, Everstone Landing LLC, TTT LLC, 3 Bros LLC, PT Dirt Moving LLC, Baonam LLC), be designated as a “Repeat Offender”. The Repeat Offender designation shall run for a period of 24 months, be assessed the amount of \$1,200 for any future violations of Chapter 27 of city ordinance during that time, and be subject to all stipulations of the Repeat Offender designation as outlined in Chapter 27 of city ordinance.

Division Manager Brad Schargorodski stated Mr. Tai Nguyen was notified at least seven days in advance to appear for this hearing.

A review of the Repeat Offender designation was completed for the benefit of all in attendance. Any citations discussed tonight to justify the repeat offender designation will not be used against Mr. Nguyen should another repeat offender designation be requested in the future. Enhanced enforcement action will be taken if Mr. Nguyen is approved as a repeat offender. If approved we do not have to give personal contact or Notices of Violation. A citation may be issued onsite for a violation observed by staff and regular inspections for any property owned may be conducted. As a repeat offender, the maximum fine shall be \$1,200.00 unless a citation is appealed, then the Board may double the fine if they uphold the citation. Mr. Nguyen currently uses eleven LLCs under different names, and staff is aware of seventeen properties owned under all of those LLC's. A brief recap of citations for different properties was listed:

- 1956 Stonehenge Avenue – 5 citations and 2 work orders
- 1960 Stonehenge Avenue - 5 citations and 2 work orders
- 1724 Catherine Avenue – 1 citation and 1 work order
- 229 West 14th Avenue – 9 citations and 2 work orders
- 1245 Shannon Drive – 6 citations and 2 work orders
- 473 Glen Lily Road – 1 citation and 1 work order
- 5402 Bakers Spring Street – 6 citations (Public Works, do not count toward repeat offender)
- 635 Woodford Avenue – 2 citations (Public Works, do not count toward repeat offender)

Currently, unpaid fines total \$48,787.88. That number does not include taxes owed, that is purely citation fees and/or work orders. There are other fees but they are not included in this due to those other fees come from Public Works, Contractor's Licensing and Animal Control cases. The Public Works Department issued stop work orders at nine of Mr. Nguyen's properties, and the Contractor Licensing Board brought an intent to revoke his contractor's license before their Board in June 2025. The approval to revoke the license was approved, but Mr. Nguyen violated the revoked license on multiple occasions. This resulted in a civil complaint filed in District Court resulting in a permanent court ordered injunction against Mr. Nguyen and any current LLC's, his agents, employees, or anyone acting on his behalf.

Gonzalez made a motion to approve the repeat offender designation to be \$1,200.00 per citation to run for 24 months.

Holman seconded the motion.

The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

***ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None***

Agenda Item 2025-61 Code Compliance

Case #2024-4231

Location: 1016 Beauty Avenue

Owner: Cedric & Judy Burnam

Officer: McKenna Tabor

Request for Authorization to Issue a Per-Day Fine Citation

This case was the result of a proactive inspection conducted on 05/14/24. The following violations were observed:

- Dangerous structure or premises – property has not had utilities since 2013
- Damaged roof

A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed owner and address with a compliance date of 06/13/24. On 06/13/24, the property was inspected and remained in violation. The property owner, Mr. Burnam, requested an extension as he had just received the Notice. Staff agreed to a one month extension. On multiple dates in July, August and September, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Contact with the owner was attempted without success. On 10/07/24, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A door tag was posted on the property, requesting the owner to contact our office. On multiple dates in October, November and December, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Voicemails were left, but no calls were returned. On 01/07/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Staff made contact with a family member of the owner to request assistance contacting the owner. On 02/05/25, and 02/19/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation with no contact from anyone affiliated with the property. On 03/20/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. The owner contacted staff and the condition of the property and his options moving forward were discussed. He expressed intent to demolish the structure. The owner was advised to please remain in contact with our office, and apply for all proper permits prior to demolition. On 03/31/25, there had been no updates from the owner nor any permit applications on file. Contact with the owner was attempted, without success.

On 06/11/25 the property was inspected and remained in violation. There were no permits on file, and no communication from the owner. On 08/22/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Contact with the owner was attempted without success. On 09/15/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address. The following violations were listed on the citation:

- **Dangerous building/hazardous structure – no utilities since 2013**
- **Roof damage**
- **Vacant and abandoned**

On 09/26/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address. The following violations were added:

- **Glazing – broken/boarded/missing windows**
- **Basement hatchways – uncovered opening to basement/crawlspace**
- **Foundation walls not maintained without cracks/breaks**
- **Duty of Maintenance of Private Property**

On 10/08/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner. As of 11/17/25 this case has been open for 552 days and the property remains in violation.

Holman made a motion to approve a per-day fine Citation, for \$100.00 per day to run 60 days or until the property is brought to compliance.

Gonzalez seconded the motion. The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None

Agenda Item 2025-62 Code Compliance

Case #2025-1535

Location: 302 Clearview Avenue

Owner: Danny Brown

Officer: McKenna Tabor

Request for Authorization to Issue a Per-Day Fine Citation

This case was the result of a citizen complaint on 02/27/25. During the inspection, the following violations were observed:

- Accumulation of Construction, Demolition, or Landscaping Debris
- Accumulation of rubbish – truck being used to store construction materials/rubbish

A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed owner and address, with a compliance date of 03/11/25. On 03/14/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A door hanger was posted at the property requesting contact with our office. On 03/31/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A phone number was located for the property owner, and contact was attempted without success. On 4/16/2025, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner. On 04/16/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Staff attempted contact with the owner without success. Later that same day, the owner texted and advised that he would have the property in compliance by Monday, 04/21/25. On 04/24/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Staff attempted contact with the owner without success. On 04/29/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Contact was made with the owner, and the owner requested another week. On 05/07/25 and 05/21/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Staff attempted contact with the owner on both dates without success. Multiple inspections were conducted in June and July and the property remained in violation. Staff noted there was some progress made toward compliance. On 08/05/25 and 08/22/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Staff attempted contact with the owner without success, but did notice progress toward compliance. On 9/17/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation.

There had been no contact with the owner for several months. On 09/26/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. On 9/26/2025, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address. The following violations were listed on the citation:

- Accumulated construction, demolition or landscape debris
- Accumulation of rubbish or debris
- Parking in yards
- Improperly parked/stored trailer

On 10/08/25, the property was inspected, and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address. The new inspection date was listed as 10/20/25. On 10/23/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner. The new inspection date was listed as 11/03/25. As of 11/17/25, this case has been open for 263 days and the property remains in violation. The property owner has recently contacted staff to express frustration with receiving citations, but has not provided any plans or updates toward compliance.

Bruni made a motion to approve a per-day fine Citation, for \$100.00 per day to run 60 days or until the property is brought to compliance.

Holman seconded the motion. The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

***ROLL CALL: Yes – Brunj, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None***

Agenda Item 2025-63 Code Compliance

Case #2025-7185

Location: 2135 Russellville Road

Owner: Samarpan LLC

Officer: McKenna Tabor

Request for Authorization to Issue a Per-Day Fine Citation

The case is complaint-based. 07/22/25. During the initial inspection on 7/22/2025, the following violations were observed:

- **Overgrown grass and weeds**

A Notice of Violation was mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address, having a compliance inspection date of 07/28/25. On 07/31/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. An attempt to contact the owner, Mr. Patel, and staff requested the entire property be mowed. On 08/07/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Another attempt to contact the owner was made with a request to mow the lot. On 08/21/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. Quote requests were sent to three city contractors to determine the cost to have the property bush hogged once a citation was issued. On 08/25/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property, and mailed to the PVA-listed owner. The new inspection date listed on the citation was 08/28/25. A work order was submitted for a contractor to mow the lot. On 08/27/25, the lowest quote of \$700 to bush hog the property was accepted, and the contractor arrived at the property to cut the overgrown lot. After attempting to mow the property, the contractor contacted staff stating he would not be able to complete the job. The division manager met the contractor on site and observed the overgrown areas full of rebar, concrete, trash, rocks, construction debris, and an entire bicycle hidden in the overgrowth. The city was charged \$200 for the transport of equipment and portion that was mowed. The contractor suggested a bulldozer be used to clear and level the lot, as it would not be able to be maintained in its current condition. On 09/05/25, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed to the PVA-listed owner. The new inspection date listed on the citation was 09/15/25. The following violations were added:

- **Vacant structures and land**
- **Duty of Maintenance of Private Property**
- **Accumulation of construction/demolition/landscaping debris**
- **Attractive nuisance**
- **Grading and Drainage**
- **Accumulation of Rubbish or Garbage**

As of 11/17/25, this case has been open for 118 days and the property remains in violation. The property has been undergoing a commercial development review process through various agencies for future development into a strip mall. The property remains overgrown and poses a safety hazard to the Springhill neighborhood properties and adjacent businesses. The property generates frequent complaints regarding wildlife, insects, being an eyesore, and poses a potential fire hazard in close proximity to businesses and residences.

Note: This case is regarding the large, vacant lot behind “Leo’s Liquors” and adjacent to Russellville and Springhill Roads. There is discrepancy regarding addresses in city mapping and computer systems, the PVA, and the commercial permit and CDR process. Historically, the entire property was known as 2205 Russellville Rd, however when the parcel was split to build on the smaller lot on the corner, it was changed to 2135 Russellville Rd. Planning and Zoning and city mapping currently show the entire property as 2135 Russellville Rd, while PVA currently shows the large vacant lot as 0 Russellville Rd, and the small corner lot as 2135 Russellville Rd.

To add further confusion, plans currently under review with Planning and Zoning for commercial development call the entire property 2205 Russellville Rd. For purposes of this case, citations will continue to be issued under the same case number and location, known as 2135, but linked to the “0” address, and are intended to cover the large vacant lot which is overgrown and not maintained.

Bruni made a motion to approve a per-day fine Citation, for \$100.00 per day to run 60 days or until the property is brought to compliance.

Gonzalez seconded the motion. The motion passed with a three to zero vote.

**ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None**

Agenda Item 2025-64 Code Compliance

Case #2024-8067

Location: 416 East 6th Avenue

Owner: George E & Emma A Whitney (Estate)

Officer: Brad Schargorodski

Request for Authorization to Demolish Structure

The case was the result of a citizen complaint on 09/13/24. During the initial inspection, the following violations were observed:

- **Exterior Use or Storage of Indoor Furniture**
- **Unlicensed/Inoperable Motor Vehicle**
- **Duty of Maintenance of Streets, Sidewalks & Public Ways**
- **Structure Unfit for Human Occupancy**
- **Unsafe Structure**

A Notice of Violation was sent to the PVA-listed owner and address, with a new inspection date of 09/23/24. On 10/17/24, the property was inspected and remained in violation. A citation was issued, posted on the property and mailed to the PVA-listed owner and address. The new inspection date listed on the citation was 10/28/24, and following violations were observed:

- **Duty of Maintenance of Private Property**
- **Abandoned property**
- **Unlicensed/Inoperable Motor Vehicle**
- **Exterior Use or Storage of Indoor Furniture**
- **Vacant Structures and Land**

Additional citations were issued on 10/29/24, and 11/26/24. On 12/06/24, the property was inspected and remained in violation. An individual, who said his name was Greg, was observed walking around the property. He was asked if he was staying there, and he clarified he is homeless but does not stay there. He is feeding and taking care of a cat staying on the side porch. The property was found to have an unsecured window. A possible relative of the owner, named Odell Wilson was contacted. Mr. Wilson is not local but stated he would have someone secure the window. Mr. Wilson mentioned plans to sell the property in about six months. Mr. Wilson was advised the property needs to be properly secured and maintained until any change of ownership. On 12/09/24, an individual named Patrick, who is believed to be a nephew of Odell Wilson, called and advised he would secure the window. In January of 2025, City Law Department comprehensively determined five property heirs for this location, and began contact each to discuss their intent for the property and possible consent to demolish. On 03/27/25, and 04/24/25 the subject named Patrick was contacted regarding brush piles on the property, boarding a window, and cleaning up a porch. On 05/02/25, additional emails were sent to property heirs as a last attempt to bring the property into compliance.

Authorization to issue a per-day fine citation was approved by the Board at the January 2025 hearing, and the per-day fine citation was issued 05/16/25. In July of 2025, the Law Department worked with our office to generate voluntary consent to demolish forms. Those forms were sent to all heirs who verbally stated by phone they would sign to allow demolition of the structure. On 11/06/25, we informed the Law Department of our intent to bring the property before the board for involuntary demolition due to the property being vacant, abandoned and unlivable. The dwelling has been without utility service since 02/05/18. There is an outstanding amount of \$10,417.33 currently owed on the property between code violations and three years of unpaid property taxes. The Law Department is still waiting for a signed and notarized consent form from Robert Whitney in Arizona, notarized consent forms from heirs Anthony Wilson and Odell Wilson (who had returned signed forms, but they were not notarized), and return of any forms from heirs Joyce Coleman and Carmen Green. As of 11/17/25, this case has been open for 430 days, and the property remains in violation. The dwelling is vacant, abandoned, characterized by multiple code violations, and is a blight on the surrounding area.

Note: Board approval for involuntary demolition allows staff to begin the lengthy administrative process of lienholder notification, asbestos inspections, utility removal, and eventually demolition. The City's Law Department provides what is known as a 'demo memo', informing us as to all parties with any sort of financial interest or ownership in the property. If the Board authorizes demolition, letters are mailed to all parties by first-class and certified mail, informing them that all structures will be demolished, and allowing 30 days to contact our office to stop demolition. Once that 30 days has elapsed, all utility companies are notified to remove service to the building, and the structure is checked for asbestos (which will be remediated if found, prior to demolition). A demolition permit is then obtained by the city's contractor, and demolition is scheduled, a process which overall generally takes 45-60 days after Board approval.

- **COMMENTS / ANNOUNCEMENTS** – The Board members approved the staff request to cancel the December hearing.

Holman made a motion to cancel the December hearing.
Gonzalez seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None

The next hearing will be January 27, 2026

- **ADJOURNMENT** - Motion to adjourn.

Gonzalez made a motion to adjourn the hearing at 6:50 PM.
Holman seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL: Yes – Bruni, Gonzalez, Holman
No – None

ADOPTED: February 10, 2026

APPROVED: B-RB
Code Enforcement and Nuisance Board Chairperson

ATTEST: Pamela Boose
Code Enforcement and Nuisance Board Clerk