MINUTES
BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
DECEMBER 9, 2016
9:00 AM

Kyle Denham, Chairman, called the December 9th Building Board of Appeals meeting to order with the following Board members present: Kyle Denham, Crystal Harrington, Rylee Hartwell, David Pommert, Mark Eastman and Ervin Wilson. Board member Don Landrith was absent. City officials present: Jeff Oliver, Building Inspector: Jordan Paul, Assistant City Attorney: Bryan Wicklund, Chief Building Official and Lindsay Dunn, Notary Public.

Mr. Denham	**Do we have a motion to excuse Mr.Landrith?**
Mrs. Harrington	**Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we excuse Mr.Landrith from this meeting.**
Mr. Denham	**All those in favor of excusing them, say "aye" (Mr. Denham, Mrs. Harrington, Mr. Hartwell, Mr Wilson , Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Motion carries, 6-0.**
Mr Denham	If you could come up to the podium and just let us know your name and address and what property you are here to speak on.
Mr Denham	Morning.
ITEM #2784	**2108 W 3rd St** **OWNER: 2108 W 3 Tr** **ADDRESS: PO Box 3133, Joplin, MO 64803** **"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the September 23, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (SECOND TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)**
Mr. Gilleland	My name is Denton Gilleland. Address is 2108 W 3rd Street.
Mr Denham	You tell us about your property?
Mr Gilleland	Beg your pardon?
Mr Denham	You tell us a little bit about your property, what's going on with it?
Mr Gilleland	Ok, uh---
Mr Denham	Item # 2784.

Mr. Gilleland	Well, since the last time I've got the roof, uh, framing done and pretty well decked except for the a few little pieces right at the top and the wall, uh, boxed in so I can get the siding on, and all. So, I've made, ah, quite a bit of progress, since I just work by myself, so---
Mr Denham	And you do have a permit in place?
Mr Gilleland	For the roof, yes, or Mr Michaels does. He's the one that actually owns the property.
Mr Denham	This item # 2784, have you been by to check on the progress?
Mr Oliver	I was by, probably a week and a half ago. Denton was out there working on it. He does have a permit for the roof, but as we discussed last time, that's not going to get it off the Agenda. He's been told a couple of time that he will need to get a permit for the rest of it.
Mr Denham	What's your plans for getting a permit for the balance of the construction?
Mr Gilleland	I thought it was up to the individual contractors to get the permits to do their particular trade.
Mr Oliver	You have a major remodel here. It's not just one thing that you're having to work on. So if you are acting as a General, which you still need to get your license, I believe, you fill the application out, you call and get the subs listed that are licensed here in town and fill the application out. If it was just one thing that needed fixed, let's say you were re-wiring, an electrician wanted to come in and pull a permit, they could do that. But in this case, we like to have the permit filled out by the General, listing all the subs and pay for it at one time.
Mr Gilleland	Ok. It was my impression that each contractor got their own permit, like the electrician had to, and so forth, and the plumber.
Mr Denham	Does that make sense?
Mrs Harrington	I think we went over all that last month. I mean, I'm looking at minutes that, pretty much, are exactly what's being said right now.
Mr Denham	That's what I thought, too.
Mrs Harrington	Yeah, I mean, I thought it was clear last---
Mr Gilleland	I thought when I got the, uh, he said when I needed to get the General or a Contractor's license to put the roof on and when I went up to get the permit to get the roof on they said that, since I'm not in the business to, you know, working on other people's houses or going out and soliciting business, that I, I could just get a permit for just putting the roof on for the homeowner.

Mr Wicklund — That may have been the way you understood it, um, that's not actually the case. Whenever there's a project that involves multiple trades, it's considered a remodel in that it requires a General Contractor to oversee the job. So, for your convenience, or for the General Contractor's convenience, we issue one permit that will cover all the trades. Now, because you own multiple properties, the City looks at that as you're operating a business. They are rental properties. You are not allowed to do, I have allowed landlords to build and even put roofs on their rentals, however, whenever it is a permit that involves several trades and include electrical, plumbing, HVAC work, that type of thing, you would be acting as a General Contractor. So the City allows you to act as a General Contractor one time in a twelve month period, on one project without a license. I don't know if you have been issued a permit, I know you were issued the roofing permit. That won't count against you, so I don't know if you've been issued a permit within the last 12 months or not. If you have, then you need to go find a General Contractor that's willing to oversee the project and be listed on the permit or you need to get your own General Contractor's license in place, which I recommend, highly. With landlords that own multiple properties, you need to either have a really good relationship with a good General Contractor or get your own license because you'd be using that license regularly.

Mr Gilleland — Ok, Ok. I could go down right now and see if I can get it, then.

Mr Wicklund — That would be fine, then. We would need to know, and I, I have not been in the house. I'm not familiar. I am going off what Jeff, um, reported, but with that permit, if you have not been issued a permit within a year, we could put you down as the General Contractor but we still need to know who the licensed electrician, plumbers, any of the subs that are going to be working, they will be listed on that permit as well.

Mr Gilleland — I will probably get Bill's Electric to do the electric.

Mr Wicklund — We just need to know that whenever you get the permit.

Mr Gilleland — Oh. Can I go down and get the permit, then---

Mr Wicklund — It would be better if Jeff or I was there because we need to make sure that this permit covers all the work that needs to be done to satisfy the Board and there's no body down there right now because we are up here.

Mr Oliver — You need to determine, besides the electrical contractor, the HVAC guy, your plumber guy, that's all that needs to be on the permit. So you need to visit with them, get bids, whatever you need to do. But those need to be put on there.

Mr Gilleland	Don't need new HVAC. It's already there and, ah, I guess the only other thing would be a plumber. I mean, the plumbing is in the house but it probably needs some repair, I'm sure.
Mr Oliver	Oh, I'm sure.
Mr Wicklund	Part of the purpose of this is to figure out what your plan is. It doesn't sound like you really have much of a plan. I mean, you don't know if the plumbing works? Is the water on?
Mr Gilleland	No.
Mr Wicklund	Oh. Do you plan on renting it out within the next year?
Mr Gilleland	Planning on renting it or selling it.
Mr Wicklund	How long have you owned it?
Mrs Harrington	He doesn't, do you?
Mr Gilleland	No. This gentleman I am buying it from--- I mean, it was in bad shape when I bought it, so there wasn't any way to test various things out.
Mr Oliver	I know there's suppose be, to this case in particular, but you do have a history, Denton, with other properties and this is just a personal opinion, sitting up here, but why do you not want to get your General Contractor's license? You say you are not out soliciting but I deal with you several times a year on properties. Why not just get the license?
Mr Gilleland	Usually, I just do minor repairs on the properties. I usually don't, you know, completely tear them down and re-build them. I just---
Mr Oliver	Well, I would basically differ. They're pretty major remodels, several that I have dealt with you on.
Mr Gilleland	Ok.
Mr Oliver	I mean, there's guys behind you that do the same thing. People come up here all the time that have their license. They are trying to do it the right way.
Mr Gilleland	I will go down and see if I can get it then.
Mr Harrington	So you are going to get your General Contractor's license?
Mr Gilleland	Yeah.

Mrs Harrington	And that will be in the minutes, on record now for this date, that on December 9th you said that you would get your license and move forward with this project.
Mr Gilleland	OK. I'll do that.
Mrs Harrington	When we meet you next month, you will have that in hand.
Mr Gilleland	I don't know what they require to get one. I---
Mrs Harrington	Pardon me?
Mr Gilleland	I'm not sure what they require to---
Mrs Harrington	You'll have to have an insurance certificate and a check.
Mr Oliver	Go to the third floor, the Finance Department is down there. There is a lady named Linda and she can help you with all of that.
Mr Gilleland	Ok. Just never gotten one so I'm not---
Mr Oliver	Well, it's about time.
Mrs Harrington	It might come in handy.
Mr Gilleland	Yeah.
Mr Denham	Do we have a motion to continue this Item?
Mr Wilson	**Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2784, 2108 W 3rd St, be continued to our January 27th meeting.**
Mr Denham	**Do we have a second?**
Mr Eastman	**Second.**
Mr Denham	**Motion by Mr Wilson, second by Mr Eastman that Item # 2784, 2108 W 3rd St be continued to our January 27th meeting for Progress Report and Demolition Hearing. All those in favor say "aye", (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None) Motion carries, 6-0.** So next time, if you don't have something to go, we may order this to be demolished or repaired. So you really need to have something ready to go next time.
Mr Gilleland	Ok,

Mr Denham — Alright, thanks. Anybody else like to come up and tell us about a particular project or property? Morning.

ITEM # 2689 — **1320 MISSOURI AVENUE**
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Glove Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (EIGHTEENTH TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Gallagher — Heath Gallagher representing 1320 Missouri Avenue. Demolition permit.

Mr Denham — Item # 2689.

Mr Oliver — I've got a little bit of information. Like he said, they got a Demolition Permit. Um, someone at their office had all they utility sign offs done and then contacted Fred Jordan and he came in and purchased the Demolition Permit this last week. The work has not begun yet, but with the permit in place, it is up to you guys, if you want to release it.

Mr Gallagher — We plan on having it done by the end of the year. That's what we discussed with them, so---

Mr Denham — This has been on our Agenda 18 times. I would rather leave it on until we know it is down. Sometimes, things don't follow through like we think they will. That's my opinion. Do we have a motion?

Mrs Harrington — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2689, at 1310 Missouri, be continued until January 27th for a Demolition Hearing or Progress Report.**

Mr Eastman — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mrs Harrington, seconded by Mr Eastman that Item # 2689, 1310 Missouri, be continued to our January 27th meeting for Progress Report and Demolition Hearing at that time. All those in favor say "aye", (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None) Motion carries, 6-0.**

Mr Oliver — When it's down, I will let the Board know.

Mr Denham — Ok, you don't have to come back if it's down. Thank you! Morning.

ITEM # 2779 — **2514 N KINGDALE**
Item previously ordered demolished, owner request to address the Board.

Mr Abruzzo — Joe Abruzzo, 2514 N Kingsdale.

Mr Wicklund — This is not on the Agenda.

Mr Denham — Yes, it's on there.

Mr Wicklund — Oh, is it?

Mr Denham — it's Item # 2779.

Mr Wicklund — Ok, good. It got on there. If the Board remembers--- this has been ordered demolished. I believe it was in the, what was it, the September meeting?

Mr Paul — It was September or October.

Mr Denham — It was last meeting that we ordered it demolished.

Mr Harrington — It was, actually, last time we made the Demo---

Mr Denham — Have you seen this yet?

Mr Wicklund — Yeah, I--- we are passing around--- um, the contractor has a petition that he went around the neighborhood and he had different property owners sign, stating that they wish to see the house completed, not torn down.

Mr Harrington — Do we have any to certify these folks, make sure they have---

Mr Wicklund — I have no, no I have not.

Mrs Harrington — Oh.

Mr Wicklund — The only other thing I have is, well a couple of things: I did receive another phone call yesterday from one of the property owners that had been to the meeting, complaining about the condition of it. He regretted that she was not going to be here today but wanted me to let the Board know that, in her opinion, she thinks it ought to be demolished and cleared up. I did go by the property yesterday. There wasn't anybody working. There has been some work done within the last month. Some more siding has been put on and I think we have some new photos showing that as well. That's about all I've got.

Mr Paul — And I'll add that Contractor has hired an attorney to have, filed, an appeal on this. Um, I've been trying to do my best about being proactive when they get filed, and so, I did get the Judge to enter a Scheduling Order in place so that it can't sit there indefinitely and, ah, in short, their attorney will have to file some kind of Brief. They will have to start spending legal fees to defend it. That Brief is due in 60 days and so, I think what the attorney indicated to me was that they intended to have this completed if they could proceed before they had to file a Brief, is their idea. It's up to

the Board's discretion whether they want to authorize a building permit to be issued in this case or just let it stand and let the Appeal proceed and let the Judge make a decision on whether or not it should, ah, be upheld.

Mr Denham — So if we were to approve this new permit and then the Appeals not approved, would the demolition still occur? I mean, are we putting in a Stay on the demolition at this point or are we---

Mr Paul — Well, there's an automatic stay in place as long as the appeal is pending so it's not going to be demolished until that's resolved and I think, based on the scheduling order, how it is worded, because we filed a record, then there is their Brief, our Brief and there is oral argument. That looks like April at the earliest. Um, so you, kind of have to weigh whether you think he's going to finish it, basically, before that point as opposed to taking it all the way down through the court process and getting demolished at that point. It is really just a policy decision as to which way you want to proceed on it. We would also want the contractor to sign a waiver with that, indicating that any improvements that he makes to the property is not going to impact the Appeal.

Mr Denham — That was my point. So last month, you did not show up at our meeting. Were you aware of the meeting?

Mr Abruzzo — No. I didn't get the letter until--- I was out of town. We are working in Mound City. So I didn't get the letter 'til, like that day.

Mr Denham — But you knew it was on the Agenda? I mean, from our previous meetings you knew it was on the Agenda.

Mr Abruzzo — No, I--- the last one, which was the October one?

Mr Denham — The one before that one, September.

Mr Abruzzo — No, the one before that, I came.

Mr Denham — Right, but you knew it was still on our Agenda. You knew it had been continued to our October meeting. So you were at our meeting when we said---

Mr Abruzzo — Yeah, but I didn't know the date. I don't know the date. I don't know when you guys--- I knew today from Bryan and that is why I put in a request to be here.

Mr Denham — If we grant a new permit, what would your schedule be? How quick can you get this house---

Mr Abruzzo — Well, we are running into really bad weather so I don't--- I'm not going to sit here--- I would like to get it done ASAP.

Mr Denham — It is pretty much in the dry.

Mr Green — We are---

Mr Denham — If you are going to speak, you need to step to the microphone.

Mr Green — I am Mike Green with Labette Bank. We are the lienholders on the property. I just want to state that we have had zero contact until the demolition was ordered. We knew absolutely nothing about any of this, um, as far as anything mailed to us, sent to us, as far as the lienholders on the property. The money is in place to finish the project. Most of the work, as you can see by the pictures, that remains to be done is on the inside, which can be done during bad weather. The HVAC is in, so you can have the heater running to finish the sheetrock, the electrical, the plumbing and all of it. The only major hold ups would be the outside cement work and the stone on the front.

Mr Denham — It seems like, the last time, there were some issues, framing, um, inspections that failed and had not been corrected. Is any of that been resolved at this point?

Mr Wicklund — No, not yet. There are minor, um, things that needed to be addressed: some anchor bolts placements in the garage, I believe.

Mr Abruzzo — The only thing left on the framing is the anchor bolts that are in and around the house perimeter that needs to be changed out and that's it on the framing.

Mr Wicklund — It passed the sheathing inspection, which allowed him to start are the siding and completing the outside. And those anchor bolts can be seen. As long as he calls for the inspections before he insulates.

Mrs Harrington — Mrs Pattaso came last month. Ah, one of the property owners there by. And at that time she said she had been tracking this. She said I live next door to the house. It's not being worked on. All I can tell you is, I'm sick of looking at it. It's been 62 days, they have been there 8 partial days out of the previous 62." And she was very much in favor of getting some activity going there. Um, so not everybody in the neighborhood is, is for holding off on this demolition.

Mr Denham — I know that one of the complaints from the neighbors was the site, the debris, a mess. Have you been diligent about cleaning it up and keeping up with the---

Mr Abruzzo — Well, everything that is needed to be used is in a neat pile. I don't know what debris she's talking about.

Mr Denham — Well, various materials that were scattered all over the side. I drove by and saw it myself.

Mr Hartwell — It even shows that in our photos, Sir. There's debris down by the road, over the---

Mr Abruzzo — Those are forms that need to be used.

Mr Hartwell — It's not neatly put. It's all scattered throughout the front yard. So, unless that has changed since these---

Mr Abruzzo — No, it's not scattered throughout the front yard. If you drive by there, it's neatly put.

Mrs Harrington — I've been there three times this week looking for some kind of activity and I just feel like, I haven't seen anything move. There is scaffolding, there's siding, there's lumber---

Mr Abruzzo — Yes.

Mrs Harrington — There's dumped concrete, um, and about three ladders, um, and work materials on the back patio where the saw horses are with lumber and siding. So it is not neat and tidy.

Mr Abruzzo — No.

Mrs Harrington — There is a reason that these neighbors that are close to that property are tired of it. And one of the issues I have with this particular property is that it has been on a list of properties that the City Council has been pushing to change the law in Joplin, because of these half dozen to 8 -10 houses, that have lingered, for years under construction. This isn't just a slow project. This house, I believe the initial permit was applied for in, I believe, was it in 2014 or 2015, one of those to. I apologize for not having it. It's in these minutes, I can tell you. But when the governing body started to change the law for an entire industry, based on a handful of properties, there is something wrong. And these are the properties that need to be attended to, today. Because every other contractor in this town is being effected by what you are doing, or not doing. And that is my issue with this property, that, I have said this to you twice, now, I think, in these conversations. I've mentioned that that is one of my main concerns. They are ready to stop letting contractors have permits for more than 6 months. That is based upon this property being listed as being a nuisance and a problem. So from my perspective, there's no reason for us not to take this action because we've dealt with it, for--- it doesn't say.

Mr Oliver — The file is in Jordan's office and he's just went to get it.

Mrs Harrington — That's the bottom line here. There has to be a way for us to start addressing the properties that have been a problem and this one is truly a problem for the neighbors. There is nothing like---

Mr Abruzzo — This particular one is a problem?

Mr Denham — You need to be at the mic, Sir. We got to record this for our minutes, I'm sorry.

Mrs Harrington — There is nothing like a tieback flapping in the wind to annoy a neighbor. We hear that from the neighbors when they come in here all the time.

Mr Denham — Part of the issue is, this neighborhood was destroyed in the Tornado. Many of these neighbors decided to rebuild at their former site. We are going on five and a half years. This only particular property has been an issue before you bought it and now it's continuing on. So, I am try to explain the neighbor's mindset on this. Please get to the mic if you are going to talk. We've got to record this. And if you are done talking, but I asked you earlier, what your schedule is and I don't believe you every answered. So get to the mic and give us what kind of schedule you actually, if we gave you a new permit, what would be, what would we see done in thirty days? What would we see done in sixty days? Contractor, please, not the banker.

Mr Abruzzo — Well, I scheduled the Engineer, not the Engineer, excuse me, the electrician to get in there and get theirs done, because I'd like to do, ah, one permit for the whole thing and that's what we talked about with, I don't know if it was Bryan or Jeff, I forgot who we talked to about it. But we would like to get one inspection done so I can continue to do the insulation and cover everything up. So, whenever I get the permit is when I can go ahead and schedule for an inspection. Now, Mike's Electrical is doing my electrical work, but since I don't have a permit, he really doesn't want to get in there and get kicked off the job. So it is really all based on when I get a permit to continue. I have rock ordered, but my mason guy can't make it there until the beginning of January. That's not on me, that's on him. He's just booked and that why I'm not doing my rock because that's who I always have doing my rock. So, um, as far as the front part of the house being rocked in, it's not going to be until January, the beginning of January.

Mr Denham — Our meeting is January 27. What do you think you can have done by that meeting, if we grant a permit today?

Mr Abruzzo — Well, I'm hoping my electrician, actually, I'm not worried about the electrical. I know he will be in there. But I'm hoping the mason can get in there, weather permitted and finish the rock out in the front. At least it will make the house look a lot better, it being an eyesore. And as far as concrete, I'd like to go ahead in there and do the concrete but again, I don't know what the weather's, it gives me, like, we've poured already several, and all my concrete blankets are used up 'cause it's just too cold. So I'd

like to be able to get, you know, more steps in there, get my retaining walls in there for my dirt, you know, in the front yard. Um, everybody that comes and see it, they like it. I don't know, there's just, maybe, two or three people that are complaining. Really, I got pictures here and I just don't see it being an eyesore. I got concrete siding all the way around, it's done. Cedar trim, cedar posts, I don't see where it's an eyesore.

Mr Wilson — The main concern that I've got is it is not a secured building because you still do not have anything to close that garage area off.

Mr Abruzzo — Well, if it's the garage closing-off area, you just, then I just go ahead and put plywood up.

Mr Wicklund — Ok, so let me back up just a little bit. Ah, to answer your question about whether this specific project is the issue with the Council. I will say, this specific project has been discussed in their work sessions meetings. Yes, it is not the only one, but it has been addressed in their meetings. The original permit was issued, and I've gone through this before, but I will do it again. The original permit was issued in March of 2015. I've dealt with the contractor after that. We have had many discussion, initially. The progress was proceeding, um, at a normal pace. Um, when it really stated slowing down and I really started getting complaints on it, I let him know that he was going to have to speed it up and stay on the project. He assured me he was going to do that. The pace really didn't change any. At one point, the permit totally expired. He, um, requested that the permit be extended. I refused that and said, "You're going to have to show me that you are going to get on the job and stay on it." Within, like the next day or two, he had a crew over that completely roofed it, and so at that point, I went ahead and extended his originally permit. Then progress seemed to stop again. After not feeling like, um, I was not getting anywhere with my discussions with the Contractor, it was placed on the Building Board's Agenda. The first time the Building Board, um, looked at this, was during their August 26th meeting of 2016. On October 28th meeting it was ordered Demolished. I guess, my question to you is, you've got a brand new house, it was ordered demolished over a month ago. What have you done on site in the last month to show the Board and the neighborhood that you're going to be on this? You understand that it is a nuisance and that you are going to finish it quick.

Mr Abruzzo — Well, like I said, I mean, I have done--- the siding is done. The siding part of it.

Mr Wicklund — On three sides of the house, you've put siding on---

Mr Abruzzo — I did it by myself. It's not a small house.

Mr Wicklund — it's not---

Mr Abruzzo — The plumbing is done, the HVAC's done, all the rough-ins. Again the electrician was scheduled to come in, um, but he had some other things he had to do, um other jobs he had to do. Then he called me and said, "that if I get on it, are they going to say something," Well, I said, "Well, I don't know."

Mr Wicklund — You do know. I've explained to you that as long as you didn't go beyond the point of required inspections---

Mr Abruzzo — Right, Right and that's what we're doing, as I, you know, I'd like to get him in there and actually, tomorrow, I was going to get in there tomorrow and change out them bolts and I'm stuck until inspection. To be honest with you, I mean, unless it's good enough for me, I mean, I can clean up the yard and stuff like that and get rid of some of the stuff but, other than that, as far as actual work on the house, I can't until it is inspected, unless you want me to go ahead and insulate it and start sheet rocking it and...

Mr Wicklund — Ok, here's what I think I would have done if I would have been in your shoes and there are circumstances, I'm sure, that I am not aware of. If I had this investment, and it had been ordered demolished, but I was told that, at my own risk, I could go ahead and start working on it, as long as I didn't miss any inspections, I would have grated out the yards, picked up all the material, whatever you were going to use, stack it up neatly in the garage, I would have finished the outside of it, I would have hung a garage door, hung a front door, got the house secured. I don't know if that is going to be enough to satisfy the Board, but when the outside is one hundred percent done, it goes a long ways in satisfying the neighborhood. That hasn't been done. I mean, you have been over there, like you said, by yourself hanging the siding. It surprises me that even having it ordered demolished hasn't bumped it up on your priority with---

Mr Abruzzo — Well, I mean, I don't' know what you guys, I mean, we got a lady taking pictures of me working on it. It, he goes over to Robern and says to Robern which is across the street, she says, "Well, don't think I haven't called the City on it" what would you think. I don't know what goes through you guys' head but, you know, I don't want to get fined on this or nothing. So, I'm trying to play by the rules but at the same time, I'm trying to get as much of it done as I can.

Mr Paul — Didn't Bryan tell you that if you proceeded, you wouldn't, he didn't tell you were going to be fined.

Mr Abruzzo — They said I'm at my own risk.

Mr Paul — So you thought that he would come out and fine you after telling you that?

Mr Abruzzo — Well, someone says you are at your own risk, I don't know, what would you think?

Mr Paul — Well, if you had a question about it, couldn't you have asked him, "What does that mean?"

Mr Abruzzo — I'm sorry, I always thought that when you are at your own risk, that is what it meant.

Mr Paul — Again, you're the one with the question.

Mr Abruzzo — The thing is, I'm trying, you know, I'm trying to play by the rules, and, so I I kind of have to hide behind bushes here. So I---

Mr Paul — I don't think anybody here, whether it's Bryan office or my office or the Board that is trying to play hide the ball with you. I think that if you have a question about anything, anybody is willing to talk with you about it. And if you have additional questions right now, I think it would be a great time to ask them.

Mr Abruzzo — Well---

Mr. Green — I understand the concerns of the neighborhood and, um, it is one of these loans that we, as a counsel, will let you know, we will be here three days a week to make inspections, um, as things proceed forward. There will no long be anything left in the yards. If you give us exactly what you want accomplished by the next Board meeting, I will make sure it gets accomplished. Um, as a bank, we are not just going to sit on a property and let it be demolished. I understand the concerns of you and, and the neighborhood of having him to progress forward and get finished. We are of the same set. As I said, the funds are there. It is ready to move forward and all I need is a--- we want this done and it will be done.

Mr Denham — Joe, at one of the previous meetings you told us that this wasn't really top priority. I don't remember, that's not a quote, but basically you were saying you were doing it when you had the funds and had the time. It can't go on like that. Are you prepared---

Mr Abruzzo — Right, I was---

Mr Denham — No, let me finish. Are you prepared to make the commitment to, if you have to hire the contractors to get it done, then get it done in an expedient manner?

Mr Abruzzo — Well yes, yeah.

Mr Denham — Because we haven't seen that.

Mr Abruzzo — But we--- I was funding it on my own for a while. I just got funding now from the bank to finish it.

Mr Wicklund	Well, that may explain why the bank was never notified.
Mr Oliver	I don't know what our title work had on it, but if the bank wasn't listed on the title work when the case started then---
Mrs Harrington	So the bank has been involved since the beginning?
Mr Abruzzo	Yes.
Mr Wicklund	Then why do you just now have the funds?
Mr Green	Because the owners of the LLC had borrowed money against their own personal property to finish the project.
Mrs Harrington	But we were told in the beginning that this was his own personal project. It wasn't part of the business and he was working on it as he could when he had the money.
Mr Green	Well, originally---
Mrs Harrington	And that's in the record.
Mr Green	I'm not sure what the record was. At the beginning of the project, there's three homes start in Joplin, two of which have been finished and sold. There's a large amount of overages on the property which kind of put a halt with him using his own money. His parents are the owner of LLC. It's a family business and since it has taken this long, they've decided to go ahead and get the funds there. We told them we are going to be involved every day on the project to make sure that it does move on, or that things are being taken care of properly, spent exactly where it needs to go and finished. I don't know about the past meetings, I mean, I haven't been here. So---
Mrs Harrington	So you have been unaware of any of this?
Mr Green	Correct.
Mr Harrington	Or---
Mr Green	A little bit. The first thing I knew about the main part of it was on moving forward with the demolition. That is correct. We knew there were some financial issues at the time, some overages and things that kept it from getting done. He said, "Hey, can we finish these properties. Take some of the money we make from them, us it on this", which was done. And then we decided to do the second loan on the property in Pittsburg to get the project finished.

Mr Denham — Any other questions or comments? So if the Board is inclined to give, issue another permit, the appeal process would still be going through the courts?

Mr Paul — Yes.

Mr Denham — It is not going to stop that?

Mr Paul — No. They're running concurrently.

Mr Denham — And if he successfully completes the project, and everyone is satisfied, I guess, then, at that point the demolition would have a permanent stay.

Mr Paul — I mean, they are the petitioner, so, if they finished it to the Board's satisfaction, I think he'd have to come back here, get you all to agree that it's to your satisfaction, in which case, you could release your demo order which would, in turn, cause them to release their appeal. So you are going to be in the driver's seat, in my opinion, in terms as whether this building complies or no, basically, the entire time, unless, for some reason the appeal were to get resolved ahead of this, which is unlikely.

Mr Wilson — Well, what if we take no action on it, today, and just allow it to go through the system, the court system, as we, you know, as a demolition and everything?

Mr Paul — Well, he would, basically, have the option as of whether he wants to be out there working on this without a permit, um, as we discussed earlier, it's probably unlikely that anybody is going to run him off but he can do that if he wants, and, um, I guess try and show up at another Board meeting, like he has today, to convenience you all that it has been fixed and it should be released. Otherwise, um, his attorney and our office are going to continue to litigate the existing order until the Judge decides whether it was validly entered or not. Keeping in mind that the court standard is not to look at this, what we call DE novo, new, they give your decision deference as an administrative body so, assuming there is not some kind of error in the record or whatever, it, basically, I don't want to use the word presumption, because it is not a legal presumption, but in layman terms, there is a presumption that it is valid and should be upheld. Again, I think what you are doing here, from a policy stand point, is trying to decide whether it's better for the neighborhood to see if he gets it done sooner, then, a demo would actually be conducted.

Mr Gilleland — Excuse me. We already had an inspector go over there, I'm thinking, this was two weeks ago on a Monday, and the plumber was there, just finishing up a few things and the inspector told him he had to get out of the property.

Mr Wicklund — Do you know--- do you have his name?

Mr Gilleland — I don't know who the inspector was. I had poured a foundation pad for JB, who's the plumber on it, ah, I forgot the name of the company, Green, something Green Plumbing.

Mr Paul — And Bryan, presumably, he doesn't have these issues if you all decide to issue a permit.

Mr Gilleland — But they had run, they had run him off the property. Somebody was there with a note pad. That's what he told me when I was at his house.

Mr Paul — Sounds like that was a neighbor rather than someone from the City.

Mr Wicklund — There are a lot of City employees. There's, there's---

Mr Gilleland — Right, again, I don't know who it was, that is why---

Mr Wicklund — I've only got two Building Inspectors out in the file, other than Jeff, and so there's only three.

Mr Gilleland — Right.

Mr Wicklund — And they know what's going on with it. So they wouldn't run anybody off, so, I can't speak for all 400 and some City employees. I don't know. I don't know what the issue was. There may have been some other totally different reason why they needed to stop. I don't know, but it did not come from the Building Department.

Mr Gilleland — Ok. Alright. I don't know who it was, like I said. He just told me that he got run off. He finished it but they were telling him that he needed to get out of there.

Mr Harrington — So they ran him off, but he finished it?

Mr Gilleland — Yeah, he had, like, ten minutes left.

Mr Harrington — I'd like to, um, I'm curious if there is anyone else here that would like to discuss this property. If there's anybody in the audience that---

Mr Denham — Would you step aside and let her speak for a second? Could you give us your name and address, please?

Ms Green — My name is Lindsey Green. We are at 2501 S Kingsdale. We recently moved from 2507. We really like the neighborhood. So, both of our properties, we now own just the one. The second property and the past property both back up to this. We have been taking turns coming to the meetings to hear what would happen and to see that it gets finish.

Mr Harrington — So, Ms Green, today, um, where's that---

Mr Denham — There is a petition he's got several neighbors to sign. I don't know if you are aware of it but several neighbors signed it that they would prefer to have the demolition stayed and allow him to finish just because they think it would be a quicker way of getting this property resolved.

Ms Green — I would love to think that. And I would love not to be looking at this anymore. I would love it not to have affected our appraisal, and it did. On our new home.

Mr Denham — Who said that?

Ms Green — My builder and the appraiser, both told us that. So, hopefully this gets done. My concern is that if we have the demo, how much longer 'til we get that done? My second concern is, the property next door to it, which is also owned by the same LLC, I understand, that we get into another situation that it is either--- And that was to my understanding that it was a personal project. The idea is, get it done. We are concerned with, especially, now that it is cold, that is not, it still is not closed in. Um, I, do we not have a, ah, the last thing I knew, there was not a garage door on it. Um, we, our builder, Jon Adams, also expressed concern as far as the driveway, an inspection on the driveway. There is almost no way for it to, for the angel it had to come off, that that was going to be, that's my concern. That we are going to keep getting held up on passing inspections, on not getting it done. It's also winter. I, I do. I own one business and I help run a second one. I understand that things come up but, at some point it is effecting our neighborhood. I don't want people coming in there and I don't want to see your business vandalize either. We would like to see it done. So, I, I would like to say, yes, please get this done. Please have it done but we were here, I was here in August and we have had different members of our neighborhood here every single month. Even when, when the property hasn't been represented. We just want to see it done. You know, we've got a whole neighborhood or really small children, um, I don't want to see it vandalized, I don't want to see a second project go up and not get finished on the second property. So, I don't know, I don't know what the right answer is and that's up to you guys. But that is still my concern that it still is not done on the second properties and that there is a second property he owns next door. So, in my mind, I would have sold the second property to finish the one and get done with it. But that's not my business but that's what I would have done. That is our neighborhood concern. There are some neighbors that are probably more angry than I am. I am sure you are hearing about it, getting the phone calls, but we just want to see it done or something done or handled. That's ultimately it.

Mr Denham — Thank you.

Ms Harrington — The issue of the weather concerns me because, um, that is an easy out, as far as I'm concerned. There is construction going on all over town. Um, there is something that can be done in almost any weather. So---

Mr Denham — I mean, there's even ways to tent the building.

Mr Harrington — You have to be willing to do it.

Mr Denham — If you don't have blankets, I think they are still making them and selling them. I mean, so don't use that as excuse, but, the driveway is going to be an issue. It is going to be steep but that is your decision.

Mrs Harrington — Well, if you are not aware of the Public Works policy, now, on, um, getting those driveways inspected before they are poured, um, many contractors in town have been pulling driveways out because the driveway approaches are not at the right angel. They're being very strict about that. So, um, I suggest that if you do intend to work on this house, under a building permit, that you be thoroughly, thoroughly educated on what is being expected right now.

Mr Paul — I guess my only other comment to the Board might be that, I don't think that assuming that your permit would be conditioned on a waiver. Those waivers say that, puts in writing, you are doing this at your own risk. And what that does, is, it says that whenever the court considers the Appeal, they are considering the building on the day you held the hearing. They are not considering any of the work he puts into it after that point. And, so, I don't think you prejudice your Appeal by issuing the permit. And I think, that if anything, you a reputing the contractor into the position where he has more skin in the game if he puts another $5,000.00 or $10,000.00 into it that is now subject to demolition, if that has any bearing on anybody's decision.

Mr Denham — My goal is to see this thing finished. At the last meeting, I felt like the demolition was the quickest way to see this property resolved. You can get it done. Really put the resources and the man power and the money to see this done, I don't have probably issuing him a permit and letting it go through the system. I just want to see some relief for the neighbors. I want to see this finished so that when they drive by it they are not reminded this every time. That is my goal. Whatever is the quickest way to get that done, I am open to---

Mr Green — On one of the issues brought up by Ms Green, the other lot is sold, so they will not be assuming another project in the neighborhood.

Mr Denham — Ok, thank you.

Mr Green — It will be closed in about two weeks.

Mr Denham — Thank you.

Mr Denham — Any other questions or comments? Does the staff have a recommendation?

Mr Wicklund — I would just request that, if the Board chooses, um, to grant permission for a new building permit, if there's any conditions to go along with that, to make them clear so that I can identify that when I permit it. Whether that is a time period, you can set any time of a time period on it you want, um, just make the conditions clear so that I can get that included with the permit, if that is what the Board chooses.

Mr Harrington — Would it be appropriate to, um, with the building permit, have the staff work a time line so that it's realist to hold them to a time line that's established by the staff?

Mr Wicklund — I would rather not.

Ms Harrington — I am sorry, but when I hear Joe talk, I've heard various stories, or, I don't mean, I'm not to be disrespectful, I hear, I hear, I hear what you feel we need to hear each time, and it's not always the same thing. And so, that's my point is, you can tell us there will be a time line but that's why I established the weather issue. I am not going to accept that "the weather is getting cold and my guy can't put the rock in." I sat in my office and watched an entire building have brick put on it in the middle of a winter that I could not believe was below zero for a certain amount of time. I know it can be done. You have to want to do it. You have to be able to, um, put the effort into it. So I'm suspicious of a time line that will be produced, um, that won't be adhered to because of, this happened, or my plumber couldn't get there until January. There are people looking for work. I know this. There are contractors all over town that could use the work. So let them work.

Mr Paul — But I don't know if the bank and the contractor are on the same page, but when I was in court with your attorney this week, he seems to indicate that you would be able to have this done in 60 days.

Mr Green — We are on the page, as you expressed, we're not going to use the weather as an excuse or anything else. The project will move forward as quickly as possible, pending inspections and getting things done and getting the property to where the Council and neighbors are happy with the property that's on it. And I can assure that, as I said, we will be there a minimum of two to three days a week and I have extensive contract background and if I have to get them hired myself, I will.

Mr Denham — Any other comments or questions? Do we have a motion? I guess one option is to take no action. It's in the Appeal process. It has already been ordered demolished. The other option is to grant a provisional permit. Is that correct?

Ms Harrington — What exact provisions do you feel like we should put on it, Mr Chairman?

Mr Denham — I think there needs to be a time limit, not the standard sixty or six months. And, ah---

Mr Paul — The waiver.

Mr Denham — The waiver.

Mr Wicklund — That requirement, all by itself, would be defined at a Certificate of Occupancy, would need to be issued by a certain date. That's when the project is complete. Just to make sure that, if that is what the Board wills, then, OK.

Mr Oliver — I have a question for the banker. You mentioned that you would make sure that this moves forward. Have you, in the last month or so, already spoke to subs that you may have to intervene and get them on the job site. Has any of that been discussed with subs or anything?

Mr Green — I, I have not but I was waiting to, but I know plenty, plenty of subs. As a banker we do lots of construction projects in Missouri and Kansas and Oklahoma and we can have that done very quickly.

Mr Paul — I will add to Jeff's comment, that, I'm not sure if you are the gentleman I spoke with from the bank, earlier, ah---

Mr Green — I am.

Mr Paul — I intended to believe that the bank intends to be exercising the kind of day-to-day oversight he's talking about today.

Mr Oliver — So any subs that you know, I mean, I guess, is your gut telling you that, hey, if I talk to them they can be there within a week?

Mr Green — Well, I can't say that they can be here within a week. I mean most of , most of them are pretty busy but we will go through the process of finding some. I mean, I'm very good friends with all the top people at Crossland Construction and various places who use numerous subs and have many that are personal friends of mine.

Mr Wicklund — I actually came up with one more questions I thought of and it will help that the representative from the bank is here. Do you have a dollar amount that is anticipated to see this through completion? I need to know that for one reason, if the Board chooses to grant a new permit, I'll need to know what's left to do on the house, dollar wise.

Mr Green — Right now we have it set at, ah, the new money is fifty thousand with a potential additional fifteen.

Mr Wicklund — I think that helps, in my opinion, I think will help the Board know what the expectation is from the Bank. It will also help me in the permitting side.

Mr Denham — Did you say sixty?

Mr Green — Up to a total of sixty-five.

Mrs Harrington — Well, I have tried to envision a scenario where we get ninety days down the road, the house is basically complete but no C of O has been issued. That's the demand we've put out, that we have to have a C of O before we will do--- before we considered doing this. It's got to be to that point and we're sitting her in ninety days with an unfinished project and, and ah, you know, they are further along, the bank's got the money in it and, but he hasn't met our expectation. Then where will we go? We are painted into a corner.

Mr Denham — Will the demolition proceed?

Mr Wilson — Well, we would add on that, if we decide on ninety, I'd add on to the end of that time period that we would have a vehicle to issue a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr Denham — Say that again.

Mr Wilson — Say we give them ninety days to finish it up. At the end of that ninety days, part of the requirement would be, that a, that it would be eligible for a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr Denham — Right, that's what we're saying. That would be a condition. I think ninety days is more than enough to get that work done. I really do. In fact, I was leaning towards sixty, but---

Ms Harrington — Well, but sixty sounds right, but I don't want to sit here and do this again because the driveway isn't poured because it was wrong and they couldn't, you know, they couldn't get the C of O. I mean, you will have to have everything done now to get the C of O. It's not just whether the house has passed inspection, it's whether the driveway has passed inspection. So I just don't want to, I don't want to do this again. It almost seems easier not to do anything than to anticipate doing this again.

Mr Denham — Yeah, it may be easier. I don't know. But my goal is to get something done for the neighbors.

Mrs Harrington — Right.

Mr Denham — And if this the way to see this project done, I am for it. But .l---

Mrs Harrington — The next meeting is seven weeks from today, which is 49 days not 60.

Mr Paul — I guess that's another question, is do you want them to---

Mr Denham — That's a good point.

Mr Paul — To be back here in January even if you give them a sixty or ninety day window?

Mr Denham — Yes.

Mr Paul — Or do you not --- Ok, that is a Yes?

Mr Denham — I would. I don't want to speak for the whole Board.

Mr Oliver — Bryan, if they do nothing and he continues to do the work, are you still going to do the inspections?

Mr Wicklund — No. We won't do any inspections unless there is a permit in place. Now, with that being said, he chose, like I told him a little over a month ago, the inspections have been done and passed to the point that the exterior of the home and the property could be a one hundred percent complete, that pouring of the driveway that Crystal is referring to, that does require an inspection that obviously, hasn't been done yet. So except for the driveway, and even that, I only referring to the approach, the first ten feet, the exterior without even issuing a permit, at this point, theoretically, could be performed.

Mr Oliver — If they are talking about C of O, we are going to need electrical, plumbing, basically. We won't be able to do those without a permit.

Mr Wicklund — Right.

Mrs Harrington — You can't sheet rock without another permit.

Mr Oliver — So I think---

Mr Wicklund — And he knows that. This isn't his first house.

Mr Oliver — But I'm kind of saying that---

Mrs Harrington — For on the record.

Mr Denham — I'm not saying that I just want to finish on the outside. I am talking about C of O as well.

Mrs Harrington — Yeah, it's got to be all the way done.

Mr Denham	Well, I think we've kicked this can around the block. We have a motion?
Mr Wilson	**Mr Chairman, I make a motion that for Item # 2779, 2514 N Kingsdale, that a ninety day permit be issued and at the end of that ninety days it--- that the project should be ready for a Certification of Occupancy.**
Mr Denham	**And waiver.**
Mr Wilson	**And to waiver the, ah—I I can't think of it now.**
Mr Paul	**Conditioned on a waiver that, ah, any improvements to the property be considered in the pending appeal.**
Mr Pommert	**Second.**
Mr Denham	**Motion by Mr Wilson, second by Mr Pommet, that Item # 2779, 2515 N Kingsdale, be granted a ninety day permit with a conditional waiver. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (Mrs Harrington voted "Nay") Motion carries, 5-1.**
Mr Oliver	When do we want to have it back?
Mr Denham	Ah---
Mr Pommert	I think every month.
Mr Denham	Yeah, they need to come to our January meeting. Do we need to have that in our motion?
Mr Paul	I don't think so. You just tell them. I mean, you're not going to take action on it in January but---
Mr Denham	And we do have a correct address for him now?
Mr Oliver	You are at Tom in Webb, on Tom Street in Webb right?
Mr Abruzzo	Yeah.
Mr Oliver	And I think you signed in? Sign in and give me your address and I think we have it now. I think we got one letter to you but let's make sure.
Mr Paul	Since you are represented, I'll send the waiver to your attorney to review.
Mr Gilleland	Ok.

Mr Wicklund	So, ninety days from today, I believe will be March the 10th. The February meeting will be on February the 24th, So, if the job progresses and it is, uh, they come to each meeting, there will just be that January meeting and then the February 24th meeting. By the time the March meeting comes around, the ninety days has expired.
Mr Denham	Right.
Mr Wicklund	So,the intent of the Board was for the permit to be good for ninety days from today's date.
Mr Denham	Yeah, and then, by that meeting there will be a couple of weeks in there that you can report back the outcome.
Mr Gilleland	Ok.
Mr Denham	Good luck.
Mr Wicklund	You probably need to plan on coming in either this afternoon or Monday and I will get you that permit.
Mr Gilleland	Ok.
Mr Green	And just to make sure, do we need to be at the next meeting with the progress report?
Mr Denham	Yes.
Mr Green	Ok.
Mr Denham	And the February meeting.
Mr Green	Sure. Thank you.
Mr Denham	Thank you.
Mrs Harrington	The fourth Friday.
Mr Denham	January 27th.
Mr Gilleland	Thank you.

ITEM # 2786 **211 S PARK**

OWNER: Lois Shilkett
ADDRESS: 812 S Pearl Ave, Joplin, MO 64801
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 29, 2016 meeting for a

"Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (THIRD TIME BEFORE THE BOARD).

Mr Denham — Morning. Could you speak into the mic, please? We have to record this.

Mrs Shilkett — Louis Shilkett. I am here to address 217 S Park, in Joplin.

Mr Denham — 417 S Park.

Mrs Shilkett — Two.

Mr Oliver — 211 S Park

Mrs Shilkett — 211 S Park?

Mr Denham — That is Item # 2786.

Mrs Shilkett — Well, I have started, we fixed a rim joist, ah, and have started putting the sheet of stuff you put on the outside of the house to, so you can put the siding on to it.

Mr Denham — OK.

Mrs Shilkett — And I have some pictures on my phone, I don't have them printed out, I will be glad to let you see them. I think my man who is doing the work has, ah, asked to have an inspection done this afternoon, was originally this afternoon, but I think he's going to be tied up. He has called to maybe do it next week sometime, ah, so that we can continue and put the siding on the house.

Mr Oliver — Ok I have been by and I have seen where you have got a new seal plate and a box. Um, that probably should have been inspected before the sheathing was put on. Did you come in and get your permit?

Mrs Shilkett — Yes.

Mr Oliver — Ok. Alright, if he is calling today or tomorrow for the inspection, that's fine. We'll get out and take a look at it. Just continue it to the next meeting, if that's what you want to do. There is being a little bit of progress made. I did meet them on the job site since the last meeting. Gave them a list of what needed to be done.

Mr Hartwell — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2786, 211 S Park be continued to our January 27th meeting for a Progress Report and a Demolition hearing.**

Mr Eastman — **Second.**

Mr Denham	**Motion by Mr Hartwell, second by Mr Eastman, that Item # 2786, 211 S Park, be continued to our January 27th meeting for a Progress Report and Demolition Hearing. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).** There's quite a bit of debris stacked around. Can you get that cleaned up before the next meeting?
Mrs Shilkett	Yes.
Mr Denham	Thank you.
Mrs Shilkett	Because he tore one whole wall off to put the, and that is in the..
Mr Denham	Yeah, I mean, it kind of stacked up but it looks like it could blow around pretty easily.
Mrs Shilkett	Yes, we will take care of it.
Mr Denham	Thank you.
Mr Oliver	Lois, right
Mrs Shilkett	Pardon me
Mr Oliver	Lois?
Mrs Shilkett	Yes, sir.
Mr Olive	I have the address of 812 N Pearl, is that correct?
Mrs Shilkett	That is correct.
Mr Oliver	Ok, I am getting my Certified Letters back.
Mrs Shilkett	Really?
Mr Oliver	Yes. So you may want to make sure you sign for those. That way
Mrs Shilket	OK
Mr Oliver	I know you are aware of these meetings. Obviously, you were. You are hear.
Mrs Shilkett	OK.
Mr Oliver	That would help, Thank you.

Mrs Shilkett — So, January 27th?

Mr Oliver — Yes, ma'am

Mr Denham — Yes, ma'am

Mrs Shilkett — Thank you.

Mr Denham — Thank you.

Mr Paul — We've got a couple of demo properties to bust through if you guys are inclined.

Mr Denham — Which one is the first item?

ITEM # 2758 — **1116 E Hills St**
OWNER: Isidro Ruiz
ADDRESS: PO Box 929, Neosho, MO 64850
"Demolition Hearing' has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (EIGHTH TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Paul — 2758.

Mr Denham — We have a motion to have Item # 2758. 1116 E Hill be the subject of a Dangerous Building Hearing? Somebody like to make that motion?

Mr Wilson — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2758, 1116 E Hill, be the subject of a Dangerous Building Hearing.**

Mr Eastman — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mr Wilson, second by Mr Eastman, that Item # 2758, 1116 E Hills St., be the subject of a Dangerous Building Hearing. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).** The Board turns it over to the City.

Mr Paul — Thank you. This is the Building Board of Appeals meeting in the Joplin Municipal Building, this 9th day of December, 2016, for the purpose of conducting a dangerous building hearing. The City will present its evidence first, after which the public has a right to cross-examine witnesses and be heard, as well as present witnesses or exhibits. The case for today is Item # 2758 on the Agenda, also known as 1116 E Hill St. The City calls Jeff Oliver.

Ms Dunn — You do solemnly affirm, under the penalty of perjury, that the testimony you shall give in the matter at issue shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — You please state your name and occupation?

Mr Oliver — Jeff Oliver, Building Inspector for the City of Joplin.

Mr Paul — How long have you been employed in your current position with the City of Joplin?

Mr Oliver — Eight years.

Mr Paul — And have you had in the performance of your duties, had the occasion to inspect the property known as 1116 E Hill St?

Mr Oliver — I have.

Mr Paul — I am going to show you what is marked as exhibit #1. Can you identify these for me? Or, rather, do you recognize them?

Mr Oliver — Yes, these are photos that I have taken of the property. Ah, these photos here are from May 26th of this year.

Mr Paul — And do the photographs show a reasonable likeness of the premises in their present condition?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — I'm going to show you, I'm sorry. What, if anything have you done to ascertain ownership of the property? If there's no objection, I offer Exhibit #1.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Oliver — I had a title search done.

Mr Paul — I am going to show that it has been marked, Exhibit #2. Do you recognize that?

Mr Oliver — Yes, it is a title search, um, dated January 19, of 2016. Shows a John and Sarah Abernathy as the owners.

Mr Paul — And to be clear if you look on the exceptions on the third page there, um, does it appear on the title search that this property was originally owned by a John Hutchison?

Mr Oliver	That's correct.
Mr Paul	And it appears that that property was sold at a tax sale, is that correct?
Mr Oliver	That's correct.
Mr Paul	It was purchased by a man named Taylor Kent or Kent Taylor.
Mr Oliver	Yes.
Mr Paul	And he, then, sold it to John and Sarah Abernathy who appear on the first page, correct?
Mr Oliver	Correct.
Mr Paul	And I am going to go ahead and jump to Exhibit #8, here. Do you recognize this?
Mr Oliver	Yes, this is a Quit Claim Deed that we received from a Mr Ruiz.
Mr Paul	And, so, that shows John and Sarah Abernathy transferring it to Mr Ruiz.
Mr Oliver	That's correct.
Mr Paul	Ok. If there's no objection I offer Exhibits #2 and #8.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	And Jeff, I'm just going to, ah, go through that chain of ownership here on our notice. Um, I guess, before we start with Mr Hutchison, I will show you what has been marked as Exhibit # 4. Do you recognize that?
Mr Oliver	Yes. It's ah, from the Missouri Courts records.
Mr Paul	And it looks like there was a guardianship opened for Mr Hutchison, is that correct?
Mr Oliver	That's correct.
Mr Paul	OK. Um, what if anything, did you do to notify the owners of the property of this action?
Mr Oliver	Sent Certified Letters.
Mr Paul	And to be clear on Exhibit #4, who does it show as the, ah, the guardian and conservator for Mr Hutchison?

Mr Oliver	Angela Casavecchia.
Mr Paul	And that's the Public Administrator for Jasper Count, correct?
Mr Oliver	Correct.
Mr Paul	Thank you. If there's no objections, I offer Exhibit #4.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	You were talking about certified letters that you sent earlier, correct?
Mr Oliver	Yes.
Mr Paul	I'm going to show you what's marked as Exhibit #3. Do you recognize those?
Mr Oliver	This is, ah, several Certified Letters that was sent to Angie Casavecchia. Angie and John on here.
Mr Paul	That's correct. After we discovered that he had a guardian, we started sending them to his guardian, is that correct?
Mr Oliver	Correct. And I do have signed receipts from all letters that were sent to Angela.
Mr Paul`	And it looks like those letters were sent up through about the same time as the Abernathy's transferred the property to Mr Ruiz, correct.
Mr Oliver	Correct.
Mr Paul	So what's the date of the most recent letter?
Mr Oliver	June 8th of this year.
Mr Paul	Do you have a signed receipt for that letter?
Mr Oliver	Yes.
Mr Paul	If there is no objection, I would like to offer Exhibit #3.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	I am going to show you what is marked as Exhibit #5. Do you recognize Exhibit #5?
Mr Oliver	Certified Letter sent to Kim Taylor. The most recent on that is also June 8th and I do have a signed receipt for it.

Mr Paul	Thank you. If there is no objection, I'd like offer Exhibit #5.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	And I will show you what has been marked as Exhibit #6. Do you recognize Exhibit #6?
Mr Oliver	Yes, these are Certified Letters that were sent to John and Sarah Abernathy. I do have a signed receipt for the most recent one, which was also June 8th.
Mr Paul	Thank you. If there is no objection, I offer Exhibit #6.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	And finally, I will show you a vein, Exhibit #7. Do you recognize Exhibit #7?
Mr Oliver	Yes, these are Certified Letters sent to Mr Ruiz at the address in Neosho, latest one being November 3rd of this year and I do have a signed receipt for that letter.
Mr Paul.	Ok, Thank you. If there's no objection, I offer Exhibit #7.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr. Paul	And just to be clear as to how those dates worked out, looked like it was about March the 24th of this year that Mr Ruiz took ownership of the property. Does that sound about right?
Mr Oliver	Yes.
Mr Paul	Ok. What, if anything else, did you do to notify the owners of the property of this action?
Mr Oliver	It was published in the Joplin Globe.
Mr Paul	I'm going to show you what's marked as Exhibit #9. Do you recognize Exhibit #9?
Mr Oliver	This is the Affidavit of Publication from the Joplin Globe with the publication dates of February 4th, 11th, 18th and 25th of this year, showing that 1116 E Hill was advertised.
Mr Paul	If there's no objection, I offer Exhibit #9.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What school and education have you had in the Building Industry that qualifies you as an expert in the construction of buildings?

Mr. Oliver — I have been a general contractor on several residential projects in the Joplin area over a twenty year period.

Mr Paul — And from the inspection of the property, do you have an expert opinion as to whether these premises constitute a Dangerous Building as defined in Chapter 26, Article X, Section 26-612 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Joplin. And if so, in which definitions of the Dangerous Building do you base your opinion, if any?

Mr Oliver — Yes, I do. Sub-section, Line 4; Whenever the building or structure, exclusive of the foundations, shows substantial damage, deterioration of the supporting/non-supporting members or the enclosing or outside walls or wall coverings.

Mr Paul — Thank you. Could you explain exactly how the building fails to meet that definition?

Mr Oliver — Yes, I'm going to go ahead and read the rest and then I'll address your question, if you don't mind. As you can see by the photos being passed around, ah, this was a vacant property. It's been vacant for some time. Um, it is severely dilapidated; windows open, wall deteriorating, letting the elements in., then gutted on the inside and has set vacant for some time. It is just overall, it is deteriorating. Line 12; Whenever the building, structure or land it occupies exists or is maintained in violation of any specific requirement or prohibition applicable to such building or structure, or land provided by this Article or other applicable laws, ordinances of State or City relating to the condition, use, location or maintenance of the building, structure, or land. Again you can see by the photo, um, this is a pretty severely dilapidated structure and certainly does not meet the City of Joplin's, uh, Codes or Ordinances in the present condition. Line 13; Whenever a building or structure has become an attractive nuisance to children or is open to unauthorized or unlawful entry. While at one point there was an attempt to secure the property, the back door of the property has remained open for several months, allowing entry into the structure. Um, Line 19; Whenever any portion of the building or structure remains on site during construction or demolition work is abandoned. Again, as you can see by the photos, um, there's been some gutting and things taken place on the inside probably, actually making the structure worse, and, ah, while there was a permit purchased, which will be addressed here in a minute, there's been no progress. So, I believe it to be, at this point, abandoned.

Mr Paul — Thank you, Jeff. If there's no objection, I offer Chapter 26, Articles IX and X, of the Joplin Code of Ordinances as evidence before the Board and also ask that the record be held open to include a copy of the Globe on the dates of publication.

Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	And I would also request that the Boards take judicial notice of this file, including minutes of the previous meetings. It would now be the time for the defendants' opportunity to cross examine the witness. We don't see anybody in the audience. We are not aware of anybody who intended to be here today. Does the Board have any questions for the witness on this particular piece of property? I see none. The City rest, so now would be the defendant's opportunity to testify, call witnesses. Again, we see no one in the gallery. We are not aware of anyone who intended to be here today and therefore, I turn the case back over to the Board for a decision.
Mr Denham	Did we pass around the photos that were referenced?
Mr Harrington	Yes, we did.
Mr Denham	Ok, I must have forgot.
Mr Oliver	Did you not see them, Kyle?
Mr Denham	I think I did, I just didn't recall. Thank you.
Mr Paul	Actually, if I could back up, um, Jeff is this a letter from the neighbors in the file?
Mr Oliver	Yes. I would say this is pretty old. That was brought in by the neighbor.
Mr Paul	And what, what, I guess, for the record, I've shown you what has been labeled as Exhibit #10. Can you tell the Board what it is?
Mr Oliver	I'll just read what it says, "The following houses located on East Hills Street, Joplin, Missouri. The City should see that they are repaired. They have been in this poor, deteriorating condition for a long time. The City needs to do something for this neighborhood." The other, there's a second home beside it that's also vacant. I have not brought it to the Board, at this point, but it does mention that property, as well. It goes on to say that "they feel they need to be taken down and the lots leveled and cleared, and maintained, per City of Joplin Codes."
Mr Paul	So basically it's a letter a neighbor has written, complaining about the condition of this property?
Mr Oliver	Correct.
Mr Paul	I'd add Exhibit #10 to the record, if I could.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — Ok. Um, back to where we were, now. We'd turn it back over to the City for, or the Board for a decision.

Mr Denham — In the motion, we need to revoke the current permit, because there is permit in place, so we need to revoke that, whoever makes the motion. Would somebody like to make a motion?

Mr Eastman — **I will. Mr Chairman, Item # 2758, 1116 E Hill St, be considered a Dangerous Building and so Demolished according to City Code, Chapter 26, Articles IX-X, Section 612, Sub-Section, Lines 4, 12, 13, and 19. I also include, um, revoking the current building permit.**

Mr Hartwell — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mr Eastman, second by Mr Hartwell, that Item # 2758, 1116 E Hill St, be considered, be declared a Dangerous Building, ordered demolished in accordance to the City of Joplin, Code of Ordinances under Chapter 26, Articles IX-X, Section 26-612, Sub-sections 4, 12, 13 and 19. The demolish will include outbuildings and the current building permit will be revoked. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).** The Board turns it over to the City.

ITEM # 2780 — **2318 W 4th ST**
OWNER: Cassie R Craddick
ADDRESS: 2318 W 4th St, Joplin, MO 64801
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (THIRD TIME BEFORE THE BOARD).

Mr Paul — The next one we have is Item # 2708, which is 2318 W 4th St.

Mr Denham — 2780?

Mr Paul — Yes, Sir.

Mr Denham — Do we have a motion to have #2780, ah, declared a Dangerous Building?

Mr Wilson — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item #2780, 2318 W 4th St, be considered a Dangerous Building and that a Demolition Hearing be held.**

Mr Pommert — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mr Wilson, second by Mr Pommert, that Item # 2780, 2318 W 4th St., be the subject of a Dangerous Building Hearing. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).** The Board turns it over to the City.

Mr Paul — Thank you. This is the Building Board of Appeals meeting in the Joplin Municipal Building, this 9th day of December, 2016, for the purpose of conducting a dangerous building hearing. The City will present its evidence first, after which the public has a right to cross-examine witnesses and be heard, as well as present witnesses or exhibits. The case for today is Item # 2780 on the Agenda, also known as 2318 W 4th St. The City recalls Jeff Oliver and I will remind you that you are under oath. Would you please state your name and Occupation?

Mr Oliver — Jeff Oliver, Building Inspector for the City of Joplin.

Mr Paul — And how long have you been employed in your current position with the City of Joplin?

Mr Oliver — About eight years.

Mr Paul — And have you, in the official performance of your duties, had the occasion to inspect the property know as, 2318 W 4th St?

Mr Oliver — Yes, I have.

Mr Paul — I am going to show you what has been marked as Exhibit #1, here. Ah, do you recognize those?

Mr Oliver — Yes, these are photos that I, ah, took just yesterday, actually, of the property at 2318 W 4th St.

Mr Paul — And do the photographs show a reasonable likeness of the premises in their present condition?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — If there is no objection, I offer Exhibit #1.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What, if anything, did you do to ascertain ownership of the property?

Mr Oliver — I had a title search done.

Mr Paul — I am going to show you what is marked Exhibit #2. Do you recognize Exhibit #2?

Mr Oliver	Ah, yes, it is a title search showing a Cassie Caddick as the owner.
Mr Paul	If there is not objection, I offer Exhibit #2.
Mr Denham	The Board accepts.
Mr Paul	What, if anything did you do to, ah, notify owners of this action?
Mr Oliver	Sent Certified Letters.
Mr Paul	I am going to show you what is marked as Exhibit #3. Do you recognize Exhibit #3?
Mr Oliver	This is a stack of Certified Letters sent to Cassie. The most recent being dated November 3rd of this year and I do have a signed receipt for that.
Mr Paul	And to be clear, Jeff, um, Cassie is aware of this action, correct?
Mr Oliver	That is correct.
Mr Paul	And, ah, you have been in contact with her and her husband with regard to this property, is that correct.
Mr Oliver	That is correct.
Mr Paul	I am going to show you what is marked as Exhibit #4. Do you recognize Exhibit #4?
Mr Oliver	Yes, um, this is an e-mail that I received from Dan, who is her husband. Ah, basically, short note in here, it says, "Mr Oliver, thank you very much for assisting us on this. As you can imagine, this has been very stressful for us. Your advice has proven very valuable to us. As we discussed, we will sign the Consent Form and return it, notarized as needed. If you need anything else from us, please feel free to contact us." So, in phone conversations, ah, and e-mails here, they agreed to sign a consent form. I have e-mailed that to them, and as it states, they will sign it, have it notarized and sent back.
Mr Paul	You just don't have it back yet?
Mr Oliver	Correct.
Mr Paul	And it looks like that e-mail is signed by both Cassie and her husband, correct?
Mr Oliver	Yes.

Mr Paul — Ok. If there's no objection, I offer Exhibits #3 and #4.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — Continuing talking about the letters you sent, I am going to show this as Exhibit #5. Do you recognize Exhibit #5?

Mr Oliver — Yes, this is a stack of letters, ah, sent to a Jeremiah Bommarito I do have a signed receipt from the most resent one which is dated November 3rd of this year.

Mr Paul — And, a notice was sent to Mr Bommarito because he showed as a possible exception on the title search, correct?

Mr Oliver — Correct.

Mr Paul — Specifically, he is, ah, Ms Caddick's ex-husband, correct?

Mr Oliver — Correct.

Mr Paul — If there's no objection, I offer Exhibit #5.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — I'm going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit #6. Do you recognize it?

Mr Oliver — These are Certified Letters sent to Credit Cars of Joplin. Most recent being dated November 3rd and I have a signed receipt for it, as well.

Mr Paul — I will also show you what is marked as Exhibit #7. Do you recognize that?

Mr Oliver — Yes, they are Certified Letters sent to TD Auto Finance, LLC. Most recent, again, being dated November 3rd of this year and I have a signed receipt for it as well.

Mr Paul — And the purpose of those two letters, were that they showed up as potential title exceptions in the form of lien holders on the title work, correct?

Mr Oliver — Correct.

Mr Paul — If there is no objection, I offer Exhibit #6 and #7.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What, if anything else, did you do to notify the owners of the property of this action?

Mr Oliver — It was published in the Joplin Globe.

Mr Paul — I show you what is marked as Exhibit #10. Do you recognize Exhibit #10?

Mr Oliver — It is an Affidavit of Publication I received with the publication dates of, ah, October 6th, October 13th, October 20th and October 27th of this year.

Mr Paul — If there is no objection, I would offer Exhibit #10.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What school and education have you had in the Building Industry which would qualify you as an expert in the construction of Buildings?

Mr Oliver — I've been a General Contractor on several residential projects in the Joplin area of over a twenty year period.

Mr Paul — For an inspection of the property, do you have an expert opinion as to whether nor not these premises constitute a Dangerous Building as defined in Chapter 26, Article X, Section 26-612 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Joplin and if so, in which definitions of the Dangerous Building do you base your opinion, if any?

Mr Oliver — Yes, I do. I'd like to make a note before I give the definition that this property was posted as a Dangerous Structure and has been in front of the Board a time or two, here. Ah, but, ah, this last, this past weekend, there was a fire and basically, destroyed it. So my definition is, ah, Line 6; When any portion, thereof, has been damaged by fire, earthquake, tornado, wind or flood, vandals or any other cause to such an extent that the structure, strength, stability, thereof is materially less than it was before such a catastrophe, or damages less than the minimum requirements of this code for similar new construction. You can see by the photos that have been passed around, the fire that took place here, basically, destroyed the structure.

Mr Paul — Thank you, Jeff. And if there is no objection, I would offer Chapter 26, Articles IX-X of the Joplin Code of Ordinances as evidence before the Board. I request that the record be held open to include a copy of the Joplin Globe on the dates of publication and I would ask that the Board takes judicial notice to its file.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — This would not be the defendant's opportunity to question the witness. We don't see anyone in the gallery, here. Again, we are not aware of anyone who intended to be here today. In fact, the only notice that we have is that the owner intended to consent to this proceeding. Does the Board have any questions to the witness? I see none. The City rests. Again, now would be

the defendant's opportunity to testify. We don't see anyone in the Gallery, not aware of anyone who intended to be here today and the City turns it back over to the Board for a decision.

Mr Denham — Do we have a motion for demolition?

Mr Eastman — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2780, 2318 W 4th St, be considered a Dangerous Building and so demolished according to City Code, Chapter 26, Articles IX-X, Section 26-612, Sub-section Line 6 and including any out buildings.**

Mr Wilson — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mr Eastman, second by Mr Wilson, that Item # 2780, 2318 W 4th St., be declared a Dangerous Building and ordered demolished in accordance to the City of Joplin, Code of Ordinances under Chapter 26, Articles IX-X, Section 26-612, Sub-sections 6. All those in favor of the demolition say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).**

Mr Oliver — I just want to add to this case that, ah, if I get the consent form back the early part of this next week, that will allow us to move forward a little faster. I will not have to wait the thirty day grace period and what have you. So, hopefully, that will take place and we will be able to move quicker on it.

Mr Denham — Had they already consented before the fire?

Mr Oliver — No.

Mrs Harrington — Is it vandalized?

Mr Oliver — When I originally posted it, it was in pretty poor condition; was open, been vacant, overgrown, just in very poor condition.

Mr Paul — On this one, I did all the searching I could, yesterday. I don't think I'm going to find better contact information. So, unless you think she is going to return our phone call, I'm ready to take this one.

Mr Oliver — Nothing has changed since I posted that a while back and I honestly---

Mr Paul — If this is her phone number, do you think she will call us back, or no?

Mr Oliver — I mean, I can try, if you want. I can try to call her right now. I have no idea. I had a conversation with her before and let her know I put it on the agenda. I gave her some time before I put it on the Agenda. She had been

in early on, at one point, trying to obtain a permit and then it's kind of like she has just set it aside.

ITEM # 2781 **519 N Jackson**
OWNER; Laura Julien
ADDRESS: 317 E Fountain Rd, Joplin, MO 64801
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (THIRD TIME BEFORE THE BOARD).

Mr Paul — I guess we are looking at the Board for some direction on this. This is Item # 2781, which is 519 N Jackson. The situation on this is if the owner had a building permit at one point, she listed some contact information on that. The address is no long listed, per Beacon, as being owned by her. This 317 E Fountain Rd. There is also a cell phone on here that we have left some voice mails on that have not been returned. Normally, I am able to find these people on Case Net or someone, 'cause everybody has had a traffic ticket or a divorce. Um, this person, I have not been able to locate, so, ah, normally, whenever we don't have that letter, I am able to find them. I guess we'd be looking to you all. Do you want us to take this, today, on the basis of publication or do you prefer that we try and call her for another month or so and see if we can't get some actual notice on her? Because, I don't think, even though she has been in contact with Jeff, I don't think that was, that was while this was pending before the Board.

Mr Denham — Is this the one where the side is really starting to decay? Or am I thinking of a different.

Mr Oliver — This is a stucco property, ah, exterior. If I go back and add in real quick. This permit is an application that's in here. It was never, actually, issued.

Mr Paul — Ok, Ok.

Mr Oliver — Kin Newhouse, also had tried to contact her several times to come in and pick it up and she never would, so---

Mr Paul — And I did speak with the neighbor, yesterday, because their information was in the file. She said no one's living there. They haven't seen anybody on the property in several months. Um, they are eagerly looking for some kind action on this as well. They say it is a serious nuisance in terms of there being varmints and things like that.

Mr Denham — The big issue is that it is open, somewhere?

Mr Oliver — It's actually been secured. Um, probably not real well, but this house has been gutted, partially gutted on the inside. There's open floors. Um, early on, when I talked to her before I actually added it to the Agenda, I asked

her to do a couple things to buy her a little time because there was some soffit in danger of falling down. She did do that but basically, nothing has happened since that time.

Mrs Harrington — So it has been on our Agenda three times? You have been dealing with it for---

Mr Oliver — I am going to say probably two to three months prior to that.

Mr Denham — Has she attended any of our meetings?

Mr Oliver — No. I have had a phone conversation and visited with her in the building here at one time.

Mr Denham — I don't see why postponing it is going to help much. She knows it is on the Agenda. It's posted on the building. Whether her cell phone is live or not, if she was interested she'd be following up on her own property, I would think. Sounds like you've done the diligence to try to contact her. I don't know, it is up to the Board. I don't know what another thirty days is going to accomplish. It sounds like she's just either moved and changed cell phones or isn't interested. Unless you feel strongly that you'd like to try again, I'd proceed on.

Mrs Harrington — I agree.

Mr Paul — Ok. I am ready to go if someone would like to make a motion.

Mr Denham — Can I have a motion to make this a Dangerous Building subject?

Mr Pommert — **Mr Chairman, I move that Item # 2781, at 519 N Jackson, be the subject of a Dangerous Building hearing.**

Mr Eastman — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mr Pommert, second by Mr Eastman, that Item # 2781, 519 N Jackson., be the subject of a Dangerous Building Hearing. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).** The Board turns it over to the City.

Mr Paul — Thank you. This is the Building Board of Appeals meeting in the Joplin Municipal Building, this 9th day of December, 2016, for the purpose of conducting a dangerous building hearing. The City will present its evidence first, after which the public has a right to cross-examine witnesses and be heard, as well as present witnesses or exhibits. The case for today is Item # 2781 on the Agenda, also known as 519 N Jackson. The City

recalls Jeff Oliver and I will remind you that you are under oath. Would you please state your name and occupation for the record?

Mr Oliver — Jeff Oliver. Building Inspector for the City of Joplin.

Mr Paul — And how long have you been employed in your position with the City of Joplin?

Mr Oliver — Eight years.

Mr Paul — And have you, in the performance of your duties, had the occasion to inspect the property known as 519 N Jackson?

Mr Oliver — Yes, I have.

Mr Paul — I am going to show you what is marked Exhibit #1. Do you recognize Exhibit #1?

Mr Oliver — Yes, these are photos that I took of property back on February of, ah, this year.

Mr Paul — And the photographs show reasonable likeness of the premises in its present condition?

Mr Oliver — Yes, in general yes. There is a ramp in the photo here, that has been removed. I had some current concerns about some soffits on the property that were taken care of at one point. Prior to bringing it to this Board. So, those things have been removed but---

Mr Paul — Outside of the ramp and the soffit, the photographs reasonable likeness of the premises in their present condition?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — If there is no objection, I offer Exhibit #1.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What, if anything, did you do to ascertain ownership of the property?

Mr Oliver — I had the title search done.

Mr Paul — I am going to show what's marked as Exhibit #2. Do you recognize Exhibit #2?

Mr Oliver — Yes, it is the title search received, um, looks like September 20th of this year showing a Laura Diane Julian as the owner.

Mr Paul — If there's no objection, I offer Exhibit #2.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What, if anything, did you do to notify the owner of the property of this action?

Mr Oliver — Sent Certified Letters.

Mr Paul — I am going to show what's been marked as Exhibit #3. Do you recognize Exhibit #3, here?

Mr Oliver — There are several Certified Letters that were sent out to Laura. The most resent being dated November 3rd, of this year. Um, sent to her at 317 E Fountain Rd. I do not have a signed receipt for any of these letters.

Mr Paul — And I want to take a second to talk about that address. Um, I'm going to show you what's marked Exhibit #4. Do you recognize Exhibit #4?

Mr Oliver — This is a print off of Jasper County Beacon website that I printed off. On this it states that the owner's address, Laura, is 317 E Fountain Rd here in Joplin.

Mr Paul — I'm also going to show you what's been marked as Exhibit #5. Do you recognize Exhibit #5?

Mr Oliver — This is a building permit application. It was never processed on this application. Laura filled out with her address being 317 E Fountain Rd. Um, that was actually done in June of this year, but never picked up.

Mr Paul — So those are the last know addresses you have for the owner and that's where you directed the letters, correct?

Mr Oliver — Correct.

Mr Paul — If there's no objection, I offer Exhibits #3, #4 and #5.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — And to skip back for a moment, Jeff, at Exhibit #1, if the Board examines Exhibit #1 on the front page, can you describe what's, generally, on the first photo?

Mr Oliver — There is a posting, ah, that I put on all properties that come to this Board or have a potential to come to the Board.

Mr Paul — And, so, what does that notice, generally, give notice of?

Mr Oliver — That it has been posted as a dangerous structure, in hopes that somebody would contact us.

Mr Paul — Contact the City? Ah, what else, if anything, did you do to notify the owner of the property of this action?

Mr Oliver — It was published in the Joplin Globe.

Mr Paul — I am going to show you what's marked as Exhibit #6. Do you recognize Exhibit #6?

Mr Oliver — It is the Affidavit of Publication from the Joplin Globe with the publication dates of October 6th, 13th, 20th and 27th of this year.

Mr Paul — If there's no objection, I offer Exhibit #6.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — What school and education have you had that qualifies to you as an expert in construction of buildings?

Mr Oliver — I have been a General Contractor on several residential projects in the Joplin area over a twenty year period.

Mr Paul — Ok. And I am looking at my notes, here, Jeff, I'm sorry. I'm going to back up here one second. To look back on the permit that was Exhibit #5, was there also contact information on the cell phone?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — And is it true that both your office and mine office have attempted to call that number and notify her that this action is pending?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — Ok. Thank you. Um, going back to your school and education, can you tell me that again?

Mr Oliver — I've been a General Contractor on several residential projects in the Joplin area over a twenty year period.

Mr Paul — And from an inspection of the property, do you have an expert opinion as to whether these premises constitute a dangerous building as defined in Chapter 26, Article X, Section 26-612 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Joplin. And if so, which of the definitions of the Dangerous Building do you base your opinion, if any?

Mr Oliver — Yes, Sub-section, Line 12; Whenever the building or structure or land it occupies exists or is maintained in violation of any specific requirement or prohibition applicable to such building or structure or land provided by this article, where other applicable laws or ordinances of the state or city relating to the condition, use, location or maintenance of the building structure or land. You can see by the photos that are being passed around, um, at one time, someone had started on this property. Ah, they've knocked a lot of the stucco, the exterior finishes off of it. Um, there are a few photos of the inside where they have started gutting. Ah, there are floor joists exposed, um, so certainly this property, in its current condition, does not meet the City of Joplin's, ah, code or ordinances. Line 18; Whenever the building or structure is in such condition as to constitute a public nuisance known to the common law or inequity jurisprudence. Line 19; whenever any portion of the building or structure remains on site, when the construction of demolition work is abandoned. So, in this case, these two tie together. Um, at one point, sometime back, ah, somebody had the intensions to rehab this property. They did some gutting of the property. Actually, putting it in worse condition and have left it. At this point, it appears to be abandoned.

Mr Paul — Thank you, Jeff. And, ah, I guess a couple of brief follow-up questions, since we don't have a signed letter in this case. Is it, also, to your understanding that , ah, the City conducted both a Case Net search and a social media search for contact information for this owner and wasn't able to find any information?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — And it's also true, that on your, ah, your file notes, you had a number for a neighbor and the neighbor didn't have any contact information for this person, either?

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — The City reached out to them and tried to get contact information.

Mr Oliver — Yes.

Mr Paul — Thank you. If there's no objections, I would also like to offer Chapter 26, Articles IX-X of the Joplin Code of Ordinances as evidence before the Board. I'd also request that the record be held open to include a copy of the Joplin Globe on the dates of publication. The Board take judicial notice of its file.

Mr Denham — The Board accepts.

Mr Paul — It would now be the time for the defendants' opportunity to cross examine the witness. We don't see anybody in the gallery. We are not aware of

anybody who intended to be here today. The City rests. Now would be the time for the defendant or any other interested party to offer evidence. Again, we see no one in the gallery, not aware of anyone who intended to be here today on this Item, therefore, the City turns it back over to the Board for deliberation and decision.

Mr Denham — Do we have a motion for demolition?

Mr Eastman — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2781, 519 M Jackson Avenue be considered a Dangerous Building and so demolished, according to the City Code, Chapter 26, Articles IX-X, Section 26-612, Sub-section Lines 12, 18 and 19.**

Mr Wilson — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mr Eastman, second by Mr Wilson, Item # 2781, 519 N Jackson, be declared a Dangerous Building and ordered demolished in accordance to the City of Joplin, Code of Ordinances under Chapter 26, Articles IX-X, Section 26-612, Sub-sections 12, 18 and 19. Demolition shall include all the out buildings. All those in favor of the demolition say "aye" " (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).**

ITEM #2754 — **119 N BYERS AVENUE**
OWNER: Pinnacle Bank, 802 S Main St, Joplin, MO
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Glove Legal Section. Item continued from the January 22, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (FOURTH TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Paul — One thing I wanted to bring to the Board's attention is the, ah, 119 Byers property. This was, do you guys recall that off the top of your head, this was the property we took last spring. Was in pretty bad shape. An appeal was filed on it by the bank, which is kind of unusual. Um, the bank wasn't the owner but was just trying to protect their lien. That property was sold within the last month or two and they, ah, the bank's dismissed their appeal. So, there is an active demo order on the property and I don't think anybody's got any standing to prevent it from being enforced. I finally got a hold of the person at the bank who was able to get me the contact information for the LLC that bought the property. I managed to find the guy who owns it. He is up in Jasper. Um, he purchased a bundle of properties from the bank and the bank threw this, kind of, at the last second. Per his conversation with me, he said that he was told there is a property with a, quote, shed on it. He got out to the property and said, there's a shed and there is this house. He was less than pleased about that series of events. Um, I don't think he was, um, upset about the demo order or anything like that. I, he seems to indicate, maybe, he might be able to

work on it. I thought I would just bring it to your attention to see if you wanted to do anything on it. I really don't think, if I call him after this meeting and tell him that they want it demolished it, that he is going to be upset about it. It think his frustration is rightfully assigned to the bank, right now.

Mr Denham — We ordered it demolished?

Mr Paul — Yes.

Mr Denham — And an appeal was processed?

Mr Paul — Yes, but it is dismissed now, so,

Mr Pommert — Is that the one that the bank was going to go over and board it up or whatever. It's the house that sits behind another house?

Mr Paul — Yes, it's that one.

Mr Pommert — Ok.

Mr Paul — So, ah, if the Board, basically, doesn't want to take any action today, which I am just, basically, here to confirm, I'm going to call him and say that there's no interest in doing additional work on this. Either you can tear it down, which I think he has access to heavy equipment, and if you don't' we are going to go ahead and put it out to bid and get it torn down ourselves.

Mrs Harrington — Is the new owner anybody we have dealt with?

Mr Paul — No, he lives up in Jasper. I think his name is Marty something. He owns Marty's racing.

Mr Denham — Sounds like we may get to know him if he bought a big pile of property, though. I'm not inclined to change anything.

Mrs Harrington — No.

Mr Paul — Alright.

Mr Wicklund — Jordan, if are able to have that conversation with him, can you let him know that the storage building is going with it.

Mr Paul — Sure. The out building still. Again, I don't think he has any heartbreak about this. He didn't single out this property that he was going to fix up and flip, like most of the folks who come here. It was kind of a hidden surprise.

Mr Denham — Ok. Any we can release, Jeff?

ITEM # 2790 — **2301 IRON GATES**
OWNER: Baldwin Rental Properties
ADDRESS: PO Box 271, Joplin, MO 64802
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (SECOND TIME BERFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Oliver — Item # 2790, 2301 Iron Gates, that structure is on the ground. It's moved, and he does have a permit for the demo. Moving very slowly. He did leave me a message yesterday. He thinks it will be two weeks before he has it all cleaned up. I don't know if you want to hang on to it at this point. It is a pile of rubble, so it's not necessarily a building that is dangerous. It depends on how you---

Mr Denham — There's a shed back there, it looks like. Maybe that's the adjacent property but, it is hard to tell from that photograph. I don't see any, ah, harm in just keeping it on the Agenda, make sure he follows through. I think it was down last meeting, wasn't it. Just knocked it down?

Mr Oliver — I think he had just put it down.

Mr Denham — So it's been kind of slow this six weeks.

Mr Oliver — They are getting down stairs. I think all they really have, equipment wise, is like a bobcat and a couple of guys.

Mr Denham — Builds it up and waits on them.

Mr Oliver — Ok.

Mr Denham — I'd rather wait, myself.

Mr Wilson, — I kind of remember that that had a shed out there on the property. It think we included that too, if I remember right.

Mr Oliver — I guess the rest can be continued to January 27th. I don't know if Bryan wanted to talk about a property here, for a little bit.

ITEM # 2635 — **502 VIRGINIA**
OWNER: AMAS, 1736 Southern Dr, Neosho, MO 64863
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the June 24, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (TWENTY FIRST TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Wicklund — Item # 2635, 502 Virginia. Just as an update, um, this building, it's the old Housmond's building. It was declared Dangerous by the Building Department December of 2013 and is still, it is definitely in worse shape now, than it was then. Since that time, um, the staff has spent over $800.00 in just sending out Certified Mail. Notifying any potential interested parties of these meetings. We have also spent $850.00, um, with a local contractor who has made some very temporary measures to try and prevent the water that is getting into this building from just effecting the adjacent apartment building. It seems to be working right now. But it is very temporary. So there's some potential investors, we have actually shown the building several times and I would request that the Item be continued to the February meeting. And at that point we should have some clear directions as far as what's the possible sale of the property. At that point, if nothing has happened, I would strongly request that the Building Board consider hold a hearing.

Mr Denham — At one time, it sounded like the county was going to--- because of the taxes, it went into the arrears in taxes, the county had some sort of control over it. Is that not the case?

Mr Wicklund — The Housmond's family, um, actually, it's been several years ago tried to give it back to the Bank. The bank won't take. In the meantime, they quit paying taxes. So the county has at least taken over responsibility for it. I don't know, at this point, who the legal owner is.

Mr Paul — I think it is the opposite. I don't know that they would say they've taken any responsibility for it . It's that, it is either at a third or a subsequent offering at a tax sale, that the county has the ability to go in and protect its tax lien. And that's what they have done. Um, I think that, I'm not sure if the law is clear whether they get title to the fee or if they're just there to protect their lien until someone comes along and pays it. But I don't,--- it's my understanding, that's the only reason that they are exercising any control over it, is just to---

Mr Wicklund — They definitely have made it clear that they have no intensions of doing anything to salvage the building.

Mrs Harrington — So are you saying, did I hear you say, we will have a demolition hearing?

Mr Wicklund — Well, at this point, if you remember, at one point the Board, um, we actually published, um, a request from Engineering firms to come up with a plan on how to best protect the structure as far as looking into replacing the roof structure. We got two bids from local Engineering firms on overseeing the project and ah, but then when the next step would have been actually hiring those engineering firms, ah, the council did not approve the expenditure of that money. And it was going to be expensive, as will the demolition or, I don't know if the Board would, in February, if nothing's happened, if the Board wants to hold an Order to Repair, a demo order. I

just, as the Building Official, um, I feel like, I mean, I declared it dangerous three years ago and we are slowly racking up a bill, not even doing anything with it because now it's on the Agenda. I feel like something ought to be done. If the Board chooses not to take action, I'd say, then I would encourage them just to release it. Do something and it looks like February may be the date which any possible, potential investors will make it clear whether they are willing to proceed or not.

Mr Denham — Technically, the Housmonds family still owns it with the bank.

Mr Wicklund — I believe so.

Mr Denham — And the bank has interest in it?

Mr Wicklund — Yes.

Mr Paul — And of course, there's a bunch of judgement liens on it, but---

Mr Wicklund — Yes.

Mr Harrington — Are there any potential buyers that you know of?

Mr Wicklund — Yes. There's actually been, ah, I know of at least four different or four or five different parties that have walked through the building. I have walked through it with them. They have pretty much all pulled out, all but, there's still one that's pretty interested, I believe.

Mr Denham — I don't think we should take it off the Agenda. I mean, if it was dangerous three years ago, I, I've been in the building and it hadn't gotten any better. I know some glass fell out of a window, landed on the sidewalk. If someone happened to be standing under it at that point, it would have been pretty bad.

Mr Paul — I mean, is there funding available if the Board does take action, one way or the other; either on a repair or demo route?

Mrs Harrington — One is about the same as the other, in this case, isn't it? Repairing it and, it is going to cost as much to demo it as it is to repair it, to satisfy the infrastructure with the other building?

Mr Wicklund — Yes.

Mr Oliver — I think you get some, find out that it will be a final, you know, with a demo. Order it to repair and get it to a certain point and nobody does anything with it, we are going to deal with it again.

Mr Denham — It's not going away.

Mr Wicklund — Whether there's funds available, I don't' know. Whether the building is dangerous, it is.

Mrs Harrington — We ordered it demoed, the Council couldn't reverse that decision. It would have to be done, it's that right.

Mr Wicklund — The Council can't reverse that decision. Now they are the one's that approved the money being spent. Or not approve it.

Mr Harrington — So why are we here?

Mr Wilson — So if we order it demoed, the Council refuses to put up the money to have it demoed, something happens and somebody gets hurt, then where are we then? In a deep hole and no way out?

Mr Paul — It definitely muddies the water. If you put a demo order on it because I'd have to look at the ordinances but it probably depends on whether the ordinance mandates that the order, you know, when someone doesn't act for thirty days, we normally put it out for bid and demo it. Um, I don't know if that language is mandatory, off the top of my head, or not. That, you know, the City shall take bids and shall demo it itself or whether the City is simply given to option to do it if funds are available. If it is a mandatory duty in the ordinances, then yes, it probably would create quite a mess.

Mr Oliver — I will add to that a little bit and I don't mean to speak for Bryan, but he is aware of the history. There was a structure on the 900 block asked back when Bryan was doing my current job, that was ordered demolished. And a, past City Manager wanted to try and save that. It set there for several years and ended up collapsing out onto Main Street. So, I just kind of wanted to throw that out there.

Mrs. Harrington — Well, maybe somebody will buy it.

Mr Wicklund — That would sure be nice.

Mr Paul — Is it a tax credit that they have applied for?

Mr Wicklund — Well, they haven't gotten to that point yet but it would include, yes, that's going to be included, I'm sure, if the deal actually happens.

Mrs Harrington — I have a question about Item # 2789.

Mr Denham — Do we need to go ahead and follow up on this one.

Mr Wicklund — I mean, I would request that it, the Item be continued at least to the February meeting and hopefully some new information will be in place and then at that time it will be up to the Board to hold the meeting or not.

Mr Harrington — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that Item # 2635 at 502 Virginia be continued until February 24th for a Progress Report or Demolition Hearing.**

Mr Hartwell — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mrs Harrington, second by Mr Hartwell, that Item # 2735, 502 S Virginia be continued to our February 24th meeting for a Progress Hearing and Demolition Hearing at that time. All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Mr Denham, abstained. Motion carried (5-0, 1 abstention).**

ITEM # 2789 — **814 W A ST**
OWNER: Richard and Judith McWilliams
ADDRESS: PO Box 1772, Joplin, MO 64802
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (SECOND TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Harrington — Have we talked to anybody or have we had any contact from anybody on Item # 2789?

Mr Oliver — I had given that to Jordan to consider for a hearing today. We've had a little bit of trouble getting a hold of them.

Mr Paul — Did you say 20 Picher?

Mr Oliver — 814 W 8th.

Mr Paul — Is that the Duncan guy or the…?

Mr Oliver — No, Williams. Where they had the different owners under the LLC

Mr Paul — Oh, yah, yah. No we--- Yeah, we looked at that one, um, we didn't have--- it's still held by an LLC and we didn't have good notice on the LLC, but we've got the contact information so we ought to be able to take that one next time.

ITEM # 2791 — **2916 E 9TH ST**
OWNER: Brothers Enterprises
ADDRESS: PO Box 4294, Joplin, MO 64803
"Finding of Fact Hearing" scheduled for this date.

Mr Harrington — Ok. And 2791, Baldwin rental properties?

Mr Oliver — 2790?

Mrs Harrington — One, 2791. Oh, that is new today. Ok, alright. Sorry.

Mr Oliver — No problem.

ITEM # 2782 — **905 CENTRAL ST**
OWNER: Adolphus Robinson
ADDRESS: 905 Central St, Joplin, MO 64801
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (THIRD TIME BERFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Harrington — Robinson. Have we talked to him this month on Central?

Mr Oliver — Have not. I have been by and it does appear that he has done a little bit more but that will kind of be the story. He will go get a little bit done, then a little bit more but---

Mrs Harrington — I am a little concerned about that one going downhill pretty fast.

Mr Oliver — Yeah, that roof is not far from really opening up, I think.

Mrs Harrington — Uh-huh.

Mr Oliver — I will try to get a hold of him on the phone for the next meeting.

Mr Harrington — Well, you know, if they come, it's one thing. They come and say I made a little progress but I ran out of money, I understand that, when it is a private citizen not a contractor. But, ah, but then when they just blow it off, it makes me think we should take some action. That is all the questions I have.

ITEM # 2778 — **820 S PICHER**
OWNER: Michael & Vickie Banks
ADDRESS: 820 S Picher, Joplin, MO 64801
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (FOURTH TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

ITEM # 2785 — **417 S PARK**
OWNER: Dawn Morian
ADDRESS: 6720 Woodson, Raytown, MO 64133
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting for a

"Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (THIRD TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

ITEM # 2787

905 S MONROE
OWNER: Sherilyn Roosevelt & Edward Watkins
ADDRESS: 523 Webb St, Webb City, MO 64802
"Demolition Hearing" has been posted in the Joplin Globe Legal Section. Item continued from the October 28, 2016 meeting FOR A "Demolition Hearing" and Progress Report (SECOND TIME BEFORE THE BOARD)

Mr Denham — Continue all the remaining items?

Mrs Harrington — **Mr Chairman, I make a motion that we continue all remaining items on the Agenda until January 27th.**

Mr Wilson — **Second.**

Mr Denham — **Motion by Mrs Harrington, second by Mr Wilson, that all remaining items on the Agenda be continued to our January 27th meeting. All those in favor say "aye" " (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0).** Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Mr Wicklund — First, I would like to recognize real quick, Mr Eastman. His, um, he has completed his term on the Board and, um, I was not able to make it to the Council meeting Monday night where they recognized the Board members and, ah, I've appreciated him being on the Board. This Board has really put in the time, patience and lots of things since the tornado and he has been a big part of that and I really appreciate that. He has agreed, at least for not, to stay on until we find somebody to replace him, which will be hard. But thank you.

Mr Denham — Thank you. Appreciate your service. Thank you.

Mrs Harrington — Stick around, it's just getting fun.

Mr Denham — Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Mr Wilson — **So moved.**

Mr Denham — **All those in favor say "aye" (Mr Denham, Mr Hartwell, Mrs Harrington, Mr Wilson, Mr Eastman and Mr Pommert voted "aye") Those Opposed? (None). Motions carries (6-0). We're adjourned.**

There being no further business to come before the Building Board of Appeals, the meeting stood adjourned at 11:12 a.m.

Approved _____
Kyle Denham, Chairman

Approved _____
Lindsay Dunn, Notary Public

My Commission expires: 6-29-2020

