

Chairman Dana Gamblin called the meeting to order.

Members present: Gary Guendelsberger, Walt Matthews, Sharon Johnson, Allison Will, Dana Gamblin, Janice Warner (came in after the start of the meeting)

Staff present: Steve Rucker, Housing Manager; Scott Thom, Chief Building Official; Ron Snyder, Code Compliance Inspector; Ken Nixon, Code Compliance Inspector.

Those wishing to give testimony were sworn in by Steve Rucker.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No comments. **Upon motion of Mr. Matthews and second of Mr. Guendelsberger, the members voted to approve the minutes of the April 22, 2022 meeting. The board voted unanimously to approve the minutes from the April 22, 2022 meeting.**

OLD BUSINESS

- **22-02 Lee Ethel Keys is appealing the Demolition of 1329 Huntington Avenue, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 57-05260.000**
Ms. Keys was not present. **Mr. Matthews made a motion to go ahead and demo.** Ms. Johnson asked if Ms. Keys was present to which it was verified that she was not present. **Ms. Johnson seconded the motion. Roll Call: Walt Matthews – yes; Sharon Johnson – yes; Gary Guendelsberger – yes; Dana Gamblin – abstain; Allison Will – yes. The motion passed.**
- **Discussion of Meeting Start Time**
Ms. Gamblin asked the board members if 4:00 pm was a good start time for meetings or if there were any suggested changes. Mr. Guendelsberger shared that he thought 4:00 pm was a good start time. **Ms. Johnson made a motion to keep the Housing Appeals Board meetings at a 4:00 pm start time. Mr. Matthews seconded the motion. The board voted unanimously to keep the start time of the meetings at 4:00 pm.**

NEW BUSINESS

- **22-03 Shameka Owens-Moore is appealing the condemnation of 102 Tyler Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 57-01970.000**
Ken Nixon, Code Compliance Inspector shared that on April 4, 2022 Ciara Motry signed a contract to rent out the lower apartment of 102 Tyler Street. Mr. Nixon shared photos of the signed contract that Ms. Motry signed. He went on to add that on April 11, 2022, Thelma Sauer, Ciara's mother, came into the Code Compliance office to report electrical and plumbing issues at 102 Tyler Street in the lower unit and basement. Mr. Nixon added that Ms. Sauer shared that her daughter, Ciara Motry, was going to move into the lower unit. When they started to move in Ms. Sauer's husband noticed some electrical and plumbing issues in the basement. Ms. Sauer's shared photos with Mr. Nixon, which Mr. Nixon shared with the board. Mr. Nixon explained that the first photo showed

plumbing that leads to the toilet. He added that it would leak water when the toilet was flushed. The next photo showed the hot water tank. Ms. Sauer questioned if the pipes were legal. The next two photos showed electrical issues, specifically the blue piping. Mr. Nixon shared that the main electrical issue, which he shared a photo of, was of an electrical box at the top and the blue conduit that has electrical wire that runs and was drooped across the stairs that lead into the basement and then connected to another rafter and then into the lower unit. Mr. Nixon shared another photo that showed electrical wiring is exposed, basically with electrical tape connected. Mr. Nixon explained the other photo showed what looked like a baseboard heater that is across a door. He shared the door is not really used as it's like a second entrance to the apartment. Mr. Nixon shared that after talking with Ms. Sauer and reviewing the photos, it was decided that Code needed to inspect the lower unit and the basement to determine how bad the electrical issues were. Mr. Nixon added that Ms. Sauer said that the landlord was going to refund the money to Ms. Motry because she was not going to move in. Ms. Motry was going to meet with Ms. Owens-Moore, the property owner, on April 12, 2022. Mr. Nixon shared that he called Ms. Owens-Moore on April 12 at 8:25 am. He added that when he called, Ms. Owens-Moore was at 102 Tyler Street and was talking with Ms. Motry about the possible code violations and possibly refund Ms. Motry her money. Mr. Nixon shared that during his conversation, he asked Ms. Owens-Moore if she would allow Code Compliance to inspect the basement and be willing to sign a consent to inspect form. Mr. Nixon shared that Ms. Owens-Moore wanted to wait until the next Monday, April 18 because it was Holy Week. Mr. Nixon shared that he told her he could not wait and need to inspect the lower unit and the basement that day. Ms. Owens-Moore shared with Mr. Nixon that she does not work during Holy Week. Mr. Nixon added that Ms. Owens-Moore was already at 102 Tyler Street to speak with Ms. Motry who was a possible tenant and to possibly refund her deposit. Mr. Nixon went on to say that Ms. Owens-Moore had told him that she would come to the Code Compliance offices after she was done with Ms. Motry to sign the consent form. Mr. Nixon shared that Ms. Owens-Moore did meet him at the office and told him and Steve Rucker that she did not want to sign the form. Mr. Nixon informed Ms. Owens-Moore that he would obtain a search warrant for the lower unit and basement. He also informed her that he would arrive at approximately 13:30. Mr. Nixon shared that he had obtained the search warrant and it was signed by Municipal Court Judge O'Brein. He went on to include that he, the chief building inspector Scott Thom, electrical inspector Greg Capucini, plumbing inspector Paul Matthews and SPD Officer Ronta Hill-Morton responded to 102 Tyler Street to serve the warrant and inspect the lower unit and basement. Mr. Nixon added that Shameka and Jamar Owens were at the residence. Mr. Nixon shared photos that he took of the basement. Greg Capucini, electrical inspector for the City of Sandusky, shared that he was asked to go along on the inspection to review electrical items in the house. Mr. Capucini referred to the letter that was in the board member's packets. He shared that there were various items such as proper connectors not used. Mr. Capucini referenced a photo and shared that the conduit

coming in from the meter base outside is supposed to be a complete set of conduit and it was not. He went on to add that there's various issues. The panel is a major what was going on in there. He added that he did his review and wrote it up and gave it to Mr. Nixon. The basement, the blue tubing, which is a conduit does not have proper strapping or connectors. The water heater, with the wattage of the water heater the wire going to the water heater was not rated for that wire as it was undersized. There were splices there just midair. An attempt was made to cover them, but they are not really correct per the National Electrical Code. The panel needed to be refed from the meter base on the inside. Mr. Capucini reference another photo to show the one connector going to the hot water, the blue tube going to the hot water tank does not have the proper connectors. Mr. Capucini shared that some of the violations are minimal but the panel was the biggest one. Mr. Capucini added that when he did his inspection, the main circuit breaker was turned off, therefore he could not inspect any voltages, he could not inspect any outlets to see if they were the right polarity or not or grounded. The main circuit breaker was in the off position and he cannot turn it on. Ms. Gamblin asked if there was any electricity in the home. Mr. Capucini answered there was to the top of the panel. It was live, but it wasn't livable until you turn it on. But once you turned it on it could present a danger and wouldn't know until that happens. Ms. Gamblin asked to clarify that Mr. Capucini said the wiring wasn't correct. Mr. Capucini asked if she was referring to the water heater, to which Ms. Gamblin said she believed so. Mr. Capucini shared that the wire going to the water heater is not correct. Ms. Gamblin asked if it violated any policy. Mr. Capucini answered that all of these are a violation of the National Electrical Code. Mr. Capucini clarified that everything he wrote up are violations of the National Electrical Code. Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Capucini if he knew who did the work to which Mr. Capucini answered that he did not know. Mr. Capucini added that at the end of the letter he submitted, he included that violations need to be corrected by a licensed electrical contractor, which is in city ordinance. Ms. Johnson asked if the landlord needed a permit to do this work. Mr. Capucini answered that the contractor will pull a permit when it happens. He added that to his knowledge, he does not know what has been corrected or what hasn't been corrected. Ms. Johnson asked that even though it's your own property you still have to have a permit for electrical and plumbing. Mr. Capucini answered yes because anything with an electrical service needs to be inspected. Ms. Johnson asked if they didn't ask to have this inspected. Mr. Capucini answered that the reason they were there was because a tenant had electrical concerns and they backed out, so he was brought in to do the electrical inspections. Ms. Johnson clarified that the landlord did not call to have his work, or whoever did the work, inspected. Mr. Capucini said that was correct. He had never been called to that residence during that time. Mr. Guendelsberger asked if he understood the permit process correctly that when a permit is taken out, it's the owner who is responsible for calling to set up an inspection. Mr. Capucini said it varies. The contractor doing the work could call, which is what usually happens, or the landlord does at a late date. Mr. Capucini believes there was another incident in MacArthur Park

in which Ms. Owens-Moore called to have a service turned on. He went on that he failed it and Ms. Owens-Moore had Great Lakes Electric come in and fix some of the wiring. He was called back and the wiring was correct and service was turned back on. Mr. Guendelsberger asked if there were exceptions to that rule when no one calls and no follow-up inspection occurs. Mr. Capucini answered that does happen but to get that condemnation sign off, the inspections are going to have to be done. Mr. Capucini added that if he goes to a building and the power is not on, he does the inspection. If it is not correct, they go back and make their corrections, call the inspector back and when the corrections have been done proper, he calls it into Ohio Edison to get the power turned on, which is the proper procedure. Mr. Nixon referenced another photo and shared that it was the toilet issue and he had Paul Matthews, plumbing inspector, review and he wrote a report. Paul Matthews, plumbing inspector for the City of Sandusky, reference the same photo. He shared that someone went up and flushed the toilet and he observed the water fall. He believes it was wrapped in white tape with maybe plaster around it. He was not sure what it was. It was not a repair that was code. He added that he can't write up a violation for a leaky toilet, it just has to be fixed, but it may be something code compliance would do. It wouldn't even require a permit to fix it. As far as he knows you are allowed to repair your own plumbing as long as you don't alter the plumbing. The hot water tank did not have a cold water shut off valve which is required. The furnace that was down there was abandoned so it is not an issue. He said the hot water tank was the only thing he looked at. He didn't go upstairs and check out the sinks and the bathrooms, he just knows the toilet was leaking when they flushed it. Ms. Gamblin asked Mr. Matthews if he checks specific pipes. She added that she knows that he can't write someone up if the toilet is leaking but asked if he checks to see if that is the right size pipe. Mr. Matthews said it was the correct size pipe, it was just broke and someone tried to tape it and glue it. Again, he was unsure of the material used. Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Matthews if he inspected all of the plumbing and these were the only two issues. Mr. Matthews answered that there really is not much in a basement, maybe 10 – 15 feet of pipe where the sink and the toilet comes down. The upstairs would drain into it but the walls are closed up so you can't see it. He added that it just needs to be repaired. It's not a big issues, just needs to be done. Ms. Johnson asked about a photo. Mr. Nixon shared that it was the baseboard heat. Mr. Nixon asked if there was an issue with the wiring on the baseboard heat. Mr. Capucini shared that the wires need to be in a conduit system. There are no bushings or anything protecting the wires from abrasion. Ms. Johnson asked if there was an issue with the baseboard heater going across the door. Mr. Capucini said electrically, no. Not if the door is not being used. A member of the audience added that the door was shut off from the other side. Ms. Johnson asked where the door went to. Mr. Nixon answered that there are two doors when you go on the front porch. You can go to the left which is the main entrance to the lower unit. If you go straight ahead, there is another door, which is the door being questioned, leads to a bedroom so it is blocked off. It looks strange but it is not being used. There is one way in the front and one way out the back. If you go to the right

upstairs if the upstairs apartment. There are three doors in that first landing. Mr. Nixon went on and shared photos of the letters the inspectors Capucini and Matthews had written. He also shared the correction order that was written by the Chief Building Inspector, Scott Thom for the condemnation. Mr. Nixon said that reports were sent to Ms. Owens-Moore via certificate and certified mail. He added that he wrote the condemnation letter on his end and forwarded it to Ms. Owens-Moore via certificate and certified mailing. Ms. Gamblin asked if as of right now Mr. Nixon has not been back to the property. Mr. Nixon shared photos of the signs that were placed on the doors. Ms. Gamblin asked if this was for the downstairs and asked if anyone was living upstairs. Mr. Nixon shared that there is someone living upstairs but everything is fine for the upstairs. Ms. Johnson asked if just the first floor is condemned, to which Mr. Nixon responded yes. The lower unit is condemned. Mr. Nixon clarified that the upper unit has its own electrical box and everything is fine up there as they inspected it the next day. Mr. Capucini added that since the second floor was mentioned, he wanted to reiterate, because there was no outgoing electric after the main breaker in the panel, at that time it does not present any issues with the second floor apartment. Even though there is some faulty wiring on the first floor, it is not heated up at the time of inspection, therefore the people in the second floor, at this time, are safe. He added an electrical contractor did contact him about doing an inspection because someone has been in there doing the work and they got a permit and they called him. Mr. Capucini told them that he would like to have permission from the home owner before he goes in there and do the inspection, which is where they are at now. He has not had a chance to go do the inspection and has not given a date. Ms. Will asked about the panel that goes to the second, if it was inspected while Mr. Capucini was there. Mr. Capucini responded that they came back at a later date and it was fine. Ms. Will shared that she is not aware of when something is condemned, what the process is to get deemed fit. Mr. Capucini shared for this property on the first floor, if an electrical contractor is called in, given the list and the items are fixed, they call for an inspection and it all passes, to his knowledge, the signs would come down. Mr. Rucker shared that a property can be condemned for multiple reasons, sanitary, structural, or if they have serious violations. Mr. Nixon shared that Ms. Owens-Moore filed an appeal.

Shameka Owens, 1126 Sycamore Line, Sandusky, Ohio, was present as the property owner. Ms. Owens-Moore said a prayer. Mr. Owens-Moore referenced the paper and said discrimination. She shared that some of the words that the electrician used, some of the pane, even picked up on those words. Illegally can enter 102 Tyler Street. Ms. Owens-Moore asked why it was illegal. She said because it the tenant no longer lived there. The tenant signed off her rights at 8 o'clock that morning. She went on that Mr. Nixon came in around 1:25 pm. She added that yes it was Holy Week and she did say that she was not going to work, but the concerns that the young girl had, she went to the house in order to address them. She added that at that time, her God, allowed Ken to call while they were standing there. She told him that they could come and inspect

but could they come before 1:30 pm because she was celebrating Holy Week. She said his reply was no, we're coming now and if you say no we're getting a search warrant. She went on that she really been saved that long but at the same time she said okay I'll play this game with you. She added that after all of that went on, she did come in to Mr. Rucker to show him the plans to be out of town that they had. She said she rescheduled her plans and met the inspectors there at 1:30 pm. She said she asked if everyone would stand before everyone entered to start the inspection and do prayer. She said everyone else exception for this demon turned around, fanned his hand like forget your God and proceeded to walk through her property like he owned it. She said she immediately got upset, ran and cut him off and told him he will never disrespect her God again like that or he can get out. She said after all of that, they prayed and things went smooth. She said her concern and why she is saying discrimination is she got the house through a land contract. Through a company in North Carolina, South Carolina. She said the same inspector that just spoke to the board about all of the violations, she said they have reports where he came and passed it not even two, three years ago. She said the same heater that was against the door, which was there because the kid kept putting a finger, so as a mother you move it up. She went on that it's not that it's strange or tacky, it was a reason. Ms. Gamblin asked Ms. Owens-Moore that she bought the property, but did she check the property out before she bought it. She went on that if she is saying the inspector came two or three years ago. Ms. Owens-Moore said it's all of the same stuff because when she bought it, it was a land contract so she was in the middle of all of the transactions. Ms. Gamblin asked if she ever went through it. Ms. Owens-Moore said she didn't have to, he did it. She said she has reports where the city's finest did it. She added that she didn't have to if the city's finest say it is good, it's good. She went on that she has reports that shows where he passed all of this. Ms. Gamblin shared that two or three years ago he passed it, but we are in a different year now, so the question at hand is did Ms. Owens-Moore physically do any inspection of the property before she purchase the property. Ms. Owens-Moore said it was a land contract and the answer to the question is that he already inspected it. Nothing changed. They didn't add a new hot water tank or new heater. It was all the same so there's no reason to get another inspection because of that. She went on that she received a telephone call from Fresch Electric. She added that she received an email from the secretary at Fresch Electric telling her that the city inspector wanted to come in and look at the work. She questioned how the inspector knew how to contact Fresch Electric and why they didn't call her. She referenced how the board asked what the process was and said we get in touch with home inspector, remember when I did that for you on Forest Street. She asked how that was not followed now. She said it was because illegal stuff was going on. She added that exactly next door to her the whole back structure is falling in. She asked if they got any write-ups or if it was condemned. She said no and asked how come. She asked what the difference was. Ms. Gamblin added that if someone sees a problem, they are welcome to call. Ms. Owens-Moore said when they came over to inspect her property, eight of her properties, they told her they were on the conjoining property

and saw something. She went on that they had Mr. Rucker, Ken, Dante, and Mr. Ron. She said she pointed out three or four of what was said. She said she went back on the second inspection and questioned next door. She said she was told they had gone back and wrote it up, but she had not heard anything and there was no big yellow sign. Ms. Owens-Moore then talked about trash that was next door that was there for seven weeks and shared that she had pictures, and no violations. She added that next door to next door. Ms. Gamblin interjected, Ms. Owens-Moore said Dana you are not going to argue because I'm not paying you no more so the bottom line is as long as I was putting money in your pocket and you were coming to the house to borrow money, you didn't act like this. She added that she is tired of this. Ms. Gamblin allowed them to speak, Ms. Owens-Moore asked to be allowed the same common courtesy. Ms. Gamblin said Ms. Owens-Moore was getting off track to which Ms. Owens-Moore said she was not because she is going to pull all of it together. Ms. Gamblin asked when Ms. Owens-Moore received the email from Fresch Electric, Ms. Owens-Moore said she had the inspection papers from before, did Ms. Owens-Moore submit them as her proof to what she is saying today. Ms. Owens-Moore responded that when she received the email, this meeting was already scheduled for today. She added that she does not like to keep dealing with stuff, so when she finished painting the room, the tenant upstairs accidentally forgot the water on flooded the whole thing. They had to do the ceiling and everything and her husband had it done in one day. She said wires got crossed so they had to hurry up and come get another inspection, but she was not going to go into that yet. She went on that next door there are all of these violations and nothing is happening. She added that directly next door at 202 Tyler Street, the whole roof. She went on that she is going to be back here at 519 Decatur, she paid a little fees. However, right next door the whole roof is coming in and she said she guarantees there is not report on it. Janice Warner asked Ms. Owens-Moore if she was denying any of the issues that they are citing at 102 Tyler Street. Ms. Warner asked to stay focused on 102 Tyler Street. Ms. Owens-Moore said her concern is if the electrical hazards are so bad at 102 Tyler Street and someone is going to get hurt, why is it three houses down you have wire exposed outside. Ms. Johnson asked about the paperwork that Ms. Owens-Moore has that she refers to as proof, if she had submitted it to the city. Ms. Owens-Moore responded no and that she withdraws her appeal and that they can come out anytime and look at it as it's already fixed. She said she withdraws the appeal and they can set up a time and get the paperwork.

Ms. Warner made a motion to accept the withdrawal from Ms. Shameka Owens-Moore. Mr. Matthew seconded the motion. Ms. Johnson asked when they do this, where does it leave her inspection. Ms. Gamblin said that is something the inspector will have to contact her back about or legal. Ms. Johnson asked if the inspectors take over and try and get in. **Roll Call: Janice Warner - Yes; Gary Guendelsberger – yes; Dana Gamblin – yes; Sharon Johnson – yes; Walt Matthews – yes; Allison Will – yes. The motion passed.**

- **22-04 David Hummel is appealing the 1st administrative penalty in the amount of \$100.00 for 508 McDonough Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 59-00755.000**

Ron Snyder, Code Compliance Inspector shared that on January 14, 2022 he was in the field and observed two residents, 508 McDonough Street being one of those, that didn't have any gutters or downspouts on that residence. He added that as a result, the property was written up and he sent a letter to the owner, Mr. Hummel, in regards to not having gutters and downspouts on the residence. Mr. Snyder shared photos of the residence and the certificate of mail certified mail. He added that he had conversations with Mr. Hummel. He added that on January 31, 2022, Mr. Hummel came to the office and dropped off an estimate he received from Camp Construction for gutter and downspouts. Mr. Snyder added that the estimate did not indicate any start or finish date. Initially the inspections were scheduled for February 2, 2022, but an extension was granted. This was based on the winter weather conditions along with him obtaining the estimate for the work. Mr. Snyder shared he gave Mr. Hummel more time. He also sent him a courtesy letter outlining that he would be given additional time to accomplish this task. On April 22, 2022, as indicated in the courtesy letter, the inspection was scheduled for this date. The inspection revealed that no work had been done. Mr. Snyder added that prior to the April 22 inspection, he had not been in contact with Mr. Hummel to indicate that they had entered into a contract with Camp Construction as initially that was just an estimate. Mr. Snyder said he was unaware of the contract, if it was an actual contract or an estimate. The work was not done. An administrative penalty was administered at that point. Mr. Snyder referenced photos which include the invoice for the first administrative penalty with certificate of mail and certified mail. On April 26, 2022, Mr. Hummel came to the office and turned in an appeal form. Mr. Snyder talked briefly with Mr. Hummel and shared that Mr. Hummel was not happy with the administrative penalty, but said he understood. He also said that Mr. Hummel shared that he had been unable to get in contact with his contractor. Mr. Snyder also shared that he found out that Mr. Hummel turned around and got another contractor and work has been completed. There are gutters and downspouts on the residence as this time.

David Hummel, 508 McDonough Street, shared that Mr. Snyder stated everything that he was going to say. Work has been completed by a second contractor. The first contractor he could not get ahold of. He shared that the work was completed on May 13, 2022.

Mr. Guendelsberger commented that the purpose of the administrative penalty is to act as an incentive to move the project along. In this case, the project had been moved along by Mr. Hummel and the project had been completed. He added he is not sure what the point of charging the homeowner a fee for the administrative penalty at this point would be as he has completed what was requested.

Mr. Guendelsberger made a motion to grant the appeal and waive the \$100.00 penalty. Ms. Warner seconded the motion. Roll Call: Gary Guendelsberger – yes; Janice Warner - Yes; Sharon Johnson – yes; Dana Gamblin – yes; Walt Matthews – yes; Allison Will – yes. The motion passed.

- **22-05 James Bickley is appealing a portion of the write-up and the 1st administrative penalty in the amount of \$100.00 for 1124 First Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 5700313.000**

Ron Snyder, Code Compliance Inspector shared that prior to January 24, 2022, he had addressed a similar issue within the 1100 block of First Street. While reaffirming an issue with another property, he noticed the residence at 1124 First Street had no gutters or eaves troughs or downspouts on the east side of that residence. There were gutters on the west side, just not on the east side. He added that while checking the rear of the property from the city alleyway, he found that the garage for said property had not gutters and/or downspouts to the south side while the north side of the garage had gutters and downspouts. As a result, the property was document and notification was sent to the property owner via certified mail and certificate of mail. He added that several days later he did receive a call from Mr. Bickley and they discussed the issue of not having the gutters and downspouts. Mr. Bickley only questioned the issue of having gutters and downspouts on the garage. Mr. Snyder shared that he asked Mr. Bickley why he had a gutter and downspout on the north side of the garage. He said Mr. Bickley's response was because that was the primary area for vehicles and pedestrian traffic in that area. An inspection was scheduled on February 25, 2022. Due to winter conditions, it was understood if the documented issues were unable to be addressed and an extension was granted. A courtesy letter was sent reflecting that because of the inclement weather, that was understandable. It was sent with certificate of mail and certified mail. The date was pushed out until May 3, 2022. An inspection was scheduled and it was found that gutters and downspouts had been installed on the east side of the residence but not the south side of the garage. As a result, an administrative penalty was administered for \$100.00 and a letter reflecting the same along with an invoice was sent to the property owners. There was also an administrative penalty evaluation done, which goes to Mr. Rucker. It should be noted that in the 2019 Residential Code of Ohio, Chapter 8, Section 801.3, Roof Drainage, "In areas where expansive soils or collapsible soils are known to exist, all dwellings shall have a controlled method of water disposal from roofs that will collect and discharge roof drainage to the ground surface not less than 5 feet (1524 MM) from the foundation walls or to an approved drainage system." Mr. Snyder shared photos that were taken from the south side wall of the property. He shared that five feet puts them about a foot out into the city alleyway. Ms. Johnson asked if the alleyway is paved. Mr. Snyder said at one time it probably had been paved. Ms. Johnson if on that side that does not have gutters if it could damage that pavement. Mr. Snyder shared that there is some erosion noted in that alleyway and shared photos to indicate so. He added that he cannot be certain, but the discoloration of the upper

portion of the backside of the garage, he questions where that discoloration was coming from. He cannot determine if it was coming from lack of gutters or not. Mr. Bickley filed an appeal. Mr. Matthews asked if it was not complete, to which Mr. Snyder said it was not complete yet. He said work was completed on the residence, but not the backside of the garage. Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Snyder if he conferred with Mr. Bickley since he has completed the residence but not the garage that he would have to write up Mr. Bickley. Mr. Snyder said that there was not work done on the property until the last inspection date. Ms. Johnson asked if the house was alright. Mr. Snyder confirmed that the house had been corrected. Ms. Johnson confirmed that it is only the one side of the garage that does not have gutters, which Mr. Snyder confirmed. He reference photos from the inspection date of May 3, 2022.

James Bickley, 1124 First Street, shared that there has never been an eve or a down on the garage and the reason being is it does not make sense. He passed around photos as he does not feel the photos Mr. Snyder shared show the relative height, the grade change going to the alley. He added that he did have work done on the east side of the house. Historically he has never had an issue. He added there is an ice situation. The pictures showed the icicles. He added if you come from Sandusky Bay up McEwen Street you would run right into his house. He added you get morning sun on a snow roof, it melts. The sun goes to the other side of the gable, the cold wind coming up McEwen Street freezes it. So it makes icicles. He shared that he doesn't think they will stay on there but in compliance he put it on the home. He added on the garage it does not make sense so he is appealing the need for them. Ms. Warner asked if there is some type of regulation that there must be gutters on the back. Mr. Snyder said it is indicated in the 2019 Residential Code of Ohio. Mr. Bickley said he read the code. Ms. Warner said there are a lot of things that don't make sense but we have to abide by them. Mr. Bickley said he understands that but would appreciate it if the board would look at the photos. It runs right into the alley, it's a downhill slope right off the drip edge into the alleyway which is unpaved and rutted. He added that they paid to have it paved 40 years ago and the city promised to maintain the pavement, but it never got done. Ms. Johnson said in regards to the paved alley that the city is supposed to maintain that so all he has to do is pick up the phone and complain to the city. She added that she has already been through it with the city and they came out and paved her alley. She stated paved alleyways have to be maintained by the city. Ms. Gamblin said to Mr. Bickley that he did do one part of what was requested because it is law. Mr. Bickley interjected that he did it for his neighbor. Ms. Gamblin added that he should have just done the garage as well which was part of the write up that was given to him. Mr. Guendelsberger asked Mr. Snyder in the previous photo, the garage and a structure was shown. Mr. Bickley said it was his property as well. Mr. Guendelsberger added that it has gutters and downspouts as well and if Mr. Bickley would have done the garage they would not be having this discussion. Mr. Matthews asked Mr. Bickley if he was given 30 days to get he project done, would he be back here smiling. Mr. Bickley said he that is what he has to

do and he can get his contractor. Mr. Matthews asked if he could have it done in 30 days, not ifs. Mr. Bickley said he could not guarantee it. Mr. Guendelsberger said the alternative is to move forward with a \$100.00 penalty, to which Mr. Bickley said he has already received it. Mr. Guendelsberger said there is a reasonable way to avoid it.

Ms. Johnson made a motion to deny the appeal. Mr. Matthews seconded the motion. Roll Call: Sharon Johnson – yes; Walt Matthews – yes; Gary Guendelsberger – yes; Janice Warner – yes; Dana Gamblin – yes; Allison Will – yes. The motion passed.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Warner asked if they are to be dealing with issues related to discrimination or if they are to just be dealing with the property issues. Sarah Chiappone, Assistant Law Director, shared that boards members can ask questions that they think are appropriate. Ms. Warner shared that they need to stay focused on the Mission, Visions and Goals for the board. Ms. Warner quoted a comment from their packet asking if that was something that should come before them. Ms. Chiappone said it was for the board to determine. Mr. Rucker shared that the Law Director stated that because an appeal was filed regardless of basis, they had to hear the appeal. Ms. Warner asked if even though it's all discrimination. Mr. Rucker said common sense would say that it's not a reason to come to this appeals board, but since it was filed, it had to be heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Guendelsberger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Johnson seconded the motion. All members voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned.

**NEXT MEETING:
June 28, 2022**

Attest:
Clerk
Date:

Dana Gamblin
Chairperson
Date: