

**Chairman Dana Gamblin called the meeting to order.**

**Members present:** Dana Gamblin, Sharon Johnson, Don Sharrah, Janice Warner

**Members absent:** Gary Gundelsberger

**Staff present:** Steve Rucker, Housing Manager; Scott Thom, Building Official; Ron Snyder, Code Compliance Officer, Angela Kotsopoulos, Code Compliance Officer; Sarah Chiappone, Law Clerk.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion of Ms. Warner and second of Ms. Johnson, the members voted to approve the minutes of the September 27, 2022, meeting. Motion passed.

Those wishing to give testimony were sworn in by Dana Gamblin.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

- **2021-06 REVIEW OF VARIANCE – Charles Kraisner is appealing the demolition of 520 E. Jefferson Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870. Parcel Number 56-00555.000**  
**Ms. Gamblin** - asked if Mr. Kraisner was present and if he would like to give testimony. Please step up to the podium. You were here for the variance part. You were going to have your person get us the information that was needed. **Mr. Kraisner** – My contractor has all of that stuff. **Mr. Rucker** – Can they take a look at the information? **Mr. Kraisner** – Yeah. Anything you want. **Mr. Rucker** – Scott Thom has been to the property recently, so he does have an adjusted percentage. **Ms. Gamblin**- Asked for Mr. Thom to step up. You’ve been to the property recently? **Mr. Thom**- Yeah, I was just over there last week and another contractor and yes, they are making progress. I also discussed some options with the contractor again today. I told him there’s a bigger percentages area if you want to concentrate in and make the biggest impact. I think it was a very productive morning meeting and what they were going to exactly do. **Ms. Gamblin**- As to the contractor. Do you have a timeline as to when you think this will be completed? **Paul Kovach (Contractor)**- We basically just put our plan of action outline up today. We are waiting on quotes from the roofing contractors and the siding. We have our mechanicals turned on next week. The gas is getting turned on next week and the water sometime either the end of the week or the beginning of the following week. Then we will be able to get our mechanical systems up and running. Then basically our timeline for the exterior and the major percentage points we’re waiting on the roofing estimates and the siding. **Mr. Sharrah**- The estimated completion date would be in March? **Mr. Kovach** - Yes. **Mr. Sharrah**- I am reading the minutes here and it said that we provided a revised extension to 27 March 2023. Do you think that you will be able to make that? **Mr. Kovach** - I think I would be. **Ms. Johnson**- I have a question. Did we already give them 6 months extension? He’s just reporting. **Mr. Sharrah**- Yes, that’s the way I read the minutes. **Mr. Kovach**- I don’t remember where things were left off. I know that was mentioned in the prior meeting a few months ago. **Mr. Sharrah**- Right. We formalized that I believe in the last meeting in the minutes, and we provided an extension up to 27 March 2023 at the last meeting which was September. **Ms. Johnson**- What date? **Mr. Sharrah**- I wrote down here Sharon 27 March 23. **Ms. Gamblin**- Yes, we had the meeting September 27<sup>th</sup> we think that you were going to be present, but you weren’t here. We wanted you to come to this meeting to find out where you were at this point. **Mr. Kovach**- I met with Scott a couple of

times since then and basically there was a little misunderstanding on the percentage breakdown. We were focusing on items that weren't impacting our percentage of completion. Now we need to redirect our focus on the things that are going to impact. **Ms. Gamblin**- He just said that you made some progress. **Mr. Kovach** - That was a little misunderstanding that we had. **Ms. Johnson**- You think that you're going to be done by March of 2023, right? **Mr. Kovach** - I don't want to throw myself and others say done 100%. But we are going to focus on our issues, big ticket factors that we discussed today. But yes, I want to say but I don't want to say hey we're going to be done and come March we're not 100% done. Because some things going to be able to focus on until the spring. **Ms. Johnson**- Has the City been in since our last meeting? Have you invited the city in? **Ms. Gamblin** – Yes, Mr. Thom just spoke and said... **Mr. Thom**- Yes, my plumbing inspector has been there. **Ms. Johnson**- How far do you think? 50, 25, 75 percent done? **Mr. Thom**- Right around there. I would say they got about 30% to go. **Ms. Johnson**- Okay, 30%. Do we need for him to report every month? **Ms. Warner**- No. I don't think he needs to report back. It seems like they've been working with the City and Mr. Thom seems to be pleased with the progress and I don't think that they need to come back every month. We'll just have them come back in March and hopefully you're going to be under that 50% threshold. Contractor- Yes. **Mr. Sharrah made a motion to monitor the situation and bring it back onto the agenda on March 28, 2023, meeting and Ms. Warner second. Members voted to approve motion and it passed.**

- **2022-08 APPEAL DEMO ORDER UPDATE – Linda Johnson 402 Hendry Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 57-00674.000**

**Mr. Harvey**- Indicated that his grandmother was ill and unable to attend the meeting. **Ms. Gamblin**- Discussed the importance of someone representing Ms. Johnson presence needed and acknowledged receiving copies of information from Mr. Harvey on behalf of Ms. Johnson. **Mr. Harvey**- Stated that the copies were estimates from RestorePro which would be cut in ½. The 10/4 estimate was prior to Mr. Harvey doing the demolition. He stated that RestorePro would be coming back out to do another estimate next week. Mr. Harvey mentioned his grandmother (insurance company) putting \$10,000 into fire funds escrow for the demolition and remodel. **Mr. Rucker**- If we received money in escrow from the fire funds, then it would sit in escrow until it was done and then the funds would be released to you. **Mr. Harvey**- We have two more contractors coming out during the second week of November for the siding and roofing. The roofing people would handle the reconstruction of the front porch. Mr. Harvey stated that he was 99% sure that his grandmother would be using the roofing company for the rest of the demolition, resealing the walls and taking the smoke smell out and all of the smoke fire damage and the remodel. He did not think that the quote for the remodel was provided in the copies given to the Board. The quote given was mainly for the demolition and smoke control or the damage from the fire. **Ms. Gamblin**- Are they going to demolish the home and rebuild it? **Mr. Harvey**- No. I would like to get someone from the city to come out. Mr. Harvey had questions regarding gas line to the house being cut and/or turned off. There were discussions about Columbia Gas possibly doing upgrades to the gas lines in that area and for Mr. Harvey to contact the gas company. **Ms. Johnson**- We have an estimate from RestorePro for \$47,700.00 to clean up the inside and not including the costs of remodeling. I am concerned about this. **Mr. Harvey**- I have been doing a lot of the demolition and removal of the debris. They're going to give me an estimate on the seal, the HEPA vacuum and sealing up the stud walls and odor control. They're not demolishing anything. They're going to take care of the

HEPA vacuum exposed framing. I got it down to the studs. **Ms. Johnson**- Did you bring the letters of credit? **Mr. Harvey** explained that they were unable to get letters due to his work schedule and his grandmother being ill. **Ms. Gamblin**- Explained that the Board has been fair to he and his grandmother Ms. Johnson, but they have not provided the Board with the requested documentation from the bank and other quotes and estimates as previously requested and concerns with the amount of money it will take to clean out the house as well as cost to rebuild the interior. The house has been sitting for 2 years. **Mr. Harvey** indicated they were going to refurbish the cabinets and other parts of the house are good. He and two other contractors would be doing mostly all of the remodel of the house. **Ms. Johnson made a motion to deny the demolition appeal of 402 Hendry Street and Mr. Sharrah second. Members voted to approve motion and it passed.**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

- **2021-0405 April Riffle is appealing the Notice and Order of Demolition of 809 Hancock Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 57-03140.000**  
**Angela ("Angie") Kotsopoulos**, Code Compliance Officer, provided information regarding a complaint received on April 15, 2021, involving a child trapped in the garage at 809 Hancock Street and the neighbor was able to get the child to safety. She shared that the house was vacant with raccoons living inside and that someone was taking the cooper out of the house. Jahn Farris went out on April 16, 2021, took pictures of trash and sent violation letter. On May 7, 2021, via search warrant, Dante Shipp and Scott Thom conducted an inspection of the property. Scott Thom's inspection damage report showed 56% damaged, decayed, or deteriorated and posted as condemned per Code 1341.18. The on that same day, a Notice and Order of Violation and Condemnation letters were mailed to Mildred and Samuel Mickles. It was discovered that the owners of the property were deceased, and the house was in Probate Court. It was later discovered that April Riffle and Agus Yana purchased the property on January 11, 2022, at Sheriff's Sale for \$7,300.00. The deputies advised that they would have had possession of that in March. The Trulia website said that they started selling the property on the March 4<sup>th</sup> for \$80,000.00 and most recently \$49,000 and then it was taken off. A lien search was done, and Notice of Order of Demolition was written on September 29 and sent to the new owners. April Riffle contacted Angie Kotsopoulos on September 13<sup>th</sup> stating that she did not know anything about the condemnation when she had purchased the property. Angie told Ms. Riffle that on May 4<sup>th</sup> that it had been condemned over one year ago. Ms. Riffle stated that she would appeal condemnation order. Angie told her that it would be fine. Angie asked Ms. Riffle if she could do an interior inspection because Ms. Riffle claimed that she had done work and to contact her attorney, Mr. Liska. In Mr. Liska's paperwork he advised that they disagreed with the assessment of the demolition that they felt that we had a Sheriff's sale to collect back County taxes which is not the case. City of Sandusky do not do Sheriff's Sales. His letter also asks that we retain our records which we do per Public Law. He also said we were going down unknowingly dishonest path. He also claims that the City owned surrounding property and that is also false. Angie further explains the complaint, appeal and filing of a demolition affidavit process to Board and audience. On September 21<sup>st</sup> Angie asked Mr. Liska if she could inspect the interior of the property again and also filled the Public Records Request. On September 22<sup>nd</sup>, Code was advised that they could have access to the property. Angie and Scott Thom showed up on the property on September 29<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 am along with Ms. Riffle and Mr. Yana. Angie described Ms. Riffle

as being very irate and belligerent and screaming that Angie was harassing her. Angie called her manager, Steve Rucker, Housing Manager to apprise him of the situation. Mr. Rucker contacted the Sandusky Police Department. Mr. Rucker and a Sandusky Police Officer came to standby as she proceeded with the search warrant inspection. The garage was dilapidated and was advised by Mr. Yana that it would be demolished. Before (May 2021) and after (September 2022) pictures were shown on the monitor of the interior and exterior of the house showing no change or worse, as well as explanation of the condition of the interior and exterior of the house. Officer requested copies of the architectural reports and noted that the percentage went up from 56% to 62% deterioration. Angie asked for Ms. Riffle and Mr. Yana to follow her back to the Code Compliance Office to complete a Public Records Request for a copy of Code's file. Neither Mr. Yana nor Ms. Riffle came into the office. Ms. Riffle later refused to complete a PRR. Ms. Johnson asked when was the property condemned and if the condemned sign was on the property presently? Angie restated that it was condemned at the time of the initial search warrant on May 4, 2021 and posted on same day. She further stated that the May 4, 2021, condemnation posting was missing on day of re-inspection but was reposted on September 14, 2022. It is unknown who removed the May 4<sup>th</sup> posting. Sheriff's Deputy Crucey said that Ms. Riffle took possession of the property on or about March 7<sup>th</sup>. **Mr. Liska-** "There's some procedural issues that I'm taking issues with that's happened with this property. This house was condemned in May of 2021. It was allowed to go to Sheriff's Sale in January, final purchase in March of 2022. That is an issue because they did do a condemnation letter of 2021 and then they sent that letter to the lawyers handling the probate. There's no response, no appeal was filed so they should have continued and done it, or notice filed. Because what you've now allowed to happen here procedurally is that now a buyer who wants to renovate a property see the Sheriff's sale says okay, I'm going to fix I'm going to buy this property. My client drove by there's no notice on the door of condemnation. She does a title check no affidavit that the building's been condemned. I've been in contact with the County Prosecutor and no notice to them. They would have never sold this property if they had known the condemnation was pending on this property not in this fashion because it's such in essence the Sheriff's sale is to cut all liens on a property so that she can start fresh in it but now we have a demolition on this property. If we were to go forward with this at 56% or 64% and that would be on her now, so she's now walked into and is suffering a \$25,000 loss simply for buying this property that she was going to refurbish or then sell somebody else who's going to refurbish this property. So procedurally that is an issue. It's a due process issue for my client. I've been in contact with the County Prosecutor's Office on this matter and they asked me to ask for a continuance in this so that we can figure out what we do. It maybe that they refund my client for money in this matter. We want to discuss that more. What I would ask for is a variance in this property or at least time to do a more detailed review of this property. I've been in contact with John Feick on this property. He's an architect in the area. Is anyone familiar with Mr. Feick? He wants to come out and do a quantitative start on the property. That is something that we're considering depending on what we hear back from the County Prosecutors on this property. As to my client went to this property there was no notice posted. She didn't take this down. If she had seen a notice posted condemnation, she never would have bought it. Why would she want to be here after they do this while an investment on this property knowing that very well that property would be taken raised on her. It just My client has made some repairs to the property. This property was absolutely trashed filled. I have no issue with the Housing Authority being served this property in May of 2021. It

was an absolute cesspool. Absolutely it is a hazard to local kids. Absolutely. That I don't discount at all. You'll see that if they have the old photos on in that packet. I'm not sure. Did you find the old photos?"

**Angie**- Yes. I used in the comparison slides. **Mr. Liska** - "Okay. Thank you. My client has moved mounds of trash out of this property. Now we do have some difference of opinion on the foundation of this property. For example, the Housing says that the bathroom is unsafe. My client can provide a video of her jumping in that bathroom repeatedly on that floor because it is not falling through. Now the tiling needs done. Cosmetically this house does need a lot of work absolutely. It does need a fresh coat of paint. It needs to be cleaned. It needs new flooring tiling. It needs repairs to the roof. It needs. There are exposed wires. My client has capped those wires as of today and we can show you photos of those that that's taken care of. The I don't understand how the percentage for the foundation has been marked at 50% on the foundation based on some liens. I know that there's the allegation that the floor is not level. We can provide photos of levels being of levels on the floor showing level. Now the house is not perfect. We have bids that come in. It does need a new roof. It has roof worked as required. My client has received a bid from Ace Handyman Service to repair the roof for Forty-three Hundred Dollars. She received a bid to replace the heating and to add air conditioning at \$17,000.00. Then she has a contractor coming in this week to walk through to give an estimate on the drywall and the plumbing on the property." **Ms. Gamblin**- I have two questions. You said that you went to our County Prosecutor, and they asked you to ask us for a continuance. Did they give you anything in writing? **Mr. Liska** - Absolutely, not. No because I received a message at like 4:30 in the afternoon last night because I contacted them and asked them was there an affidavit for this? Why was this allowed to go to Sheriff's sale? And they said no. And then they contacted my office late and said ask them for I think it's between 30 to 90 days that this Board can give. Ask for a continuance so we can get the matter of this, so we don't have to litigate. Because I think that realistically my client just would like to have her money back and then the city could raise this building if that's what is determined to do that, and the next buyer could then take on that lien but. **Ms. Gamblin**- If she doesn't get her money back again because we actually don't really get involved with the sheriff sales so I'm not going to sit here and pretend to tell you the ins and outs, but I guess my question is it was 56% in 2021 and not it's 62% that it is deteriorated. You just stated that she has someone coming for the roof, someone coming for this but overall, what are they telling her that it is going to cost her to rehab and bring this house up to code? Because from our standpoint, anything that is over 50% is demolishable. **Mr. Liska**- Right, I understand that part of it. The issue that I have is how my client got stuck in with this property on that's going to be demolished. There's been nothing provided to my client about what needs to be focused on and what needs fixed. The percentages I received; I've not received those percentages that were brought up. Those were not provided to my client. And there's no specifics like ok we need to work on this floor area here, redo this structure. We do know that the roof needs to be repaired and we have that estimated \$4350 but I don't know what that does for this percentage on this property. **Ms. Warner**- I don't know if the Sheriff's Sale or the variables or whatever should come before the Housing Appeals Board. All we are here to do is to see if we need to demolish this property or not. It is more than 50%. **Angie** passed out information from the County's website about how all Sheriff's sales are buyer beware situations. **Mr. Liska**- There's also supposed to be able to title searches on the property to show you everything is going on with the property and that was conducted both by her privately and the County Prosecutor. **Mr. Sharrah**- I missed your first comment. Can you please repeat

it. **Mr. Liska**- No. There was when you're supposed to do title searches to see impending liens on the property and there's nothing. There's no way for her to know at all about this condemnation. There's nothing out there. There was no marking on the property. Though I do admit that they show the photo of it being marked. At the time of purchase, it's not there and there was no affidavit filed so literally this would be a massive warning flight to anybody buying property from that sheriff's sale in Sandusky City proper that you'd be walking into a condemnation, and you might just be out not only the \$7,000 for the purchase but then the \$25,000 to have the property demolished. **Ms. Warner**- I think that we should look at the condition of the house. **Mr. Liska**- I understand your position on that but you do have the ability to grant a variance when you look at the entitle of it. The totality of the situation. ***Discussions of whether the Board have the right to grant a variance, extend the time, agree with the appeal and/or reverse the demolition order. The City of Sandusky is not a part of the Sheriff's, nor does it get involved with Sheriff's sales.*** **S. Johnson**- Asked counsel why did his client not contact the City of Sandusky about the property? There was a sign there. **Mr. Liska**- What generally ma'am in those situations something would be recorded lien on the property. That's generally how that's handled. The sign was missing. **Mr. Rucker**- We don't file anything with the County. There are no liens or anything that's going to show up. **Ms. Johnson**- But if she came down to City Hall you could have told her. **Mr. Rucker**- He's speaking about a title search and information that would show up on that lien or that title search or that lien search any information that we have in the Housing, or the Compliance Office is not going to show up on that lien search because we don't file anything until the appeal process has been completed. **Ms. Johnson**- Because it pertains to liens it doesn't protect **Ms. Riffle**- I do have something to say. On April 21<sup>st</sup> to 2020 I did after purchasing the place John came down and did an inspection from Code. He sent me a paper the only violation he had was the trash nuisance and I instantly cleaned it up. **Ms. Warner**- Did you say 2020? **Ms. Riffle**- I do have that letter here too where he contacted me about the trash. Me and him spoke on the phone, I got dumpsters. We instantly had it cleaned up. A month later I received a call from Stephen, and I tried to call him back saying there was a problem 809 Hancock. I called and called. He didn't return any of my calls. I had to call John to see if Stephen was a real that even worked down there because Steven would not return my calls. John informed me that he did work at Code Office, and he gave me to John his secretary or something. And I left a message again. I got no phone communication back from him. I contacted my lawyer, and I said something is going on nobody wants to return my calls, nobody wants to send me paperwork can you figure out what's going on for me here please. **Mr. Liska**- I did leave a voicemail as well and I was never contacted. **Ms. Riffle**- I requested the paper verbally and in writing. It was just something they did not want to hand anything. **Ms. Johnson** wanted to know why is Ms. Riffle buying the property and what are her plans to fix up the property and then flip it pr rent it or what? Is she in the business of buying lots of properties like this and fixing **Mr. Liska**- What happens Riffle buys multiple properties and then she goes in, and she sees what's the state of it okay. This property has value based on its location. You're near the waterfront that's been renovated which the city has done an amazing job with. It's very impressive. It's only 8 blocks away so this property has value based on its nearness to that waterfront district. She makes three decisions. Okay I'm gonna make some minor cosmetic changes and I'm going to sell this to somebody else who's going to turn into something else. She will fix up herself and sell a whole or she'll fix it up and then rent. ***Discussions about variances expectations and/or upholding demolition order.*** **Mr. Liska** stated that if granted a variance that the roof would be

repaired and that Construction Unlimited coming out to the property this week to give estimates on the drywall and the plumbing and what's going to take to fix that; the safety hazards of the exposed wires in the lighting fixings have been addressed and they have been capped until they can have new light fixtures put in; it's clearly the two things that we're doing that we can do immediately or in the near future. **Ms. Gamblin-** Commented on the back and forth about Mr. Liska stating that his client wanted her money back from the County for the Sheriff's sale but she's going to put money back into it to fix it up. **Mr. Liska-** If I could be honest ma'am there's no guarantee that that's going to happen so that would be best case scenario for my client. Can't guarantee it's going to happen. Okay, if that's not going to happen what do we do not lose the investment then we're going to have to comply with the Code get that house built up to be in compliance. So that it's not a complete \$30,000 loss for my client. Because that's what she's looking at right now is a loss of \$30,000 on this property. The purchase price and the cost of demolition. She had to also pay the back taxes ma'am and then she'll have to pay the taxes this year plus it'll be the cost of demolition estimated between Twenty to Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars. **Ms. Johnson** had some concerns about Ms. Riffle only doing cosmetic work on the house, the low roof estimate for \$4300 and if it would be a patch job. \$20- to 20. **Mr. Liska** Could not answer if it would be a new roof or patch up. He did say that he would have John Feick, a professional engineer, come in and do a complete review of the property before the next hearing and get his official opinion on what it's going to take to completely fix the property if a variance is granted in time. Mr. Feick, who is a professional engineer, will do a complete analysis of what needs to be done to fix the property. **Ms. Johnson made a motion to give Ms. Riffle 30 days to provide all documentation needed to save the house for demolition. Mr. Sharrah seconded the motion. Members voted to approve motion and it passed.**

- **Case No. 2022-0461 Katrina Crum is appealing the First Administrative Penalty for 710 Warren Street, Sandusky, Ohio 44870 Parcel Number 57-03243.000**

Ron Snyder, Code Compliance Officer, shared that on May 2, 2022, he was in the field and noticed that 710 Warren Street had a number of exterior issues. He presented photos of the property showing the roof to east end of the residence flaking, crumbling, and/or deteriorating shingles; roof also appears to be raised in one area and sunken in another, depending on the viewer's perception; no downspouts on North side of residence; gutters on the West side front and South side of the residence are drooping and/or sagging/damaged; no gutter on North side of the residence; the handrailing on the front steps was detached at the top, not allowing it to be used for what it's designed; front porch steps need to be covered painted, as with other wooden areas on the front porch (trim, etc.). A Notice of Violation(s) letter was sent out on May 3, 2022, to the property owners. On June 7, 2022, a reinspection was conducted, and no changes had been made. There were some unexplainable changes to the steps and because of that a courtesy extension was given to the property owners. A follow-up inspection was scheduled for July 12, 2022, and a distinct change was noted. The fascia board had been replaced; they buttoned down the eve area; the drip edge had been kind of secured; still no gutters, no spouts and again a courtesy extension was granted pushing their timeline down the road a little bit. On August 16, 2022, a re-inspection showed that no progress had been made at this point. An administrative penalty letter to correct the violation was sent to the owner on August 16, 2022, along with an invoice for

\$100. There was an administrative penalty evaluation done and signed by the Housing Manager. Mr. Snyder explained that after receiving in communication with the property owner to do some further investigating and found that the property owner did live at the 710 Warren Street address and was not receiving the mail in a reasonable amount of time. He then drove out and placed his business card in the private residence mailbox in Castalia. Ms. Crum then contacted Ron on August 18, 2022, and had discussions regarding if she had received mail from Code Compliance Office, Code's procedures regarding mailing violations and notices to the taxpayer's mailing address through the Erie County Auditor's website which still indicated the Warren Street address and not their mailing address. Ms. Gamblin invited Ms. Crum up to the podium to speak. **Ms. Crum-** Stated that she had received Ron Snyder's card out of her private residence in Castalia. She stated that she still has not received the mail sent to the Warren Street residence. She further stated that she has every intention on getting the gutters fixed but she, her husband and others have been very busy. She understands that it needs to be done. **Mr. Sharrah-** Asked if she received any kind of estimates at all to make repairs? **Ms. Crum –** Was unsure if her husband has any estimates but that he had contacted a couple of people to do the repairs, but they were too busy to do so. Her husband was going to take of the issues, but he too was too busy at work to take care of the issues. She noted that she had gotten the painting done to the steps. Ron Snyder acknowledged via photos that this was true. **Ms. Johnson-** Asked if the property was a rental or do you have other rentals? **Ms. Crum-** This is my only rental. Discussions about the mail were had. Ms. Crum stated that she had not as of the meeting received anything from Code regarding the violation. Ms. Crum admitted that she was aware of the gutter issues and broken railing but not aware of the steps needed to be painted. She stated that she checks on the rental property regularly and has a good relationship with her tenant. Further discussions were had about waiving penalty. **Ms. Warner made a motion to waive the \$100.00 administrative penalty. Ms. Johnson second the motion. The motion passed waving the administrative penalty.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Ms. Warner made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Sharrah seconded the motion. All members voted in favor and the meeting was adjourned.**

**NEXT MEETING:**

**November 29, 2022**

---

**Attest: Treka Parker, Housing Clerk**

**Date:**

---

**Dana Gamblin, Chairperson**

**Date:**