



Code Compliance Board Regular Meeting Minutes

February 5, 2026, at 3:00 PM

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

Doug Bond, Steve Heller, Wayne Johnson, Paul Mandelkern, Kristen Matt, Carlos Diez-Arguelles, Melissa Blaney

Legal Representative for the City:

Assistant City Attorney Richard Geller

Staff Present

Building Official Gary Hiatt, Code Compliance Division Manager Susanne Porras, Code Compliance Officer Phillip Wade, Code Compliance Officer Christina Busch, Board Secretary Susan Pruchnicki

1. Call to Order

- a. Roll Call
- b. Board Chair Wayne Johnson welcomed everyone and provided guidelines for all to follow during the meeting. He then read the Statement of Purpose.

2. Swearing in of Witnesses

Witnesses were sworn in by Board Secretary Susan Pruchnicki

3. Consent Agenda

- a. Approve the Regular Meeting minutes from January 8, 2026

Douglas Bond made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Paul Mandelkern seconded the motion.

VOTE:

Steve Heller	Yes
Kristen Matt	Yes
Wayne Johnson	Yes
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Carlos Diez-Arguelles	Yes
Melissa Blaney	Yes
Doug Bond	Yes

Motion passed unanimously 7-0.

4. Public Comments (for items not on the agenda): Three minutes allowed for each speaker.

Kelly Price of 890 Georgia Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789 approached the podium and introduced herself. Ms. Price stated that Code Compliance was targeting her real estate signs, and that she was noticed approximately two weeks ago because a sign was too close to the street. She then stated that she passed seven signs on her way to the meeting that were not compliant, and that she brought this problem to the Board's attention over a year ago. She asked that Code Compliance be consistent in its delivery of violations. She stated that when she receives a notice she calls and speaks with staff and raises her concerns. She stated that it is really hard when she passes competitor's signs that she brought to the Board before that are still the same location and still in violation but don't have the ugly stickers on them. She stated that it was a burden and wished that Code Compliance would be as kind to her as they were with everyone else.

She then raised her concern about 648 Swoope Ave., Winter Park, FL. She stated there was a non-compliant tree (in distress) and that the city sent her a notice to remove it. She responded with a survey indicating that the tree was partially on city property. Urban Forestry responded with an apology and removed the tree. She stated she wished that the department would be more consistent, noting that she used to sit on the City's Tree Board. She recognized that Board was dissolved and that the Code Compliance Board now oversees Tree Appeals.

She also complained about the Cypress trees planted on the west side of Swoope Ave. She stated there is nowhere else in the city where Cypress trees are being planted, and that she has contacted the city and asked that they be removed. She stated the trees are unsightly, that there is no lake or retention pond nearby. She stated that she wanted Parks Services Manager Josh Nye or Parks Superintendent Jordan Hinirichsen to look into this, that Cypress trees offer no beautification to the city, and to remove them. She suggested to the Board members that they drive through the areas where Cypress trees continue to be planted, noting that they are not being planted on Webster Ave. or on Via Tuscany.

4. Public Hearings (Public participation and comment on these matters must be in person.)

a) CCB LDC-25-0345 2218 Whitehall Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792

Code Compliance Officer Christina Busch introduced herself and confirmed the address and ownership of the property per Orange County Public Records. Officer Busch stated that the violation was self-witnessed during her routine inspection of the area.

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION: Trailer parked in plain view from the right-of-way for over 24 hours.

CODES CITED: Chapter 58, Section 58-71 (f) (1) Boats, Trailers, and Recreational Vehicles of the City of Winter Park Land Development Code.

COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS: Cease parking of trailer for more than 24 hours or store it out of the view from the public right-of-way and/or adjacent neighboring properties.

Officer Busch presented photos from her initial inspection conducted July 22, 2025, and her follow-up inspection of July 24, 2025; a courtesy notice was issued to the owner. Follow-up inspections conducted on August 5, 2025, and August 15, 2025, found that the trailer had been removed from plain view. Follow-up inspections conducted on September 9, 2025, and September 11, 2025, found the trailer parked on the front lawn for more than 24 hours. A formal Notice of Violation was issued on September 11, 2025, and received on September 22, 2025.

A follow-up inspection was conducted on November 12, 2025, and the trailer was no longer in plain view. Follow-up inspections conducted on November 24, 2025, and November 25, 2025, found the trailer parked in plain view for more than 24 hours. Follow-up inspections conducted December 16, 2025, and December 18, 2025, found the trailer parked in the back yard, but the gate was open and remained that way for over 24 hours and the trailer was visible.

Follow-up inspections conducted January 20, 2026, and January 22, 2026, found the trailer still parked in plain view from Whitehall Drive. A Notice of Hearing was posted on January 20, 2026. A follow-up inspection was conducted January 30, 2026, after the owner, Mr. Duff, called to say that he complied with the notice issued. The gate was found to be closed during the inspection, obscuring the trailer from view. A final follow-up inspection was conducted on February 5, 2026, and the property is currently in compliance.

Officer Busch finished her presentation by providing a history of previous cases for the same violation at the same property in 2022, 2023, and 2024. She noted that even though the property is currently in compliance, she brought the current case before the Board to have it adjudicated. She then asked the Board if they had any questions.

Mr. Johnson directed a question to Assistant City Attorney Rick Geller, noting that the statute says that a closed structure means a structure having at least 75% opaqueness, and asked for a definition of opaqueness. Mr. Geller responded that opaqueness means you cannot see through it. Mr. Johnson confirmed that when the fence was open it was not considered opaque.

No one appeared on behalf of the respondent.

Board Discussion

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Geller if the Board can consider the previous cases, not for fines, but just for the pattern of behavior. Mr. Geller said yes, they could because under Florida Statutes 162.09 you can consider the history of prior non-compliance of repeat violations, and any fines that you assess can go up to \$500.00 per day instead of \$250.00. He added also because of the compliance/non-compliance seesawing back and forth it may be considered. It is the present case that is before you, but the Board did not need to close its eyes to the prior history in finding that there have been repeat violations.

Mr. Bond offered that \$500.00 per day was harsh in his opinion, and that \$250.00 per day was pretty stiff as well and asked the other Board members for their thoughts. Mr. Johnson stated that he didn't like the Respondent parking on the lawn, but that when the trailer is behind the fence and the gate is open, to him that was different from parking on the lawn.

Ms. Blaney asked if the cases had been closed, and if the Board fined him on this case because of the history. She asked if the Respondent is currently in compliance, if the current case would remain open and potentially be brought back before the Board, that violation was more of a nuisance. Officer Porrás responded that Ms. Blaney was correct and added that even if the current case was closed and the city issued an Affidavit of Compliance to the property owner, if the violation happens again the city could bring it back to the Board as a Massey Hearing for repeat violations. Ms. Blaney confirmed with Ms. Porrás that since none of the previous cases progressed to a Massey Hearing that the city just started over. Mr. Geller clarified that today's hearing was not a Massey Hearing, so any concern of a fine being too much is not a decision the Board had to make at this time. Ms. Blaney asked Mr. Geller if today's decision would be that he could be fined for future violations. Mr. Geller responded yes.

Ms. Blaney asked Officer Busch if she had spoken with the Respondent because it appeared that the violation was occurring every couple of months. Officer Busch stated that she has spoken to the Respondent, but he had not provided her with any reasons for not remaining in compliance. She added that she drives by the area continuously and the violation is over 24 hours within any given week. She stated that she sometimes keeps a case open because she's dealt with it for several years and the violation keeps happening even after talking to the Respondent multiple times.

Mr. Mandelkern raised a question about the recommended motion, that if he understood the procedure correctly that the Board passes a motion, it is turned into an order, and the order is then served on the Respondent, so the Respondent does not get the motion that is passed immediately. His concern was that the timeframe to cease the violation was enough to allow for this process. Mr. Geller answered that the Respondent received notice of the hearing and could have been present to receive instantaneous notice. He also confirmed the process of a motion being transformed into a more appropriate order format which is then signed by Chairman Johnson and served on the Respondent. The order may be signed several days after the hearing, but states the effective date being the date of the hearing. The Board can decide to allow extra time for the order to be delivered.

Mr. Bond offered that he saw no problem with allowing 7 – 10 days, as it would prevent the Respondent from claiming ignorance after being served with the order that explains what will happen if the violation occurs again.

Ms. Blaney noted that the final photos Officer Busch presented from January 30, 2025, and today, February 5, 2026, both showed the gate was closed, blocking the view of the trailer, so the Respondent may believe that his case would not be presented to the Board. Mr. Geller agreed that compliance had been met and offered a suggestion to amend the motion to make clear in the first paragraph that the non-compliance is past tense and not in the present.

Mr. Johnson asked Officer Busch if the Respondent asked her to cancel the hearing. She responded that he did not ask but did call to report he was in compliance. Based on that an inspection was done and the compliance was documented but the case was still coming before the Board. The Respondent was provided with the date and time of the hearing and advised to attend and he said he would. Mr. Johnson then asked if the violations were all self-observed or if neighbor complaints were also filed. Officer Busch stated that in this case it was self-observation, but complaints are received often about his parking of the trailer. She added that some other cases against this property were started by complaints.

Mr. Johnson offered that in terms of procedure the orders are created immediately following the hearing and delivered to his office for signature on Monday or Tuesday of the following week for signature, so they are almost always signed in a few days. Mr. Geller added that any delays in the process fell on him because he reviews the orders before they are signed and he may not get to them immediately once received.

Mr. Bond suggested a 7 or 10-day compliance period. Mr. Johnson responded that Mr. Bond could put that in his recommended motion.

Mr. Bond offered the following motion:

From the evidence presented today, I move to find the Respondent, Sean Michael Duff, Compliance Board Case #LDC-25-0345, owner of 2218 Whitehall Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792 was in violation of Chapter 58, Section 58-71 (f) (1) Boats, Trailers, and Recreational Vehicles of the City of Winter Park Land Development Code.

The Respondent has been properly notified per regular and certified mail and posting to satisfy Florida Statutes chapter 162 and City Code section 2-109 due process requirements.

The respondent is ordered to cease parking of trailer for more than 24 hours or store it out of the view from the public right-of-way and/or adjacent neighboring properties within seven days of this hearing date. Failure to comply with this order will result in fines of up to \$250.00 per day for each day the violation continues. The Respondent is further ordered to contact the City Safety & Code Compliance Officer and provide documentation of action taken by February 12, 2026.

Ms. Matt seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Douglas Bond	Yes
Steve Heller	Yes
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Kristen Matt	Yes
Carlos Diez-Arguelles	Yes
Melissa Blaney	Yes
Wayne Johnson	Yes

Motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

b) CCB LDC-25-0465 2218 Whitehall Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792

Code Compliance Officer Christina Busch introduced herself and stated that this case was for the same property as the previous case, so she would forego the property description. She stated that the violation was self-witnessed during her routine inspection of the area.

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION: Illegal parking of a motor vehicle on the grass area of the front lawn.

CODES CITED: Chapter 58, Section 58-86 (c) (2) b Parking – Off Street Parking of the City of Winter Park Land Development Code. Officer Busch displayed a slide of city parking regulations and read it to the Board.

COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS: Cease illegal parking of motor vehicles.

The initial inspection was conducted on September 9, 2025, and found a black truck parked on the grass in the front yard. A follow-up inspection conducted on October 2, 2025, found a white SUV parked on the grass in the front yard. On October 7, 2025, the Notice of Violation was posted on the property. A follow-up inspection conducted on October 15, 2025, found no illegal parking on the property. A follow-up inspection conducted on November 18, 2025, found a white truck with a topper parked on the front lawn. A follow-up inspection conducted on November 24, 2025, found the black pick-up truck and the white truck with the topper parked on the front lawn; the property was in violation again. Follow-up inspections conducted on November 26, 2025, and December 8, 2025, found the white truck with the topper parked on the lawn. A follow-up inspection conducted on December 19, 2025, found the vehicle had been moved to a different place on the front lawn. A follow-up inspection conducted on December 31, 2025, found no parking on the lawn.

A follow-up inspection conducted January 2, 2026, found two vehicles parked on the lawn area. Another follow-up inspection conducted on January 20, 2026, found the same two vehicles parked on the lawn. On January 20, 2026, the Notice of Hearing was posted on the property. A follow-up inspection conducted on January 26, 2026, found the white truck parked on the front lawn. A follow-up inspection was conducted on January 30, 2026, a couple of days after Mr. Duff called to say he had complied with the notice issued, and no vehicles were parked on the lawn.

A follow-up inspection conducted on February 2, 2026, found a vehicle parked on the front lawn again. On February 3, 2026, a follow-up inspection found the vehicle was still parked on the lawn. A follow-up inspection conducted on February 5, 2026, prior to today's hearing, found no vehicles parked on the lawn. The property is in compliance as of today.

Mr. Bond asked Officer Busch if there was no time limit for parking on the grass, if it didn't have to be over a 24-hour period. Officer Busch confirmed that was correct, that parking on the grass was the violation.

Mr. Johnson noted that in the previous case there were earlier cases and asked Officer Busch if there were any for this case. Officer Busch said yes and again displayed the slide with them.

Ms. Matt asked if there were any neighbor complaints received for this violation. Officer Busch stated not for this case, but there were complaints received in the past for the same violation.

Mr. Sean Michael Duff appeared and was sworn in. He identified himself as the property owner. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to be there. He also thanked Officer Busch, stating that she had given him a lot of chances and that he had been working with her for a couple of years and learning the ropes. He stated that he grew up at this property and knows the neighbors very well. He stated that in the past there was no problem, no HOA, or Code Enforcement, so this was all new to him.

Mr. Duff stated that he owns four vehicles and tries to stay within the parameters. He offered that when the two vehicles remained parked on the lawn it was due to a death in the family, that he left the property in the middle of the week and didn't return to move the vehicles prior to Officer Busch's inspections. He acknowledged that was no one's fault but his own.

Mr. Duff stated that he is a contractor, and that he is working with someone and getting tests done to see if he can widen the existing driveway. He stated that he is constantly moving his four vehicles around. He then mentioned the gate on the fence from the previous case, stating that he has four Quads stored in the back yard, and the gate was fine. He said there was something going on with kids from the neighboring High School, that he had found dirty diapers on his property a couple of times a week and also destroyed part of his gate making it difficult to close.

Mr. Duff stated that it's unfortunate that there is no HOA, that it is his property, that he is working with the city, and in the process of trying to get a permanent fix so the vehicles aren't always in the situation that he has to move one vehicle to access another one. He apologized and asked the Board for understanding as he is trying to rectify the situation.

Mr. Johnson informed Mr. Duff that the Board heard the earlier case regarding the trailer before he arrived and did see the gate Mr. Duff referred to as being broken. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Duff, even considering the broken gate, if there was a reason that the trailer wasn't always parked in the back yard. Mr. Duff replied that the trailer is difficult to park in the dark with the other items stored and the trees in the back yard, so he usually waits until the next day, but sometimes he has to go to work so he moves it when he gets home, but that is when it has been "caught" parking in plain view. He said that when he moved into the house it was always parked in the front yard until he found out he couldn't park it there. He stated that the gate is fixed, and you can't see the trailer. He noted the times the trailer was visible it was loaded with materials for his job to be delivered to a job or storage unit. Unfortunately, sometimes this is at night, and he can't put the trailer back right away.

Mr. Johnson asked how many vehicles could fit in the back yard. Mr. Duff stated that he had three bikes stored and the trailer. He stated the biggest thing with the trailer was learning to park it in the space available, that he has damaged the screen enclosure around his pool.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Duff if there was a reason he could not arrive for the first case. Mr. Duff stated that he was working, that he changed clothes in his truck, but had to park almost ½ mile away from City Hall so it took longer to arrive than anticipated. Mr. Duff thanked Officer Busch again for her patience in giving him so many chances and that he did not want to seem ungrateful. He reiterated his intentions for fixing the parking situation and said he did not want to be a nuisance to the city. Mr. Johnson thanked Mr. Duff for attending, because the trailer violations seemed blatant until he explained things.

Ms. Blaney asked Mr. Duff if he had a permit for the driveway addition. Mr. Duff stated that he was working on getting a permit but had to get the ground tested first. He stated that there have been situations before with the water table so adequate testing needs to be done to ensure that concrete installed doesn't sink. He mentioned that a neighbor he has known for a long-time installed gravel and it is considered his driveway.

Mr. Johnson asked if Mr. Duff lived alone. Mr. Duff replied that he had a 17-year-old son that lives with him. Mr. Johnson asked if the son would be able to move the vehicles if necessary. Mr. Duff responded that his son does have his license, but that he does not drive any of his vehicles.

Mr. Bond asked Mr. Johnson if he wanted to inform Mr. Duff of the Board's decision on the trailer case. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Geller, who then advised Mr. Duff that he was given seven days to cease any activity where the trailer would be in public view from the right of way or neighboring properties. He added that Mr. Duff seemed to resolve the violation by storing it behind the fence. The order will serve to let you know that you are on notice to make certain it remains that way, and there will be a written order that he will receive service of in the next week. There were no fines issued against him in the order, but they could be assessed if there are any repeat violations. Mr. Duff stated that he understood.

Board Discussion

Ms. Matt offered that she was not convinced to make a motion, that in her opinion Mr. Duff was making good-faith efforts to fix the parking issue and needs more time. She recommended staying the case. Mr. Johnson responded that like the previous case Mr. Duff was compliant and the order was worded that the violation was in the past.

Ms. Blaney offered that it was a matter of a timeline, that it seems that Mr. Duff is getting the work put together to submit for a permit to expand his driveway for a permanent fix to the issue. She felt that he should be given a reasonable period of time, that staying the case offers no pressure to complete the process.

Mr. Heller offered that Mr. Duff already has a double driveway and didn't believe that Mr. Duff would be able to get a permit to expand the driveway further. Ms. Blaney said that it would have to do with the impervious area available on the lot. Building Official Gary Hiatt confirmed that Ms. Blaney's thoughts were correct, and that it would be Zoning and Engineering that would look at the impervious area. He stated that if a permit application was received that his department would try to push it.

Mr. Duff returned to the podium and stated that realistically he is not looking at adding a six-inch slab or extending the driveway per se but installing pebble or white river rock and add dark mulch around it so that one of the vehicles can be parked off the existing driveway.

Mr. Johnson offered that the main issue was the trailer, and if it was consistently parked in the backyard the other four vehicles could fit in the driveway. Mr. Heller added that the vehicles must stay off of the grass in the front lawn. Mr. Duff agreed but noted that he had to move a vehicle to get his truck out to use the trailer, and that he understood that that was on him.

Mr. Hiatt suggested that Mr. Duff stop and visit the Planning Department before he left City Hall today to see what he can do with the rock or extensions of the driveway. Mr. Duff asked if that was where he needed to go to register as a contractor. Mr. Hiatt said he could speak to one of the Permit Techs and they will go through that process with him.

Mr. Johnson repeated Ms. Matt's desire to stay, and Mr. Blaney's concern about leaving the case open-ended. Ms. Blaney offered staying the case would only be for one month, which she didn't think was enough time for Mr. Duff. Mr. Geller pointed out that the Board could stay the case to any time they felt it was appropriate. Ms. Blaney responded that she did not think staying the case was appropriate, that she didn't see a reason and asked Mr. Hiatt if 30 days was reasonable to obtain a permit if Mr. Duff submits an application within 7 days. Mr. Hiatt responded that if Mr. Duff lets him know that that application is there he will push it. He added that the Building Department side would be easy, that Zoning and Engineering are the departments they would have to nudge along.

Mr. Duff returned to the podium noting his biggest concern was dealing with people that run tests and how long it takes. He stated he might let them know and they would put in the order, but it might be two months before they are able to do it, he really didn't know. Mr. Hiatt clarified that Mr. Duff's comment was about soil testing for his driveway, not what the city would do. The city would not go out and test the soil. Mr. Hiatt said if Mr. Duff came in with a driveway permit they will look at impervious surface, and if the driveway sinks into a sinkhole that would be on Mr. Duff for not getting it tested. Mr. Duff asked about not dealing with concrete. Mr. Hiatt said they could have those specific conversations in the Planning Department offices.

Mr. Bond asked Mr. Duff to confirm the number of vehicles he owns. Mr. Duff replied four that could be seen in the photos, two others that aren't pictured, and three bikes. Mr. Bond asked if the driveway could accommodate four vehicles. Mr. Duff said yes, but they were on the curb, and that the passenger doors could not be opened. Mr. Bond stated that what he was getting at was just an inconvenience. Mr. Duff stated that his Camaro has very wide doors. Mr. Bond responded that he experiences the same problem, that basically it was inconvenient to rotate the vehicles and he understood, but the vehicles will fit in the current driveway. Mr. Bond confirmed that Mr. Duff has a son at home the drives, then offered an example that if he needs to leave, his wife will move her car. Mr. Duff replied that his son does not know how to drive a stick shift. Mr. Bond again confirmed that the current driveway can accommodate his vehicles so that is not a problem.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Duff when he moves a car, if it could be parked on the street. Mr. Duff replied that he thought about that, but it would impede the school buses, and he didn't want to upset anyone. He recounted the dirty diapers being tossed in his yard. Officer Porras added that as long as there is no prohibited parking on each side of the street Mr. Duff can legally park any of his cars along his property. Mr. Duff said that he still intends to work on expanding the driveway, that he really didn't like leaving his vehicles on the street.

Mr. Diez-Arguelles asked Mr. Duff if all four vehicles are parked in the driveway if they blocked the sidewalk. Mr. Duff said no that he makes sure not to block the sidewalk.

Mr. Johnson stated that his difficulty is that the violation is easily correctable although it may be an inconvenience.

Mr. Johnson proposed the following motion:

From the evidence presented today, I move to find the Respondent, Sean Michael Duff Compliance Board Case #LDC-25-0465, owner of 2218 Whitehall Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792 was in violation of Chapter 58, Section 58-86 (c) (2) b Parking – Off Street Parking of the City of Winter Park Land Development Code.

The Respondent has been properly notified per regular and certified mail and posting to satisfy Florida Statutes chapter 162 and City Code section 2-109 due process requirements.

The Respondent is ordered to cease illegal parking of any motorized vehicle on the grass area of the front lawn within seven days of this hearing date. Failure to comply with this order will result in fines of up to \$250.00 per day for each day the violation continues. The Respondent is further ordered to contact the City Safety & Code Compliance Officer and provide documentation of action taken by February 12, 2026.

Paul Mandelkern seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Douglas Bond	Yes
Steve Heller	No
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Kristen Matt	No
Carlos Diaz-Arguelles	Yes
Melissa Blaney	No
Wayne Johnson	Yes

Motion passed 4-3.

Mr. Johnson explained to Mr. Duff that he is not being fined today, that he has to correct the violation within seven days and notify the Code Compliance Officer. It is the same for this case as the prior case for the trailer. Mr. Duff asked if since he was in compliance if he still needed to call Officer Busch. Mr. Johnson said yes.

c) CCB PM-25-0186 508 Brechin Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792

Officer Porras requested to table this case, that Code Compliance received notification that the property owner applied for the fence permit that was required.

Mr. Heller made a motion to table case PM-25-0186. Mr. Bond seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Douglas Bond	Yes
Steve Heller	Yes
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Kristen Matt	Yes
Carlos Diaz-Arguelles	Yes
Melissa Blaney	Yes
Wayne Johnson	Yes

Motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

6. Non-Action Items

None

7. Staff Updates

Officer Porras noted that case LDC-25-0559 1815 Barker Dr., Winter Park, FL 32789. The case was related to short term rental and the violation was corrected.

Mr. Johnson asked if this case was the video house. Officer Porras responded no, it was a different property nearby.

8. City Attorney Reports

Mr. Geller provided an update on Atlantic Oasis Trust, owner of the illegal rental house on 1810 Barker Dr. The Appellant has moved for a review of your stay order. The city will respond today. Also, the Appellant filed their initial brief this week. Mr. Geller stated that it will be reviewed and a response filed within the next month.

Mr. Mandelkern asked Mr. Geller if the brief was on the Motion to Stay or to the merits of the case. Mr. Geller responded there are two different items, first the Motion to Stay and then the brief, which is on the merits of the case.

Mr. Mandelkern then asked Mr. Geller what happened to the foreclosure item the Board voted on for the property at 2661 Via Tuscan, if the City Commission approved it. Mr. Geller deferred to Gary Hiatt.

Mr. Hiatt stated that it was added to the Commission Agenda under the City Attorney's Report. The commission directed preliminary research and to meet with the owner's attorney, Mr. Chakir, who was also there and wanted a reduction in fines. Mr. Chakir was directed to work directly with the city attorney. Mr. Hiatt said the case is not on the upcoming Commission Agenda, and a response from the city attorney said that they had not communicated with each other.

9. Board Comments:

None

10. Upcoming Agenda Items

Division Manager Susanne Porras informed the Board of four cases on the schedule for the March 5, 2026, meeting.

Mr. Johnson asked if any of them were tree cases. Ms. Porras responded no.

11. Adjournment

Board Member Kristen Matt made a motion to adjourn. Board Member Steve Heller seconded.

VOTE:

Douglas Bond	Yes
Steve Heller	Yes
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Kristen Matt	Yes
Carlos Diaz-Arguelles	Yes
Melissa Blaney	Yes
Wayne Johnson	Yes

Motion passed unanimously, 7-0.

Code Compliance
Board Minutes
February 5, 2026

ATTEST:

Approved by the board on March 5, 2026

Susan Pruchnicki

/s/ Susan Pruchnicki, Board Secretary