



Code Compliance Board Regular Meeting Minutes

June 4, 2026, at 3:00 PM

City Hall Commission Chambers
401 S. Park Avenue

Present

Steve Heller, Wayne Johnson, Paul Mandelkern, Carlos Diez-Arguelles, Melissa Blaney

Absent

Kristen Matt

Legal Representative for the City:

Assistant City Attorney Katherine Ruiz

Staff Present

Building Official Gary Hiatt, Code Compliance Division Manager Susanne Porras, Code Compliance Officer Christina Busch, Code Compliance Officer Phillip Wade, 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 May 7, 2026

Steve Heller moved to approve the minutes as presented. Paul Mandelkern seconded the motion.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

VOTE:

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

Motion passed unanimously 5-0.

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

None

5. Other Business

a) **LDC-25-0465** 2218 Whitehall Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792

Code Compliance Officer Christina Busch introduced herself and offered information on the previous hearings about this case and also a letter received from Jennifer White, an associate of the Respondent, Sean Duff, requesting that the Board Order of April 2, 2026, be reconsidered and the fine reduced or eliminated. Officer Busch allowed time for the Board to review the documents from the case.

Division Manager Susanne Porras introduced herself and reminded the Board that the case in question was adjudicated. Mr. Duff appeared before the Board for a Massey Hearing and was found in violation. The Order has been recorded with Orange County Records. She stated that the city is allowing Ms. White to express her concerns, but the case has been adjudicated, and fines were assessed.

Mr. Mandelkern requested guidance on the procedure when a hearing has been conducted and a fine imposed. Attorney Katherine Ruiz stated that because the order finding the Massey violation was already recorded, it has become a lien. The only entity that can negotiate a lien to release or modify the terms is the City Commission. It is beyond the Board's scope of authority.

Mr. Mandelkern responded that if that was said another way, it is final. The Massey Hearing was a final order. It was a final adjudication. Ms. Ruiz replied that the Board found a violation, a repeat violation, determined a fine amount, and that was recorded with Orange County official records. Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. Ruiz if that meant that the Board does not have jurisdiction to vacate the recorded order. Ms. Ruiz replied that the decision would fall on the City Commission. Mr. Mandelkern thanked Ms. Ruiz.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

Mr. Sean Duff, owner of 2218 Whitesell Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792, and Ms. Jennifer White approached the podium. Ms. White stated that she does not live at the subject property. She also told the Board that she was not appearing in a legal capacity, but that she was a Florida-licensed attorney and works for the State of Florida. Her appearance was a personal matter.

Ms. White stated it was her understanding that there was a hearing held in February where Mr. Duff was ordered to come into compliance with city codes about parking vehicles on the lawn and easement around his property. She stated he had come into compliance. There were four cited dates (February 16, 2026, February 23, 2026, March 9, 2026, and March 16, 2026) that she was made aware of after Mr. Duff was fined. Ms. White stated that each of those violations was for her vehicle having been parked on the lawn or easement. She stated it would be unfair for her not to try to get the fine waived or ask the Board to reconsider the order.

She stated that she disagreed with the city attorney regarding the Board's Authority. She referred to an order from the Attorney General issued on March 25, 1985. She said that before she told the Board what that order said, she stated that a Notice of Hearing was received for May 7, 2026. She believed that the notice was in response to her letter. She stated that it was their understanding that the notice was issued in error. She stated that they did come to the hearing and were told that they weren't supposed to appear until June. She said she did not know when the decision was made to reset the hearing and asked if it was in response to her letter. She thought the notice was a response because that was the matter today.

She then told the Board that the power still resides with them 30 days from the Massey Hearing, to decide whether or not to rehear the case. She stated that if the Board made that decision and sent the notice for May 7, 2026, they still have the power. She went on to say that even if the Board did not have the power to reconsider, under Chapter 162, 162.08, and 162.09 – Administrative fines, costs of repairs, and liens. Section 2 (c): An Enforcement Board may reduce the fine imposed pursuant to the section. She gave the document she was reading to Ms. Ruiz and was going to email the PDF she believed was an authority from the Attorney General, indicating that as long as the decision to re-hear the matter was made within 30 days, the Board does have the authority to re-hear it. Ms. White believed that since they were rescheduled for the May 7, 2026, hearing, the decision was made within the 30 days of the order. She said she couldn't, in good conscience, allow Mr. Duff to pay a \$400.00 fine for something that she made him do. He was fined for continuing violations that he did not commit.

She asked Ms. Ruiz if she had enough time to review the document and the Attorney General's order. She asked whether the Board had found that the decision to rehear the matter was not made within the 30 days; she also asked whether the Board would consider reducing the fine to a penny.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. White if she had a personal relationship with Mr. Duff. She responded that they had been dating for approximately 15 months. Mr. Johnson then

confirmed with Ms. White her statement that she was the one who parked on the lawn, as opposed to the street.

Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. White if it was her position that Mr. Duff did not know she was parking on the lawn. She responded yes, adding that when Mr. Duff told her about the \$400 fine assessed for the four times her vehicle was parked in the easement. Mr. Duff added that he was not aware of her parking there until he received the pictures from Officer Busch.

Ms. Blaney asked Officer Busch if, when she sees a violation, she notifies the property owner. Officer Busch stated yes, a Notice of Violation is sent, and if not corrected, a Notice of Hearing is sent. The Notice of Massey Hearing is sent when the property is not in compliance with the Board order. Ms. Blaney asked if a notice was sent each time she found a violation. Officer Busch replied that the re-inspections are marked as "failed" in the system used and are public record. Ms. Blaney requested further clarification about the number of notices sent. Officer Busch said notices are not mailed each time, and she was not sure if an electronic message may have been sent from the system. Mr. Duff responded that he spoke with Officer Busch. She told him that once a hearing is held, there are no second chances, that the Massey Hearing for violating the Board Order was the next step. He stated he called after receiving a \$40 invoice for filing a lien and then a \$400 invoice for violating the Board order. Ms. Blaney asked Mr. Duff if Ms. White's vehicle was included in the case before the Massey Hearing. Mr. Duff replied no. Ms. Blaney asked where Ms. White was parking before the first hearing. Mr. Duff replied in the grass or in the easement. Ms. White added that if Mr. Duff parked on the easement, then she would park in the driveway. Ms. Blaney asked Ms. White if Mr. Duff informed her about not parking on the grass or easement after the first hearing. Ms. White said no. Mr. Duff stated that he didn't know she was parking there. Ms. White stated that Mr. Duff did not mention going before the Board until closer to the hearing date. She said the February hearing predated all of her violations in February and March.

Mr. Johnson stated that two hearings were held, and the city presented photos. He remembered a discussion about the vehicles, one was a van for work, and the other was Mr. Duff's son's vehicle. He asked Mr. Duff if Ms. White's vehicle was pictured then, why he did not mention that one of the vehicles belonged to Ms. White. Mr. Duff responded that during the first hearing, all of the vehicles were his. He also brought up being told at the first hearing to park on the street, which he did, and received a ticket for it. Mr. Duff added that he would be coming before the Board again on July 2, 2026, for a commercial vehicle. Mr. Duff stated that after the February Hearing, the violations were caused by Ms. White's vehicle being parked on the easement.

Ms. White stated that the four dates that triggered the Massey Hearing, which Mr. Duff missed, were after the February hearing date. Ms. Blaney re-stated that Ms. White comes to the property on Sunday and leaves early on Monday, then asked Officer Busch what time she did her inspections. Officer Busch replied that it varies, but most of the time she left the office around 8:30 AM.

Mr. Duff asked if Officer Busch always started her route in his neighborhood or if it switched. He felt that over the past couple of years, it had been a witch hunt. Mr. Johnson replied that it was his understanding that the violations were reported to the city.

Mr. Johnson asked the Board if there were any more questions for Ms. White or Mr. Duff. There were none.

Ms. Ruiz requested to address Ms. White's position on Chapter 162. She stated that the Board does have the authority to lower the fine. The fines assessed stop being fines and become a lien upon being recorded. Therefore, the provision does not apply in this case. Ms. Ruiz stated that the period for appeal has passed. Because the fine has been converted to a lien, there is nothing the Board can do. Ms. Ruiz stated Mr. Duff could try presenting the grievance to the City Commission, which is the only one with the authority to take any action on the lien.

Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. Ruiz, just to be clear for the record, that the Board does not have jurisdiction to do anything at this time because the Massey Order became final and became a lien when it was recorded, the time to appeal the order in court has expired, and the only remedy would be for the City Commission to reduce the fine or vacate the order. Ms. Ruiz confirmed. Ms. Ruiz added that to the best of her knowledge, this forum was provided as a convenience, and the only person who can bring the grievance is Mr. Duff, because Ms. White is not the property owner or the aggrieved person under the code.

Mr. Johnson asked Officer Busch to confirm that she had photographs to support the four dates listed in the Massey order. Officer Busch replied yes and offered to show them to the Board.

Mr. Mandelkern stated, per the advice of the city's legal counsel, that the Board had no jurisdiction regardless of the facts, or whose vehicle it was, or whether the property owner had responsibility. He asked if a motion should be made.

Ms. White and Mr. Duff returned to the podium. Ms. White stated that she could appreciate the Board relying on the city attorney's position. However, the statute is clear if you go by the plain meaning. She stated that is where the Board should go, not with case law or opinions. She stated that the statutes specifically state that "the Enforcement Board may reduce a fine imposed pursuant to the section." Ms. White reiterated that when they were noticed in February, the four violations that triggered the Massey Hearing had not yet occurred. The Massey Hearing was missed by Mr. Duff, for which she sent a letter requesting that the decision be reconsidered.

Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. White about the letter she kept referring to. Mr. Johnson stated there was no letter; it was a response to the motion, located on page 329 in the packet. Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. White if that was what she was referring to. Ms. White

responded yes. Ms. Blaney noted it was marked received on April 20, 2026.

Mr. Duff explained that he had an emergency on the date of the Massey Hearing. He told Ms. White that instead of appealing the decision, they should request another hearing, so she sent the letter. Mr. Duff stated that if another hearing wasn't possible, then they would appeal the decision. He stated that by the time the letter was mailed, the deadline had passed. He also stated that he could not find any information online indicating where the letter should be mailed. He then stated that he brought the letter to City Hall to deliver in person and was told no one from Code Compliance was available. The person he spoke with said the letter could be left with them, and they would see to it that the officer received it. He reiterated that he received a Notice of Hearing to appear on May 7, 2026, and thought he was getting another chance to be heard. He said it was his fault for not appealing the decision right away, and that Ms. White suggested he do so.

Mr. Mandelkern responded to Mr. Duff, saying that, unfortunately, there is a legal issue, as the Massey Hearing was held, the lien has been recorded, and the city attorney is saying that it takes the matter out of the Board's hands.

Mr. Johnson asked the city if there was supposed to be a May Hearing for this that was canceled. Officer Porras responded that the plan was to bring the business to the Board, not as a hearing, but to allow Mr. Duff and Ms. White the opportunity to speak to the Board based on Ms. White's submission.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Johnson stated that to him, this was not his area of law, but he was confident that the Board did not have the authority to remove a lien; that decision is for the City Commission. Ms. Blaney agreed.

Ms. Ruiz said it was her understanding that the Board had no authority to modify a lien. She added that they did have inherent authority to reduce or increase fines assessed and imposed, so long as it doesn't contradict Chapter 162, but once it becomes a lien, it is out of this Board's hands.

Mr. Heller asked for confirmation that the fine became a lien because of the timeframe. Ms. Ruiz responded that the fine assessed in the final order at the Massey Hearing was imposed when the order was recorded with the county. Mr. Heller asked what the timeframe was between the order being issued and being recorded. Ms. Ruiz responded upon recording.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

Mr. Johnson reminded the Board that the February hearing did not impose fines at that time, only the possibility of fines if Mr. Duff did not comply.

Ms. Ruiz offered for the record that Chapter 162.09 (3) reads: A lien arising from a fine imposed pursuant to this section runs in favor of the local governing body, which is the City Commission, and is why she said this was not the proper forum. It went on to say that only the local governing body can issue a satisfaction or release of a lien entered pursuant to the section. It is outside of this Board's jurisdiction. She asked the city when the order was imposed; Officer Porras said April 2, 2026. Ms. White said if the lien is imposed immediately, there is no logic in the rule that says it can be reduced. Ms. Ruiz then explained to Mr. Duff that the first hearing was because of the violation. Repeat violations resulted in the Massey Hearing which order is final and fines issued become a lien upon recording of the order.

Mr. Mandelkern made a motion to dismiss the matter based on the lack of jurisdiction. Ms. Blaney seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Steve Heller	Yes
Wayne Johnson	Yes
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Melissa Blaney	Yes
Carlos Diez-Arguelles	Yes

Motion passed 5-0.

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

a) **BLDG-25-0017 209 Tyree Ln., Winter Park, FL 32792**

b) **PM-25-0130 209 Tyree Ln., Winter Park, FL 32792**

Officer Porras informed the Board that the property owner had retained an attorney and stated that the city received notice yesterday afternoon. She said the attorney was here and that applications for the required permits were submitted. She requested that the cases be tabled based on intentions and stated that the property will be monitored.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to table case BLDG-25-0017 and case PM-25-0130, 209 Tyree Ln., Winter Park, FL 32792 until the city finds a time more appropriate. Mr. Heller seconded.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Mr. Heller Yes

Mr. Johnson Yes

Mr. Mandelkern Yes

Ms. Blaney Yes

Mr. Diez-Arguelles Yes

Motion passed 5-0.

c) N-25-0005 471 Holt Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789

Officer Porras introduced herself and let the Board know that the recommended motion was amended, and distributed copies to the members.

Officer Porras provided the location and property owner's information per Orange County official records. She stated that the Notice of Hearing was issued on April 20, 2026.

Codes Cited: Chapter 62 – Offenses and Miscellaneous Provisions; Article IV-Offenses Involving Public Peace and Order; Division 2. – Noise and Disturbance Control; Sec. 62-92 – Definitions (2), (4), and (5); Sec. 62-94 Enforcement; Sec. 62-95 Owner's and lessee's responsibility; Sec. 62-96 – Noise Disturbances prohibited generally (a), (1), (2), (3), (5), (8), and (9); Sec. 62-97 – Specific prohibitions (2), a, 1, 2, and 3, b, c, and (f) of the City of Winter Park Code of Ordinances.

VIOLATION DESCRIPTION: Noise disturbance reports from WPPD related to loud music coming from a residence, creating public nuisance conditions for all neighboring properties within the residential zoning district.

COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS: Cease all illegal noise disturbances and comply with and adhere to the City of Winter Park noise disturbance regulations.

Ms. Porras stated that the initial Notice of Violation was issued to the tenant, Alexander Maria Meyerblohm, who resided at the property, on June 20, 2025. The Notice of Violation was sent via regular and certified U.S. mail to the tenant as required by the Florida State Statutes. A copy of the notice was issued to the owner of record Julie K. Kahn Revocable Living Trust at 1776 S. Chickasaw Trail, Orlando, FL 32825-8242. All notices were posted on the property and at City Hall and sent via regular and certified U.S. mail per Chapter 162 due process requirements. Ms. Porras presented the USPS tracking receipt for the original violation. The Notice of Hearing was issued on April 20, 2026, and posted on the property and at City Hall.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

Ms. Porras presented a list of multiple CAD Reports. These reports are calls that were made to the Winter Park Police Department related to noise disturbances. The dates and case numbers were read, and she informed the Board that copies of the reports were included in the packets:

- 02/02/2025 at 02:03 hours 20250330214
- 02/02/2025 at 02:43 hours 20250330285
- 02/07/2025 at 23:11 hours 20250383010
- 02/09/2025 at 03:25 hours 20250400269
- 02/09/2025 at 04:18 hours 20250400316
- 02/14/2025 at 03:43 hours (**CC EVENT REPORT 2025CE000293**)
- 05/09/2025 at 04:08 hours 20251290370
- 08/24/2025 at 01:28 hours 20252360169
- 08/30/2025 at 22:09 hours 20252422320
- 09/04/2025 at 23:18 hours 20252473165
- 09/12/2025 at 22:22 hours 20252552728
- 09/19/2025 at 14:14 hours 20252621649
- 09/19/2025 at 21:21 hours 20252622582
- 09/20/2025 at 03:05 hours 20252630297
- 10/05/2025 at 00:55 hours 20252780111
- 10/17/2025 at 15:02 hours 20252901677 (**CC Event Report 2025CE002446**)
- 11/01/2025 at 22:42 hours 20253052126
- 03/29/2026 at 01:46 hours 20260880176
- 04/15/2026 at 08:53 hours 20261050989 (**CC Event Report 2026CE00619**)

Ms. Porras stated that three Event Reports were created for Code Compliance as noted above, and that copies of these reports were in their packets. The last one issued on 4/15/26 prompted the Notice of Hearing.

Ms. Porras stated that the Respondent, Julie K. Khan, emailed and called her, stating that she was in receipt of the notices for the hearing, and also shared some of the addendum paperwork and copies of the lease for the students who were currently living in the house. Ms. Khan stated that all students have moved out of the house since then, and it was her intention not to renew their lease.

Ms. Porras then displayed the amended Recommended Motion for everyone's benefit. She informed the Board that several neighbors were present at the meeting, as well as the property owner. She asked the Board if they had any questions.

Ms. Blaney asked if this was the first time this case was presented to the Board. Ms. Porras said yes.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

Mr. Mandelkern asked what prompted the hearing now instead of in 2025. Ms. Porras responded that the first violation notice was sent when the first Event Report was received. She stated that the calls continued, but that most of the Officers were able to resolve the issues upon arrival, hence no event reports were issued. When she received the other Event Reports, she took action immediately.

Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. Porras if what she was saying was that it is dependent upon the Police Officer submitting a CE Incident Report. Ms. Porras replied yes.

Mr. Heller asked if the responding Police Officer(s) notified the landlord about all of the violations. Ms. Porras said that would be a question for the Officers present to respond to. Mr. Heller referred to the addendum to the lease, which said the tenant would typically be evicted. He asked if the landlord isn't aware of the violations, how would they prevent it from happening? He wanted to understand the processes. Ms. Porras referred to the initial Notice of Violation in 2025, which was sent after the first CE Event Report was received. She pointed out that the owner was copied on the notice.

Ms. Porras told the Board that the house is currently vacant, and the owner intends to consider renting only to Seniors and females. She stated Ms. Khan is present and has new information to provide to the Board.

Winter Park Police Officers K. O'Hara, K. Noyes, and P. Newman approached the podium and introduced themselves. Mr. Johnson asked if the homeowner is notified when they respond to a call. Officer O'Hara replied no, they do not notify owners or landlords. They assess the situation. She stated that typically, when she responded, she spoke with one of the fraternity brothers or the President who lived there. She stated he was respectful and said he would turn down the music. It was "Fox Day," and everyone was gathering to get on buses. Officer O'Hara stated that they don't always do a CE Event Report.

Officer Noyes stated that it was alarming to see the large number of cases that did not result in a CE Event Report being written. Only that report goes to Code Compliance. All of the other calls were handled nicely; none resulted in an infraction that needed to be enforced. He said they needed to do a better job of writing reports that go to Code Compliance. He identified himself as the author of the final CE Event Report on "Fox Day," when a clear violation was observed.

Officer Newman stated that when he responded, a large party was taking place at the residence. At the time, a CE Event Report was not generated due to known violations that were previously reported. There were 50–100 people at the party who were cleared out, and the issue was resolved.

Ms. Blaney asked if the system showed a history of the property when a report was submitted. Officer O'Hara replied that they do not receive a history with a call for service; they would have to look for it. She stated that there are so many officers and not all addresses are familiar. She stated that if addresses are flagged for safety reasons, Dispatch will inform the responding officer.

Mr. Johnson asked if these situations were reported, vs. an officer being on patrol and observing them. Officer O'Hara responded yes. She noted that the violation had to be observed before making contact with the resident. Typically, the resident turns off the music.

Ms. Blaney stated that, based on Officer Ohara's response, a call appears as a new occurrence each time unless the same officer has responded multiple times. Officer Noyes replied yes, due to the rotation between day and night shift, and two squads on each shift. He noted that the April 2026 incident was the first time that he and Officer O'Hara had responded. Ms. Blaney asked if there was a procedure to check addresses for previous activity, given that the College Quarter is notorious for noise disturbances. Officer Noyes stated that they do not often review previous calls for service, nor do they have access to a database to contact owners or landlords. Ms. Blaney asked if there were multiple calls for the same address; why did that not trigger writing a report? Officer O'Hara responded that they cannot make that assumption, as tenants come and go. Ms. Blaney said that was her point, that if a report was written, Officer Porras could look in the system. If it is determined to be a continuous violation by a landlord, she can reach out to them.

Officer Noyes reiterated that he was surprised at the number of calls to this property. He added that he would have preferred that more CE reports were sent to Officer Porras during the time frame of the violations.

Public Comments:

The Respondent, Ms. Julie Khan, owner of 471 Holt Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789, introduced herself. Ms. Kahn stated that she was unaware of any of the calls and that the police did not contact her. She stated that the immediate neighbors had her phone number, and she has always told them to let her know if there are problems.

She stated that she purchased the property seven years ago, intending it to be her retirement home. She stated that the notice in her hand was the first she received. She reached out to Officer Porras, discussed the situation, and provided all documentation for leasing the property. She took a moment to apologize to the neighbors present, acknowledging that she had previously been involved with the Neighborhood Association and received communications. She wished that other residents had reached out to her when these disturbances occurred. She stated there was nothing she could do if she was unaware of the incidents. She stated she was embarrassed to see the number of visits made to the property. She said the students who lived there were wonderful, polite, and always nice whenever she checked on things. She stated that she asked the tenants to leave immediately after she was informed of the disturbances. She stated that she plans to sell the property because Rollins College is making it difficult to rent with additional dorms

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

under construction. She stated that she has retired and no longer intends to live in that house.

Mr. Johnson asked if the property was currently vacant. Ms. Khan replied yes.

Mr. Heller asked if Ms. Khan received the Notice sent on June 20, 2025. She replied no and pointed out that the street name was wrong on the letter displayed, that it was South Chickasaw Trail, not Chickasaw Trail. Mr. Arguelles asked if it was sent via certified mail. Officer Porras replied no, that copies are only sent via regular mail.

Mr. Grant Eddy of 479 Holt Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789, approached the podium and introduced himself. He stated that he and his family have lived in the neighborhood for five years, and during that time, have repeatedly witnessed the behavior that brought him to the hearing. He stated that they have experienced loud music coming from the property, often accompanied by large crowds gathering for parties. He stated the noise level was not at a reasonable volume, and they could feel vibrations from it in their home. He said the music seemed to be played through a concert-quality sound system, not a standard household speaker, and is so loud they felt as if they were attending a concert in their own home. He said the music was obstructive, intrusive, and impossible to ignore.

Mr. Eddy stated that, in addition to the noise, other activities contribute to an unsafe environment, i.e., what appeared to be underage drinking and large crowds gathering in public roadways, blocking access. These were not isolated incidents; they are ongoing and occur at all hours. He stated that the pattern of activity had created a significant disruption to their safety and the neighborhood, which should be a quiet residential community.

Mr. Heller asked Mr. Eddy if he had Ms. Khan's contact information and had reached out to her at any time. Mr. Eddy replied no.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Eddy if he had placed any calls to report the incidents. Mr. Eddy replied yes and stated that he always asked the responding officer to generate a Code Event Report.

Ms. Nancy Galyean of 746 McIntyre Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789, approached the podium and identified herself. Ms. Gaylean stated that her home is very near the intersection at Holt Ave., and the property being discussed is three doors away from her. She stated that she often heard loud music and young people shouting while playing beer games.

Code Compliance
Board Minutes
June 4, 2026

Ms. Galyean stated that 741 Holt Ave. was purchased by Ms. Khan in 2004. Ms. Galyean stated that she began reporting complaints to Code Compliance for property problems in 2010, other than the noise. She stated she has records of all the complaints, including a wrecked vehicle and garbage all over the front lawn. Ms. Galyean understands that kids will be kids, adding that the root problem is continuing to rent to college students but not requiring them to behave.

Ms. Galyean recognized what she felt was another problem: Code Compliance is only open during regular business hours. The only recourse after hours is to call the Police. If the officer chooses not to write a report, then the neighborhood is left holding the bag. She understood that the Police Department was not under the purview of the Code Board; however, she recognized a failure in the system. Ms. Gaylean added that she did not feel it was the responsibility of a resident to contact a property owner to complain.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Galyean if she had contacted Ms. Khan at any time. Ms. Gaylean responded no, that she did not have her phone number.

Ms. Melinda Wright of 737 Maryland Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789, approached the podium and identified herself. She stated that she was the organizer of a neighborhood advocacy group formed in response to the concerns before the Board. She stated that 471 Holt Ave. is commonly known as "the Blue Party House" because of the frequent loud parties often held outdoors. She stated her group identified the property as one of the two most persistent in its disturbances of the peace.

Ms. Wright stated that her home was ½ a block away from the subject property, but she could still attest to the ongoing noise problem. She stated that if she lived next door to the property, as Mr. and Mrs. Eddy do with an infant, she would find it very difficult to cope with the noise. She added that having to call the police repeatedly at 3:00 AM, and whether or not the police decide that the violation has been resolved, puts undue pressure on the residents.

Ms. Wright went on to complain about litter on Holt Ave. being a chronic problem, stating the highest concentration of trash is located in front of 471 Holt Ave., especially after parties. She stated she knew this because her husband was one of the residents who cleaned it up. She stated that without enforcement, it encourages the same behavior throughout the neighborhood and degrades the quality of life. She stated there are times when she feels unsafe, and they look to Code Compliance for assistance.

Mr. Arguelles asked Ms. Wright if she was aware of any neighbors who had Ms. Khan's phone number to contact her. Ms. Wright said no.

Board Discussion:

Ms. Ruiz informed the Board of an apparent defect in the notice. She explained that the original notice of violation issued on June 20, 2025, treated only the tenant as the violator, not the property owner, and that the notice to the property owner was not sent by certified mail. Mr. Arguelles asked about subsequent notices. Officer Porras responded that the Notice of Hearing was sent to the owner by both regular and certified mail. She stated that it was not sent to the tenants because they were moving out.

Mr. Mandelkern asked for clarification. Ms. Ruiz responded that the Notice of Hearing was sent to the property owner and posted on the property. The original Notice of Violation was not provided to the owner via certified mail. Ms. Ruiz responded that the Notice of Hearing was sent to the property owner and posted on the property, and that the original Notice of Violation had not been served on the property owner by certified mail. Mr. Mandelkern observed that this did not make the hearing notice defective. Ms. Ruiz agreed, but explained that for the finding of violation there remained a deficiency in providing the property owner, who was being treated as the violator, with notice of the alleged violation. Mr. Mandelkern asked Ms. Ruiz what the ramifications would be. Ms. Ruiz replied that it would be a decision for the Board to make; they could table the case or continue. She added that the property is vacant. Mr. Mandelkern and Mr. Heller raised the subject of multiple violations occurring after the initial one, none of which the Respondent was notified of. Officer Porras acknowledged. Mr. Mandelkern asked whether, after the initial violation notice was issued, that notice was required to be sent via certified mail to the property owner for each subsequent violation. Officer Porras replied yes.

Ms. Blaney reminded everyone that technically, the police were called out many times, but most were not considered code violations. The recent code violation in April is what triggered the hearing.

Mr. Mandelkern stated that the revised recommended motion does not ask the Board to fine the property owner for the violations, only to prevent future violations, so it is not critical that the notices were not received. Ms. Ruiz responded that it was her understanding that there had to be a violation to trigger the Board's involvement. Mr. Mandelkern asked if that meant the Board did not have jurisdiction. Ms. Ruiz replied that the Board had jurisdiction, but also a notice issue with respect to the individual treated as the violator during the hearing, which was the property owner. Ms. Blaney asked if it was a due process issue, because the April notice was the first received, a second notice would be necessary for a hearing. Ms. Ruiz answered yes to the due process concern.

Mr. Arguelles asked if there were not three CE Events. Officer Porras responded that she received the first one from June 2025 and the last one from April. 2026. She did not receive the report from October 2025. Mr. Arguelles asked if the reports were to be sent to her. Officer Porras responded yes. Mr. Arguelles asked what happened. Ms. Porras did not know.

Mr. Heller asked if this was something that should be addressed by the City Commission, as it seemed to be happening a lot. He felt that the Board's hands were tied, that there was no doubt about what was happening. He added that the Board had nothing on the

homeowner, that they couldn't prove she knew what was happening, or that she didn't receive any notices until April. Mr. Arguelles stated that the City Commission needed to address what was occurring in the neighborhood, not just at this house but in College Quarter, and that the homeowners should not have to deal with it. He added that the Board has been presented with this type of violation at every other meeting. He agreed that the Board's hands were tied, thus they were not doing what they should be doing for the homeowners. Mr. Heller added that there needed to be a procedure, that calling the police, and then the responding officer having the discretion of writing a CE report. He said this was the same as the last case for the area. Mr. Arguelles stated that people who buy homes in the neighborhood know they can rent them for a high price to wealthy college students, so they make money but do not take responsibility when things go wrong.

Building Official Gary Hiatt addressed Mr. Johnson. He stated that, seeing and understanding the frustrations, the initiative would be taken to meet with the Police Department and any other departments involved to close some of the gaps in the future. We will provide the findings of the meeting to you if desired at the next hearing. Mr. Johnson thanked Mr. Hiatt.

Mr. Heller did not think the Board could proceed much further with the case. Mr. Johnson responded that a motion could be made, whether to dismiss, find no violation, etc.

Ms. Blaney did not think the case should be dismissed. She suggested a motion based on the respondent receiving a first notice, and that she needs to remain in compliance to avoid a Massey Hearing. She offered the following motion:

To consider the first Notice of Hearing to the Respondent, Julie Khan Revocable Living Trust, regarding a violation at the property at 471 Holt Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789, which is now in compliance. If compliance is not maintained, a second Notice of Hearing will be provided.

Mr. Mandelkern questioned whether two violations were required to have a hearing. Ms. Ruiz responded no, but the Respondent is entitled to adequate notice, and the Statutes and the city code provide for certified mail service. She explained that this is separate from the actual act, for which notice has to be provided. Mr. Mandelkern said the notice for the hearing specified when the violations occurred. Ms. Ruiz responded that because the Notice was sent for violations that the respondent was not aware of or provided the opportunity to correct, it is not proper to impose a fine.

Officer Porras stated that the issue, as she understood it, is that the notice sent on June 20, 2025, was not sent via certified mail. She stated that she did nothing wrong, that the Statute allows a notice to be sent to a tenant if they are in violation of the code by regular and certified mail. The property owner is copied by regular mail, but she did not send it via certified mail in this case. She stated that she had proof that the tenant received the notice and that he called and spoke with her. Ms. Porras assumed that the tenant did not notify Ms. Khan of the notice, but she had no control over that.

Ms. Ruiz is stating that because the copy was not sent by certified mail, the notice requirements were not met.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

Mr. Mandelkern said that the property owner stated she did not receive the notice and asked if that was because the address was wrong. Officer Porras said the address listed is missing the "South" designation.

Ms. Blaney asked if the statute specified how many notices were required and how much time was given to correct a violation. Officer Porras said it talks about the violator, who could be the person occupying the residence or the property owner. It is vague in a sense that it does not define who is a "violator", but it also includes certified and regular mail and posting the property, which was done for the Notice of Hearing, but not the Notice of Violation. Ms. Blaney said Ms. Khan stated she received only one notice and that she is in compliance. She added that typically, the Board would issue an order to stay in compliance to avoid a second hearing.

Mr. Heller stated that Ms. Khan received one notice and then became compliant. Mr. Mandelkern stated that a case with the same violation was heard by the Board recently, and an order was issued. Mr. Heller stated that the decision here would be easier to make if all violations were reported as code violations. Ms. Porras stated that the conversation that Mr. Hiatt will have with the Police Department on streamlining the process moving forward will address this. Mr. Heller stated that after speaking with the officers, creating CE Reports appeared to be discretionary. Ms. Porras agreed and believed without a doubt that they meant well. The officers responded to the site, took control of the situation, and resolved the call. In their mind, there is no reason to create a CE Event Report. It was agreed that this is an educational process, and a procedure needs to be established. Ms. Blaney brought up the fact that the ordinance is between 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM, and that some of the calls were made in the afternoon.

Mr. Mandelkern asked if the Board had the choice to table the case or issue an order. Mr. Johnson added that the Respondent only received one notice in April. Ms. Porras confirmed the date of the notice and the conversations she had with Ms. Khan shortly thereafter.

Ms. Blaney agreed with Mr. Mandelkern's argument that there were several violations, but the owner is now in compliance, so the Board should issue the order recognizing compliance with the stipulation to remain so to avoid another hearing.

Ms. Melinda Wright returned to the podium. She stated that her advocacy group has met with the Chief of Police about the subject, and one of the things he advised them to do was to make sure the responding officer writes a report.

Mr. Heller stated that he manages several properties that he owns and rents out. He noted that he cannot be everywhere at once and relies on neighbors and tenants to address problems. He stated it is hard for him to take responsibility for what a tenant does if he isn't aware.

Wayne Johnson made the following motion:

From the evidence presented today, I move to find the Respondent, Julie K. Khan Revocable Living Trust, in compliance for Compliance Board Case #N-25-05, owner of 471 Holt Avenue, Winter Park, FL 32789 regarding Chapter 62 – Offenses and Miscellaneous

Code Compliance
Board Minutes
June 4, 2026

Provisions; Article IV – Offenses Involving Public Peace and Order; Division 2. - Noise and Disturbance Control; Sec. 62-92 – Definitions (2), (4) and (5); Sec. 62.94. Enforcement; Sec. 62-95 Owner’s and lessee’s responsibility; Sec. 62-96 - Noise disturbances prohibited generally (a), (1), (2), (3), (5) (8) and (9); Sec. 62-97 - Specific prohibitions (2), a, 1, 2 and 3, b., c, and (f) of the City of Winter Park Code of Ordinances.

The Respondent has been properly notified per regular and certified mail of today’s hearing, June 4, 2026.

The respondent has been in compliance since May 10, 2026.

Mr. Mandelkern suggested that an amendment be made to the order as follows:

The respondent is ordered to take any reasonable measures to ensure that its tenants comply with the City of Winter Park Noise Disturbance codes, including, without limitation, ensuring that future tenants do not engage in prohibited conduct that violates the City of Winter Park Noise Disturbance code while on the subject’s property.

Mr. Heller seconded the suggested amendment. Ms. Blaney asked if the amended order let Ms. Khan off the hook. Mr. Johnson said no, it says that if compliance is not maintained, then this case can be referenced in a future hearing. Ms. Ruiz clarified that any new violation would have to be of the same code(s) within five years. Ms. Porras added that it had to be the same violator. Mr. Heller asked if that would be the tenant or the property owner. Ms. Ruiz responded that it depends on who is cited as the violator.

Ms. Khan approached the podium again. She stated that one of the neighbors testifying had a better date for when the home was purchased. At that time, there was a Homeowners’ Association, and she participated in some activities. She stated the association knew that the property was slated to be her retirement home. Mr. Johnson steered Ms. Khan back on the topic at hand about her phone number being known to neighbors. She stated that she did not recognize Mr. Eddy at first, but she had more contact with his wife. She stated that Mrs. Eddy had her phone number, that she spoke with Mrs. Eddy often when at the property. She stated she found out about a noise complaint against a previous tenant from a new tenant and told Mrs. Eddy to call her if it happened again. Mrs. Eddy said that she would rather enjoy the music. Ms. Ruiz requested that Mr. Mandelkern to please repeat the suggested amendment; he did so.

VOTE – AMENDMENT:

Steve Heller	Yes
Wayne Johnson	Yes
Paul Mandelkern	Yes
Melissa Blaney	Yes
Kristen Matt	Absent
Carlos Diez-Arguelles	No

Code Compliance
Board Minutes
June 4, 2026
Motion carried 4-1.
Ms. Blaney seconded the motion as amended.

VOTE:

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

Motion carried 5-0.

6. Non-Action Items

None

7. Staff Updates

- a) N-25-0010 455 Huntington Ave., Winter Park, FL 32789. The Board assessed fine has been paid.
- b) CCB# PM-26-0045 650 N. Wymore Rd., Winter Park, FL 32789. This case was scheduled for today's hearing. However, the property came into compliance as of May 28, 2026.

8. City Attorney Reports

None

9. Board Comments:

None

10. Upcoming Agenda Items

- a. LDC-26-0141 1960 Albert Lee Parkway, Winter Park, FL 32789 (Storage Pod)
- b. LDC-26-0093 2218 Whitehall Dr., Winter Park, FL 32792 (Commercial Vehicle).
Ms. Porras confirmed that this case was a different violation than the one previously heard.
- c. LDC-26-0104 658 S. Lakemont Ave., Winter Park, FL 32792 (Tree Appeal)

11. Adjournment

Steve Heller made a motion to adjourn. Paul Mandelkern seconded.

Code Compliance

Board Minutes

June 4, 2026

VOTE:

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

Motion passed unanimously, 5-0.

ATTEST:

Approved by the board on July 2, 2026

Susan Pruchnicki

/s/ Susan Pruchnicki, Board Secretary