

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 2

NAME: CHA, EUN S TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 12039 EDDLESTON DR
 PORTER RANCH, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/OF SISTER ELSIE DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2569005007 / INVOICE NO: BN12005070

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant claims he cleared the property on April 15, 2011, however; in his correspondence appeal he has several different dates. The Fire Inspector did talk with the Appellant and explained that he did not clear his property all the way down hill where there was some re-growth.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 3, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 2

MARTIN, RUSSELL D AND LISA A

NAME:

MAILING ADDRESS: 10319 HAINES CANYON AVE
TUJUNGA, CA 91042

SITUS ADDRESS: 10319 HAINES CANYON AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2569023016 / INVOICE NO: BN12005328

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated when they received the first Notice of Noncompliance, which specified what need to done to bring the property into compliance, he had the work done before the second Notice was received. He also stated that he had not taken any pictures nor had documentation because he did not think he had anything to prove, but in the future he will document everything.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 17, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 10, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 14, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the Noncompliance fee as assessed the Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 2
NAME: MEHRABIM REZA AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 10517 HAINES CANYON AVE
TUJUNGA, CA 91042
SITUS ADDRESS: 10517 HAINES CANYON AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2569024047 / INVOICE NO: BN12005344

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant did pay workers to clear some property on April 24, 2011, July 16, 2011, and September 17, 2011. They cleared the Castor Bean plants according the first inspection instructions and cleared the new growth and dying branches before the second inspection.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 10, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 14, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed non-conformance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 2

NAME: KOREAN JOY FELLOWSHIP CHURCH

MAILING ADDRESS: 7131 BON VILLA CIR
 LA PALMA, CA 90623

SITUS ADDRESS: 9729 TUJUNGA CANYON BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2572015015 / INVOICE NO: BN12005369

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant cleared property on June 4, 2011, and November 2, 2011, and thought they had complied.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 6, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 12, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on November 7, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 7
NAME: MCKENNA, JOSEPH M AND DIANE J
MAILING ADDRESS: 12611 AMBOY AVE
SYLMAR, CA 91342
SITUS ADDRESS: 13865 ALMETZ ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2582009009 / INVOICE NO: BN12005450

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellants were victims of the Station Fire, and the earthquake that dropped there house about 18 inches and then the floods from the rains flowed into the house. The mud brought multiple seeds and weeds onto the property, at that point the appellants who are both physically disabled had to go 500 miles away to take care of elderly parents who also have cancer and hardships. The Noncompliance fee is waived for 2011.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 11, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Due to extreme hardship the Noncompliance fee is waived. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices a legally required, affording the appellants due process. No notices were returned to the Department.

Due to extreme hardship the total assessment due is \$0.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE:	APRIL 25, 2012	Council District: 12
NAME:	WILSON, WALTER F AND MARIANNE E	
MAILING ADDRESS:	17900 MAYERLING ST GRANADA HILLS, CA 91344	
SITUS ADDRESS:	17900 MAYERLING ST	
ASSESSOR'S ID NO:	2601018031 / INVOICE NO: BN12005526	

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant cleared the property twice, however when the Fire Inspector first inspected the property on May 26, 2011, it was in Noncompliance. The Appellant contacted the inspector to determine what else needed to be done and was instructed to do additional clearance that was within 200 feet from neighbor's gazebo.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 26, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on December 7, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Disallow and waive the Noncompliance Fee. The Fire inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as required by law, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department. However, the Appellant provided sufficient evidence that they acted in good faith to gain compliance.

The total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12
NAME: VOLFSO, YEFIM AND LARISA
MAILING ADDRESS: 16968 STARDUST PL
GRANADA HILLS, CA 91344
SITUS ADDRESS: 16968 STARDUST PL
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2609026039 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellants claimed they cleared the property on October 16, 2011, which was on the compliance due date per the First Noncompliance notice.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 19, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 26, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on December 29, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Disallow and waive the assessed Noncompliance fee, the Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property before the compliance due date, which did not afford the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department.

The total assessment due is \$0.00

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12
NAME: SHOHEI, HOUSHANG C
MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 64674
LOS ANGELES CA 90064
SITUS ADDRESS: 21048 NASHVILLE ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2706003025 / INVOICE NO: BN12005989

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant claims he cleared his property but gave no dates or pictures as proof.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 6, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 16, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12

NAME: UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY SPASTIC

MAILING ADDRESS: 6430 INDEPENDENCE AVE
 WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91367

SITUS ADDRESS: 11051 OLD SANTA SUSANA PASS RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2723005039 / INVOICE NO: BN12006029

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant did clear the property, but it was after the Fire Inspector made the second inspection.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 25, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as required by law, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12

NAME: HUPPERT, LARRY AND SUSAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 9019 BALCOM AVE
 NORTHRIDGE, CA 91325

SITUS ADDRESS: 9627 BADEN AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2724011022 / INVOICE NO: BN12006110

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellants claim they had property cleared on June 15, 2011, and provided a bill from some gardener, however no dated pictures of what he cleaned.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 30, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12

NAME: PINER, BRUCE AND ANDREA

MAILING ADDRESS: 19214 DUNURE PL
 NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 19214 DUNURE PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2820009020 / INVOICE NO: BN12006201

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated they hired a professional gardener to do the clearing and it was completed on July 1, 2011 before the second inspection.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 25, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 6, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on November 19, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12

NAME: AWAD, MOHAMED

MAILING ADDRESS: 19585 PINE VALLEY AVE
 PORTER RANCH CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 19585 PINE VALLEY AVE

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 2822002012 / INVOICE NO: BN12006219

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant purchased the property in August 2010. When the property was purchased, his home insurance agent inspected the property and assured him that he was in compliance with the Fire codes. After receiving the first Notice of Noncompliance, the Appellant contacted Brush Clearance Inspector Siddens regarding the three items listed on the violation notice of which he felt did not apply to his property.

Inspector Siddens advised the property owner to do additional work on the property. Another gardener was hired to complete the work.

The Appellant further stated that he is in extreme financial hardship, as he has lost his job on September 1, 2011. He also is the primary provider for several members of his family. He provided proof that he is receiving funds from the California Employment Development Department.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 6, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on November 15, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Rescind the assessed fee. The Fire Department was provided with proof of financial hardship. The noncompliance fee is hereby rescinded

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12

NAME: WILSON, FREDRICK A TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 19360 RINALDI ST 259
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 19542 SEMINOLE PL

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 2822020010 / INVOICE NO: BN12006227

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant believed he was exempt from doing brush clearance because in 1990 the hill in his backyard slid down onto the neighboring golf course. He obtained soils; structural, architectural, grading, erosion and engineering reports and a building permit to install a huge deck to act as an umbrella to save the slop. The permit also specified the type of vegetation to be planted to ensure the integrity of the hill. When he received a Notice of Noncompliance, he inquired as to his current status and if he now needed to do brush clearance but received no follow-up from the Fire Department.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 22, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on November 7, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE	APRIL 25, 2012	Council District: 12
NAME:	ANDERSEN, ALLEN K AND BETTE T TRS	
MAILING ADDRESS:	12049 BEAUFIT AVE NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326	
SITUS ADDRESS:	12046 BEAUFIT AVE	
ASSESOR'S ID NO:	2870004027 / INVOICE NO: BN12006250	

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated that they do their best to comply with Fire Codes yearly. He stated that the last brush fire burned the concrete wall, as shown on the pictures he provided the Fire Department, and most of his hillside.

The Appellant stated they have always responded to City's requests with immediate action and have never been charged or fined for any infractions in the past.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 25, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 21, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Disallow and waive the assessed Noncompliance Fee. The Appellant provided sufficient evidence that they acted in good faith to gain compliance

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 12

NAME: HALPERN, BARRY R AND DEBRA K

MAILING ADDRESS: 18550 BRYMER ST
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 18550 BRYMER ST

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 2872018011 / INVOICE NO: BN12006276

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated in the questionnaire that she spoke with Inspector Siddens a number of times and their gardener would address the area in question. The Appellant provided a copy of an invoice to Integrity Tree Service in the amount of \$1,600 to remove various trees from the hillside. And in November 2011, they hired another gardener to do additional work to the hillside in the amount of \$792.00.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 4, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Disallow and waive the assessed Noncompliance Fee. The Appellant provided sufficient evidence that they acted in good faith to gain compliance

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 5

NAME: JAGTIANI, NEELAM S TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 33 EMPRESS AVE NO 1012
 N YOUR ONTARIO CAN M2N 99999

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/OF 1628 N BEVERLY GLEN BLV

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 4371038013 / INVOICE NO: BN12006557

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant lives in Canada and was not informed by the previous owners that the property had been inspected by the Fire Department and was found in violation. The Appellant said that Inspector Schroeck suggested a gardener and that gardener was paid \$900 to clear this lot and also another lot in June 2011. However, no receipts or invoices from the gardener were included.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 13, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on June 9, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on June 9, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 5

NAME: BAER, MAX A JR AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 10433 WILSHIRE BLVD STE 104
LOS ANGELES, CA 90024

SITUS ADDRESS: 2760 BENEDICT CANYON DR

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 4382005003 / INVOICE NO: BN12006698

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated he hired a professional gardener to clear the property at a cost of over \$5,000. The work was extensive and he used his best efforts to complete the work within the 60-day period. In addition, the Appellant stated he worked closely with the Fire Inspector,

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 4, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 13, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 5, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Waive the assessed Noncompliance Fee. The Appellant provided sufficient evidence that he acted in good faith to gain compliance.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 5

NAME: FISHER, GRETCHEN A

MAILING ADDRESS: 10228 NORWICH AVE
MISSION HILLS, CA 91345

SITUS ADDRESS: 9839 PORTOLA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4383006020 / INVOICE NO: BN12006789

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated they hire Brian Alexander to clear the property. She stated she hired another person to do the clearance but they did not complete the work and therefore she had to hire another person, which was Mr. Alexander. The Appellant stated she is having financial difficulty.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 4, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 14, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on August 18, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the Noncompliance fee. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide any proof of having financial hardship nor did the Appellant provide sufficient documentation to waive the assessed Noncompliance Fee.

Total assessment due is \$320.00

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 5
NAME: HUGHES, MARILYN K
MAILING ADDRESS: 417 N CHAPEL AVE
ALHAMBRA, CA 91801
SITUS ADDRESS: 10082 1/2 WESTWANDA DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4383025029 / INVOICE NO: BN12006839

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant claims to have cleared the property, but provide no receipts or pictures with dates to verify the work

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 22, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 14, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the Noncompliance fee as assessed. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department.

The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$312.00

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 5

NAME: LEVIN, JOHN

MAILING ADDRESS: 9779 OAK PASS RD
 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90210

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/O 9738 ARBY DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4385014030 / INVOICE NO: BN12006888

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant claims he cleared the property, however he provided no dated receipts or dated pictures as proof.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 6, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 4, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the Noncompliance fee as assessed. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 11

NAME: GHYSELS, STEPHEN AND ELIZABETH

MAILING ADDRESS: 823 ENCHANTED WAY
PACIFIC PLSDS, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/O 781 ENCHANTED WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4419002001 / INVOICE NO: BN12007001

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant stated they never received any Notices of Noncompliance from the Fire Department because we had the wrong address. A change of address was provided to the Fire Department with the correct mailing address.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 19, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 12, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Noncompliance fee is waived due to no due process to the appellant as notices sent to wrong address. New address not changed until October way after Noncompliance fee inspection. Non compliance fee is waived

The total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 11

NAME: 13711 ROMANY PARTNERS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 2999 OVERLAND AVE NO 130
LOS ANGELES CA 90064

SITUS ADDRESS: 13711 ROMANY DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4425006002 / INVOICE NO: BN12007027

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant claims he cleared the property on September 1, 2011, however; he provided no dated receipts and no dated photographs as proof.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 9, 2011.
- Second Inspection performed on July 28, 2011.
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2011.
- Property was found to be in noncompliance upon second inspection: therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the Noncompliance fee as assessed. The Fire Inspector made all appearances to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the appellant due process. No notices were returned to the Fire Department. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

The total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 11
NAME: KNEPP, FRED A JR TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 3651 MANDEVILLE CANYON RD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049
SITUS ADDRESS: 3651 MANDEVILLE CANYON RD
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4491003006 / INVOICE NO: BN12007043

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant hired Pan American Brush Clearance to clear his property in the amount of \$1,250.00. An estimated of the charges was provided along with the appeal dated March 17, 2011.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 12, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on June 9, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on June 9, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Disallow and waive the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Appellant provided sufficient evidence that they acted in good faith to gain compliance.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 8
NAME: MARINE, WALLACE C AND WANDA W AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 3748 CRESTWAY PL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90043
SITUS ADDRESS: 4131 DON TOMASO DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5026013017 / INVOICE NO: BN12007084

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant in a letter signed but undated wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone to complete the clearance work by February 5, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 12, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 8, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 1
NAME: MARTINEZ, GABRIEL AND MARISA
MAILING ADDRESS: 6832 CITRINE DR
CARLSBAD, CA 92009
SITUS ADDRESS: 3112 JOHNSTON ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206019004 / INVOICE NO: BN12007175

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work himself, completing the work on the property by March 6, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 3, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 2, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE**WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 1
 NAME: HACOPIAN, VAHE CO TR
 MAILING ADDRESS: 906 PENSHORE TER
 GLENDALE, CA 91207
 SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5209020011 / INVOICE NO: BN12007258

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had hired a contractor to undertake the brush clearance work, clearing the property on March 17, 2011, and again on July 23, 2011. He added that he owns lots 126, 128 and 129. Lot 127 is a lot that has been for sale for years, and he believes has been abandoned by its' owner. He believed that by his neighbor not clearing his lot, it impacts him, as the boundaries between the lots are very hard to determine.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 4, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

**NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: SILVER DISCOUNT PROPERTIES LLC
MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 48708
LOS ANGELES, CA 90048
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON CATO
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5214004001 / INVOICE NO: BN12007480

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by March 22, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, adding that twice a week on a Wednesday and Sunday he clears the property. Appellant asked that the assessed fee be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 17, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 13, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14

NAME: MARTINEZ, ROBERTO

MAILING ADDRESS: 25948 AVENIDA ESPALDAR
 MORENO VALLEY CA 92551

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5214004023 / INVOICE NO: BN12007571

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property, and indicated that he was not the registered owner of the lot until December 9, 2011.

Appellant provided no corroborating evidence to substantiate his statement.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 4, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 13, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: MORALES, CARLOS SR AND EMMA
MAILING ADDRESS: 2334 HIGBURY AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON BEAGLE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5214005023 / INVOICE NO: BN12007597

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by the summer of 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and felt that he had always cleaned his land for many years. Appellant asked that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 4, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on November 29, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14

NAME: NGUYEN, MINH T

MAILING ADDRESS: 15581 BROOKHURST ST
 WESTMINSTER, CA 92683

SITUS ADDRESS: 2418 N EASTERN AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5216007004 / INVOICE NO: BN12007720

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had hired someone to undertake the brush clearance work on the property, but did not keep track of their completion date.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 2, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: JAIMES, INNACIO G AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 1113 BUELAH AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90063
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217017005 / INVOICE NO: BN12007977

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work himself and with hired help, completing clearance on the property by September 29, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and stated that the only vegetation on the property was live trees and green plants, that could not create fires. Appellant asked that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 8, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 27, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is 312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: JAIMES, INNACIO G AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 1113 BUELAH AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90063
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217017006 / INVOICE NO: BN12007985

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work himself and with hired help, completing clearance on the property by September 29, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and stated that the only vegetation on the property was live trees and green plants, that could not create fires. Appellant asked that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 8, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 27, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: LIN, SHIHCHE E AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 3527 WOODVALLEY DR
HOUSTON, TX 77025
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217017007 / INVOICE NO: BN12007993

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant in a letter signed and dated March 1, 2012 wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by March 26, 2011, and then again by November 4, 2011. Appellant provided photographs, maps, and phone call logs, indicating that he was making every effort to comply even though he lives out-of-state in Houston, Texas, and maintains the property in Los Angeles, California.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the City had misidentified his neighbor's noncompliant lot with his own. Appellant asked that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 8, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Disallow and waive the assessed Noncompliance Fee. The Appellant provided sufficient evidence that he acted in good faith to gain compliance

Total assessment due is \$0.00

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14

NAME: MARTINEZ, GABRIEL AND MARISA

MAILING ADDRESS: 6832 CITRINE DR
CARLSBAD, CA 92009

SITUS ADDRESS: 3112 JOHNSTON ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206019004 / INVOICE NO: BN12007175

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work himself, completing the work on the property by March 6, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 3, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 2, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$320.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$320.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE:	APRIL 25, 2012	Council District: 14
NAME:	WU, GUO LIANG AND	
MAILING ADDRESS:	2134 N MARIANNA AVE LOS ANGELES, CA 90032	
SITUS ADDRESS:	2164 N MARIANNA AVE	
ASSESSOR'S ID NO:	5223005016 / INVOICE NO: BN12008033	

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken to do the brush clearance work on the property himself, completing clearance by March 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: ESCOBEDO, LYDIA
MAILING ADDRESS: 5019 O SULLIVAN DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032
SITUS ADDRESS: 5019 O SULLIVAN DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223007033 / INVOICE NO: BN12008124

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property on or around June 30, 2011, and then again on September 30, 2011. Appellant indicated that all of the clearance work was done according to the department's brush clearance recommendations.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 26, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: GARCIA, MARIA G AND MANUEL
MAILING ADDRESS: 4937 O SULLIVAN DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032
SITUS ADDRESS: 4937 O SULLIVAN DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223008018 / INVOICE NO: BN12008173

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements for the past forty years, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by September 9, 2011. He included emails sent to the Department Inspector, indicating that he was in communication regarding his efforts to cut the vegetation on the property by an additional forty feet.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: GUTIERREZ, GERTRUDE TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 538 N CUMMINGS ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90033
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223009006 / INVOICE NO: BN12008223

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she received no notification of Noncompliance, and that she had seven parcels cleared. She provided an invoice from Ishmael Carrillo Tree Service dated July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,500.00 to clear all of the lots, and provided photographs taken by the landscaping service showing work in progress on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011.

Appellant requested waiver of the assessed Noncompliance fee against her property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not completely remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office.

From the evidence proffered had made a substantial effort towards full compliance, paying \$1,500.00, and showing the contracted service doing clearance work on July 1, 2011, with a compliance die date of July 7, 2011. Additionally, it does appear that the lots are contiguous to one another, where inspection took place for all lots on the same day. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Appellant should only be held responsible for only one out of the six Noncompliance fees assessed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE**WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
 NAME: GUTIERREZ, GERTRUDE TR
 MAILING ADDRESS: 538 N CUMMINGS ST
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90033
 SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223009007 / INVOICE NO: BN12008231

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she received no notification of Noncompliance, and that she had seven parcels cleared. She provided an invoice from Ishmael Carrillo Tree Service dated July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,500.00 to clear all of the lots, and provided photographs taken by the landscaping service showing work in progress on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011.

Appellant requested waiver of the assessed noncompliance fee against her property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not completely remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office.

From the evidence proffered had made a substantial effort towards full compliance, paying \$1,500.00, and showing the contracted service doing clearance work on July 1, 2011, with a compliance die date of July 7, 2011. Additionally, it does appear that the lots are contiguous to one another, where inspection took place for all lots on the same day. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Appellant should only be held responsible for only one out of the six Noncompliance fees assessed.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: GUTIERREZ, GERTRUDE TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 538 N CUMMINGS ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90033

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223009008 / INVOICE NO: BN12008249

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that she received no notification of Noncompliance, and that she had seven parcels cleared. She provided an invoice from Ismael Carrillo Tree Service dated July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,500.00 to clear all of the lots, and provided photographs taken by the landscaping service showing work in progress on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011. Appellant requested waiver of the assessed noncompliance fee against her property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on December 3, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not completely remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office.

From the evidence proffered had made a substantial effort towards full compliance, paying \$1,500.00, and showing the contracted service doing clearance work on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011. Additionally, it does appear that the lots are contiguous to one another, where inspection took place for all lots on the same day.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Appellant should only be held responsible for only one out of the six Noncompliance fees assessed.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: GUTIERREZ, GERTRUDE TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 538 N CUMMINGS ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90033
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223009010 / INVOICE NO: BN12008264

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she received no notification of Noncompliance, and that she had seven parcels cleared. She provided an invoice from Ismael Carrillo Tree Service dated July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,500.00 to clear all of the lots, and provided photographs taken by the landscaping service showing work in progress on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011.

Appellant requested waiver of the assessed noncompliance fee against her property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not completely remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office.

From the evidence proffered had made a substantial effort towards full compliance, paying \$1,500.00, and showing the contracted service doing clearance work on July 1, 2011, with a compliance die date of July 7, 2011. Additionally, it does appear that the lots are contiguous to one another, where inspection took place for all lots on the same day. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Appellant should only be held responsible for only one out of the six Noncompliance fees assessed.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
 NAME: GUTIERREZ, GERTRUDE TR
 MAILING ADDRESS: 538 N CUMMINGS ST
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90033
 SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223009011 / INVOICE NO: BN12008272

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she received no notification of Noncompliance, and that she had seven parcels cleared. She provided an invoice from Ismael Carrillo Tree Service dated July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,500.00 to clear all of the lots, and provided photographs taken by the landscaping service showing work in progress on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011.

Appellant requested waiver of the assessed noncompliance fee against her property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not completely remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office.

From the evidence proffered had made a substantial effort towards full compliance, paying \$1,500.00, and showing the contracted service doing clearance work on July 1, 2011, with a compliance die date of July 7, 2011. Additionally, it does appear that the lots are contiguous to one another, where inspection took place for all lots on the same day. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Appellant should only be held responsible for only one out of the six Noncompliance fees assessed.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE**WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
 NAME: GUTIERREZ, GERTRUDE TR
 MAILING ADDRESS: 538 N CUMMINGS ST
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90033
 SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223009012 / INVOICE NO: BN12008280

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that she received no notification of Noncompliance, and that she had seven parcels cleared. She provided an invoice from Ismael Carrillo Tree Service dated July 1, 2011, in the amount of \$1,500.00 to clear all of the lots, and provided photographs taken by the landscaping service showing work in progress on July 1, 2011, with a compliance due date of July 7, 2011. Appellant requested waiver of the assessed noncompliance fee against her property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 22, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not completely remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office.

From the evidence proffered had made a substantial effort towards full compliance, paying \$1,500.00, and showing the contracted service doing clearance work on July 1, 2011, with a compliance die date of July 7, 2011. Additionally, it does appear that the lots are contiguous to one another, where inspection took place for all lots on the same day.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Appellant should only be held responsible for only one out of the six Noncompliance fees assessed.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 13
NAME: MAHONEY, KATHRYN M TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 2038 N ALVARADO ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90039
SITUS ADDRESS: 2036 N ALVARADO ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5420005026 / INVOICE NO: BN12008728

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellant in a signed but undated letter wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements having owned the property since 1998, and had completed brush clearance work on the property by October 2011. She stated that she had seen a brush clearance inspector walking in the neighborhood, but did not receive the Noncompliance Notice in the mail. A reprinted copy was mailed to her, and she indicated that she regularly participates in neighborhood clean-ups as a member of the neighborhood council.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 3, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 14, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 19, 2011
- Property was found to be in Noncompliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$312.00 Noncompliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. The Appellant did not provide sufficient documentation to waive the Noncompliance Fee. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.