

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 13
NAME: HIGGINS, JAMES O
MAILING ADDRESS: 2843 EFFIE ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90026
SITUS ADDRESS: 2839 EFFIE ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5423024007 / INVOICE NO: BN12008769

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 that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by 2011. He stated that there were two lots had had been joined together, and a tropical garden had been planted.

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

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 1, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 31, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 31, 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: 13
 NAME: RYDER, THOMAS A AND
 MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 525
 LOS OLIVOS CA 93441
 SITUS ADDRESS: 980 N HOOVER ST
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5427003022 / INVOICE NO: BN12008801

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 February 25, 2012 wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by September 6, 2011. He indicated that the property is an upslope lot with no front yard. Photographs were included.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and indicated that the photographs show how much around and mustard plants grow in a typical year. Appellant requested that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 18, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on November 23, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on November 23, 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: 13
NAME: KURTIN, EMILIA A
MAILING ADDRESS: 2651 WAVERLY DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90039
SITUS ADDRESS: 2649 WAVERLY DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5438022013 / INVOICE NO: BN12008884

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 July 1, 2011. Appellant provided an invoice from Artist Tree Service dated February 29, 2011 in the amount of \$2,000.00.

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 September 10, 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: 13

NAME: RODRIGUEZ, ROLDAN AND ANA L

MAILING ADDRESS: 2621 GLENDALE BLVD
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90039

SITUS ADDRESS: 2621 GLENDALE BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5439009001 / INVOICE NO: BN12008926

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant remembered receiving the Notice to Abate A Public Nuisance that gave him a due date of July 2, 2011, which he did. Appellant has been the property owner since November 1997. He stated he received the first Notice of Noncompliance but the not the Second Notice of Noncompliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 3, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 13, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on November 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

Confirm the assessed Noncompliance Fee. At the time of the reinspection, the Fire Department deemed the work not complete and inadequate.

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: IBANEZ, JOSE G AND CONNIE
MAILING ADDRESS: 4019 1/2 N FIGUEROA ST
LOS ANGELES CA 90065
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L BETWEEN GLENALBYN & MONTALVO
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5451019016 / INVOICE NO: BN12009056

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 by April 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, but indicated that she was not aware that the responsibility for clearance extended to the "paper street." Appellant requested that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 23, 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: VEGA, JAMES
MAILING ADDRESS: 850 LUCILE AVE 5
LOS ANGELES, CA 90026
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 120' SOUTH OF 651 ANDALUSIA
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5451027018 / INVOICE NO:

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 hiring a gardener and having the property cleaned by June 2, 2011. Appellant included an F-1307 indicating that his property had been issued a Cleaned by Owner on July 13, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the Cleaned by Owner notice indicated that he was being unfairly charged, arguing that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on June 29, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on June 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 date of the Cleaned by Owner Notice was dated subsequent to the second inspection, not prior to it. 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: SADEGHI, MANSOUR M AND SHIVA
MAILING ADDRESS: 20931 PARKRIDGE
LAKE FOREST, CA 92630
SITUS ADDRESS: 152.32' S OF 3570 GLENALBYN DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452012014 / INVOICE NO: BN12009262

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 sometime in February 2011. Appellant indicated that he has a construction business, and has the crew available to complete the clearance work, indicating that he has completed clearance since owning the property in 2002.

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 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 22, 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: CONNAUGHTON, ALEX J
 MAILING ADDRESS: 2392 STONY LN
 BREa, CA 92821
 SITUS ADDRESS: 3448 GLENALBYN DR
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452013002 / INVOICE NO: BN12009270

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 April 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that he believed the Department had failed in its duty to warn him of the needed brushwork, and that since he was not given the notice and the time to remedy the situation, the fees should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 13, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on June 14, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on June 17, 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.

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: ELLER, WILLIAM G AND BELEN
MAILING ADDRESS: 408 BEECH ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065
SITUS ADDRESS: 408 BEECH ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452013014 / INVOICE NO: BN12009288

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 themselves, completing the work by August 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 13, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 2, 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: MAR AND COMPANY INC

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 5939
GLENDALE, CA 91221 5939

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF 701 & 657 ISABEL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452016026 / INVOICE NO: BN12009304

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 by hiring Mr. Edgar Rivas to clear the property by July 2, 2011. Appellant provided an invoice dated July 31, 2011 in the amount of \$380.00.

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 15, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 12, 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: LIU, JOSEPH
 MAILING ADDRESS: 8316 GARIBALDI AVE
 SAN GABRIEL, CA 91775
 SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 40 FT S/OF 3589 GLENALBYN DR
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452018001 / INVOICE NO: BN12009353

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 hired Mr. Miguel Cortez to complete the brush clearance work on the property. Appellant provided an email from Mr. Cortez, along with two receipts, one for \$1,000.00 dated June 1, 2011, and the other for \$100.00 dated October 31, 2011.

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

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 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: 1
NAME: JIE CAO
MAILING ADDRESS: 15548 LOS ALTOS DR
HACIENDA HTS, CA 91745
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452018016 / INVOICE NO: BN12009387

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

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

Appellant provided a copy of the two Money Orders submitted to contest the charges, and indicated that the Noncompliance forms were never received.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 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: 1
NAME:	WU, DAVID AND	
MAILING ADDRESS:	18138 DORSET CT ROWLAND HGHTS, CA 91748	
APRIL 25, 2012	VACANT LOT	
ASSESSOR'S ID NO:	5452018024 / INVOICE NO: BN12009437	

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

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

Indicated that he received only the first Notice of Noncompliance, and that the Administrative fees imposed were excessive.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 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: 1
NAME: CAO, JIE
MAILING ADDRESS: 15548 LOS ALTOS DR
HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CA 91745
SITUS ADDRESS: 3558 N CAMINO REAL
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5452018025 / INVOICE NO: BN12009445

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

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

Appellant provided a copy of the two Money Orders submitted to contest the charges, and indicated that the Noncompliance forms were never received.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 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: 1
 NAME: CARRERA, CIRLIO AND ELPIDIA
 MAILING ADDRESS: 7837 CLAYBECK AVE
 SUN VALLEY CA 91352
 SITUS ADDRESS: VLE OF AND OPP 3153 FUTURE ST
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5454006017 / INVOICE NO: BN12009510

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 on April 11, 2011, and then again on May 11, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance; that the assessed fee should be waived; and added that he regularly clears his lot, but that the lots alongside his own are filled with debris.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 12, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 13, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 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 taken steps to remedy the hazardous conditions on his property. According to the Fire Department, at the time of the second inspection, these conditions persisted and the Noncompliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and mailed out all of the notices as legally required. Notices were never returned by the United States Post Office. However, the Appellant proffered evidence shows that the Notice of Noncompliance and the Second Notice of Noncompliance were both mailed out on the same day, namely November 9, 2011. Appellant provided the letters themselves bearing this date, and the Post Office date stamp showing both letters through the window envelope. Given the above, the Appellant was not apparently afforded due process, specifically the notices, as required. Therefore, it is the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Noncompliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 1

NAME: AYALA, ARTHUR L JR AND LORENZA

MAILING ADDRESS: 204 S 1ST AVE
COVINA, CA 91723

SITUS ADDRESS: VL 60' FROM CO OF FORTUNE ST / C

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5454006025 / INVOICE NO:

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, but that when he and his son inspected the property on November 27, 2011, the clearance work had already been completed, which was before the compliance due date of November 29, 2011.

Appellant added that the First Notice of Noncompliance, and the Second Notice of Noncompliance, were both mailed out to him on the same day, and he provided proof -- the envelopes date-stamped by the US Post Office -- with the notices showing through the window envelopes.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on November 9, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 23, 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 Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and mailed out all of the notices as legally required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. However, there is an issue with the mailing of the notices themselves. The First Notice, and the Second Notice of Noncompliance both show date-stamped on the same day, November 10, 2011, which Appellant states he received together on November 11, 2011.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 1
NAME: AGUILAR, MANFREDO AND MARTA
MAILING ADDRESS: 2307 JULIET ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90007
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 20' N/O & BEHIND 1333 ISABEL
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5454009019 / INVOICE NO: BN12009627

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

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

Appellant wrote in an unsigned and undated letter that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property for the past ten years without incident. For the year in question Appellant stated he completed the clearance work one week before the deadline 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 August 12, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 15, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 6, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee.

Therefore, the recommendation 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: QUIRRIN, BARBARA, HEIR

MAILING ADDRESS: 2904 FUTURE ST
LOS ANGELES CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: 2904 FUTURE ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5455010027 / INVOICE NO: BN12009775

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant, in the written appeal, objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote in a letter signed but undated, that she had initially not undertaken brush clearance work on her property as the first notification was sent to the wrong address. However, when a second notification arrived, Appellant took steps to comply. However, Appellant stated that in a visit by the Department Inspector, he insisted that a blue tarpaulin on the roof be removed, which she believed were outside of the purview of the jurisdiction of the Department's concern with hazardous brush.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that she has ten children or grandchildren who work or worked in the past for the City of Los Angeles.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 16, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 7, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 20, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: VINZANT, GLENN R

MAILING ADDRESS: 2265 MOSS AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: 2310 N YORKSHIRE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5462008033 / INVOICE NO: BN12010104

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 in past years undertaken brush clearance work on the property himself. Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

However, Appellant stated that due to illness and being on Social Security, he was not able to hire out the clearance work to anyone.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 5, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 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

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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee.

Therefore, the recommendation 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: SUMEKH, BEHROOZ
 MAILING ADDRESS: 19531 PARTHENIA ST
 NORTHRIDGE CA 91324
 SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 152.43' W/OF 812 MT WASHINGT
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5464014017 / INVOICE NO: BN12010757

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

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

Appellant wrote that he was a lien holder on the property, taking title on September 1, 2011, and provided a Trustee's Deed Upon Sale, which recorded on October 24, 2011. Appellant believed that the assessed fees were the responsibility of the previous owner.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 7, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 22, 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

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.

Appellant by his proffered evidence did not take a possessor interest in the property until September 1, 2011 when he foreclosed on the lien, and did not record this ownership interest until October 24, 2011. The Appellant apparently did not have ownership of the property at the time the second inspection, when the Noncompliance inspection fee was incurred and attached.

Therefore, the recommendation that the Noncompliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: SUMEKH, BEHROOZ
MAILING ADDRESS: 19531 PARTHENIA ST
NORTHRIDGE CA 91324
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 76.41' W/OF 812 MT WASHINGTON
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5464014018 / INVOICE NO: BN12010765

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was a lien holder on the property, taking title on September 1, 2011, and provided a Trustee's Deed Upon Sale, which recorded on October 24, 2011.

Appellant believed that the assessed fees should be the responsibility of the previous owner.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 7, 2011.
- Second Inspection performed on August 22, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on November 23, 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 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.

Appellant by his proffered evidence did not take a possessor interest in the property until September 1, 2011 when he foreclosed on the lien, and did not record this ownership interest until October 24, 2011.

The Appellant apparently did not have ownership of the property at the time the second inspection, when the Noncompliance inspection fee was incurred and attached.

Therefore, the recommendation is that the Noncompliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: CENDEJAS, CLAUDIO
MAILING ADDRESS: 4448 TURQUOISE ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 476 AVE 44
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5465009003 / INVOICE NO: BN12010856

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 personally undertaken brush clearance work, completing clearance on the property by August 2, 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 July 26, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 20, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 28, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee.

Therefore, the recommendation 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: BEST WORKERS COMP E LLC
 MAILING ADDRESS: 969 N LA BREA AVE
 INGLEWOOD CA 90302
 SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 328 FURNESS
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5467024005 / INVOICE NO: BN12011144

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant, Mr. Stan Ofomata, objected by written appeal 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 25, 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 28, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 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

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 give sufficient evidence 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: ARSHAD, MOHAMMAD M
MAILING ADDRESS: 17041 ROSCOE BLVD
NORTHRIDGE CA 91325
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 4829 MARMION WY
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5467025023 / INVOICE NO: BN12011243

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he did not clear the property himself, and did not know when work needed to be completed.

Appellant stated that he purchased this vacant lot in 2010 and was unaware of any liens against the property, having purchased it at a deed auction.

Appellant added that he could not afford the upkeep on the property, and sold the land on January 31, 2012. Appellant asked that invoices be waived, as he had never seen them before.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 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

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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee.

Therefore, the recommendation 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: HOLY VIRGIN MARY COPTIC

MAILING ADDRESS: 4900 CLELAND AVE
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L REAR OF 4951 ALDAMA ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5471015020 / INVOICE NO: BN12011292

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant, Mr. Magdi (Mac) Abdou, in his capacity as a Church Board member, objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property belonging to the Holy Virgin Mary Coptic Church. In a signed but undated letter, Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken clearance work by hiring a contractor. However, Appellant stated that the property is surrounded by three or four residential homes, whose owners used the Church property upon which to dump their cleared brushes and trees.

Appellant believed that his contractor's work was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and enclosed photographs, as well as an invoice dated September 21, 2012 in the amount of \$1,015.00. Appellant asked for re-consideration of the imposed fines.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 4, 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 organization 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: SERAYDARIAN, GEORGE AND SONIA TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 540 N MONTEBELLO BLVD STE B
MONTEBELLO CA 90640

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 40' W/OF 4857 ELDRED ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5471017015 / INVOICE NO: BN12011300

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, and included photographs, which he claimed, were taken by his gardener and showed the clearance work completed.

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 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 1, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on August 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: WONG, CHUNG K
MAILING ADDRESS: 9233 LETHBRIDGE WAY
SAN DIEGO, CA 92129
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 200' W OF 4857 ELDRED ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5471017031 / INVOICE NO: BN12011326

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 a City contractor named Silent Fire Inc completed brush clearance work on the property.

Appellant added that while he did not receive the first Notice of Noncompliance, he did receive the second, and that the tree apparently in question was not on his property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 1, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee.

Therefore, the recommendation 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:	WASHINGTON, DALE	
MAILING ADDRESS:	6392 CANTILES AVE CYPRESS, CA 90630	
SITUS ADDRESS:	V/L 123FT W 4858 GRANADA ST	
ASSESSOR'S ID NO:	5471020015 / INVOICE NO: BN12011375	

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

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

Appellant in a letter signed but undated letter indicated that his father Mr. Frank Washington quitclaimed the property to him. Appellant added that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by the spring of 2011. He indicated that in the past years the City of Los Angeles had cleared the lot for approximately \$350.00 in fees.

Since the administrative and clearance fees now apparently exceed the value of the property, Appellant indicated he wished to donate the vacant lot to the City of Los Angeles to avoid foreclosure and the tax sale process.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 1, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: MAZDIYASNI, PARVIZ P AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 35 BLAKELEY
IRVINE, CA 92620

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5474041003 / INVOICE NO: BN12011532

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 he did not receive the First Notice of Noncompliance but he did receive the Second Notice on August 4, 2011. He hired Brain Walsh Brush Clearance on August 10, 2011, to do undertake brush clearance work on the property. Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 4, 2011
- Third 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

Disallow and waive the assessed Noncompliance fee. The Appellant had notice that there were hazardous conditions on the property, and had apparently taken steps to remedy the situation. Appellant included an invoice from Brian Walsh Brush Clearance dated August 10, 2001 in the amount of \$200.00, and a copy of his check # 5337 dated August 15, 2001 shows payment.

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. Appellant was issued both a Second letter of Noncompliance along with an F-1307 Cleaned by Owner notification within days of one another. The latter document holds sway. Therefore, the recommendation is that the Noncompliance fee should be waived given the fact that the Appellant was informed that his property had passed inspection and was in compliance.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14

NAME: NGUYEN, TIFFANY T

MAILING ADDRESS: 9024 WILLOWBERRY WAY
ELKGROVE CA 95758

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 158' E/O 4517 CLELAND AVE.

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5475018007 / INVOICE NO: BN12011763

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellants Mr. Kevin Nguyen and Ms. Tiffany Nguyen by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellants wrote in a letter signed and dated February 15, 2012, that they were familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and that they had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by September 6, 2011. Ms. Nguyen indicated that sometime in October 2011, she had transferred ownership of the property to her husband.

Appellants believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellants added that they were extremely surprised at their receipt of the first Notice of Noncompliance, and that they paid a "hefty" price to have a contractor clear the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 4, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 29, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 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

The Appellants 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee.

Therefore, the recommendation 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: HOMES FOR LIFE FOUNDATION

MAILING ADDRESS: 8939 S SEPULVEDA BLVD # 460
LOS ANGELES CA 90045

SITUS ADDRESS: 4902 BUCHANAN ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5477008001 / INVOICE NO: BN12011797

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote, in a letter signed and dated March 6, 2011, that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property through the efforts of Mr. Jim Withrow, who completed clearance work by the summer of 2011.

Appellant believed that the work Mr. Withrow performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant stated that the organization is a nonprofit housing and services corporation for homeless mentally disabled persons in Los Angeles for the past twenty-five years, and have always followed and complied with the requirements pertaining to the City-owned lot next door to their premises.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 20, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 17, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: WILDWOOD DEVELOPMENT LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 3835 FRANKLIN AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90027

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 1533, 1537 WILDWOOD DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479003002 / INVOICE NO: BN12011870

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 August 22, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant provided a photograph, and stated that was taken on the day the property went up for sale.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 16, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on August 16, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: ROS, PROSPERO A AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 11572 STRATHERN ST
 N HOLLYWOOD, CA 91605

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 1503 WILDWOOD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479004008 / INVOICE NO: BN12011912

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 September 29, 2011, wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property, which was initiated by his brother, and completed by April 1, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that "ocular inspection" was made, and submitted photographs to show that he "obediently complied" with clearing of the lots prior to the annual inspections.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 27, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: ESQUEDA, LARRY AND ROSA
MAILING ADDRESS: 1501 SILVERWOOD DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 1515 WILDWOOD DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479004011 / INVOICE NO: BN12011920

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 along with a gardener, completing clearance on the property by June 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 27, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 27, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: CASTELLANOS, MIGUEL AND MICHELLE

MAILING ADDRESS: 1436 RIDERWOOD AVE
HACIENDA HEIGHTS, CA 91745

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479004020 / INVOICE NO: BN12011946

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 personally undertaken the brush clearance work on the property, clearing it by May 19, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant provided photographs, showing what he claimed to be only green grass and poison oak left, having cut down all of the shrubs.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 12, 2011
- Second 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 give sufficient evidence 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: YERGER, ANGELICA TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 5414 EMERALD DR
ELDERSBURG, MD 21784
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479019003 / INVOICE NO: BN12012019

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. In correspondence, a letter unsigned but dated May 27, 2012; the Appellant argued that the time allowed for compliance was too short to allow her to respond in a timely manner for a number of reasons. It was Christmas, contractors on the City of Los Angeles Brush Fire website were unavailable, and she eventually hired a land surveyor at a cost of \$1,125.00 to conduct a boundary survey.

Appellant discovered the succulent trees on her property were Euphorbia Tirucalli or "Fire stick" that secrete a highly poisonous sap, of which many contractors refused to handle removal of these dangerous plants. In addition, the property has extremely steep property layout. Appellant added she tried diligently to hire a contractor but was unable to secure a weed abatement contractor and with a neighbor's assistance, she was able to clear the property by February 20, 2012.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on December 12, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on January 9, 2012
- 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 give sufficient evidence 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: BARRAGAN, VALERIANO T AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 809 ANNAN TER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042
SITUS ADDRESS: 809 ANNAN TER
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5480007011 / INVOICE NO: BN12012084

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 by June 1, 2011, and again by October 15, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that after diligent clean-up there was nothing that could catch fire on the property and that she had received a Letter of Compliance, followed by one of Noncompliance, leading Appellant to assume that someone at the Fire Department reversed their decision regarding their property meeting the requirements.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on September 21, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 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

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 give sufficient evidence 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: AHTEN, EARL R

MAILING ADDRESS: 2921 FAIRMOUNT AVE
LA CRESCENTA, CA 91214

SITUS ADDRESS: 5517 NORDYKE ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5480032003 / INVOICE NO: BN12012217

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 August 9, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that he had placed a call to the Department Inspector, who when he did not call back Appellant assumed this to mean that no further clearance work needed to be done.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 30, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: MCMAHON, MARGARET TR ET AL
MAILING ADDRESS: STRIJDHOF LAAN
2600 ANTWERPEN BELGIUM 99999
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5485018008 / INVOICE NO: BN12012365

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he is the trustee and was familiar with the brush clearance requirements. He had undertaken brush clearance on the property by hiring a property management company to do the work.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant provided an Invoice dated June 18, 2001 in the amount of \$3,500.00 from Freddy Cordova Landscaper to remove nine dead trees on the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 7, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 2, 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

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 give sufficient evidence 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: NAYLOR, CHARLES M AND MARY E TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 1440 EATON TER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: 1440 EATON TER

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5485018024 / INVOICE NO: BN12012373

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 previous spring.

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 31, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 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

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 give sufficient evidence 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: 4
NAME: DUONG, DAO
MAILING ADDRESS: 25027 PEACHLAND AVE # 260
NEWHALL, CA 91321
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L WEST OF 6869 LOS ALTOS
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5549026007 / INVOICE NO: BN12012605

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 on or around June 26, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that the Department Inspector did not give him the opportunity to comply.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 19, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: 5
NAME:	KAPLAN, PETER D TR	
MAILING ADDRESS:	8711 ST IVES DR LOS ANGELES, CA 90069	
SITUS ADDRESS:	8711 ST IVES DR	
ASSESSOR'S ID NO:	5560003015 / INVOICE NO: BN12012845	

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 on or around April 2, 2001, and October 7, 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 26, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 3, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on October 5, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: 4

NAME: EDELIST, ALLEN TR ET AL

MAILING ADDRESS: 4420 SHERMAN OAKS CIR
SHERMAN OAKS, CA 91403

SITUS ADDRESS: 3397 BARHAM BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5579007022 / INVOICE NO: BN12013249

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 October or November of 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that he would provide statements from his gardeners to attest to the fact that they did the work.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on October 19, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: BUTKA, ANTHONY H AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 4286 VERDUGO VIEW DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5678023001 / INVOICE NO: BN12013546

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 May 24, 2011, and had paid \$1,400.00 to have his property cleared. Appellant stated that he did not hand over check (#1442) to Mr. Cesar Hernandez for brush clearance until after he had personally inspected the property.

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 August 30, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 1, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: PAJELA, RUPERTO AND LOURDES TRS
MAILING ADDRESS: 4305 CALEDONIA WAY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065
SITUS ADDRESS: 4305 CALEDONIA WAY
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5678029002 / INVOICE NO: BN12013553

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant submitted the Noncompliance Questionnaire for review. However, due to administrative error, the appeal was misplaced.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on July 26, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on July 26, 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. Due to an administrative error, the appeal was not available for review.

The total assessment due is \$0.00

**2011 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: APRIL 25, 2012 Council District: 14
NAME: MESHKIN, MATT
MAILING ADDRESS: 17632 METZLER LN #210
HUNTINGTN BCH, CA 92647
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5689005015 / INVOICE NO: BN12013603

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 and described it as "once in a while on a regular basis."

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 July 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 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 give sufficient evidence 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: LOPEZ, GERONIMO AND LIDIA
MAILING ADDRESS: 6160 OUTLOOK AVE
LOS ANGELES CA 90042
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF FIGUEROA ST 142' S/OF S
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5708003001 / INVOICE NO: BN12013652

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 August 16, 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 July 27, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 16, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 6, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: LOPEZ, GERONIMO AND LIDIA
MAILING ADDRESS: 6160 OUTLOOK AVE
LOS ANGELES CA 90042
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF FIGUEROA ST 200' S/OF S
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5708003002 / INVOICE NO: BN12013660

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 August 16, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived, and stated that he was in fact in the midst of clearing the property when a landscape company arrived and informed him they were there to clear the lot. Appellant informed the crew that he was the owner, and they immediately left.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 27, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 16, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 6, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: LOPEZ, GERONIMO AND LIDIA
MAILING ADDRESS: 6160 OUTLOOK AVE
LOS ANGELES CA 90042
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/O 7676 N. FIGUEROA STREET
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5708003003 / INVOICE NO: BN12013678

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 August 16, 2011.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived, and stated that he was in fact in the midst of clearing the property when a landscape company arrived and informed him they were there to clear the lot. Appellant informed the crew that he was the owner, and they immediately left.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 27, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on August 16, 2011
- Third Inspection performed on September 6, 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 give sufficient evidence 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: WRIGHT, DALE
 MAILING ADDRESS: 4456 NORTHRIDGE DR
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90043
 SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
 ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5716008030 / INVOICE NO: BN12013686

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 August 10, 2011. Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

Appellant, in a unsigned but dated March 7, 2012, wrote that he was diligent in his efforts to clear his property, and that he had been in communication with the Department's Inspector with regard to the clearance work that needed to be done. Appellant stated that he had cleared the property in August, and was surprised that he had failed the second inspection, which occurred in November. Appellant added that it had already cost him \$1,500.00 to remove the dead tree on his property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 2, 2011
- Second Inspection performed on November 18, 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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation 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: 15
NAME: LUTH, JULIA D
MAILING ADDRESS: 1464 W 185TH ST
GARDENA CA 90248
SITUS ADDRESS: 1464 W 185TH ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 6108014004 / INVOICE NO: BN12013694

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellants, Mr. Thomas D. Luth and Ms. Julia Dee Luth, objected to the imposition of a Noncompliance fee on the property.

Appellants, in their ten-page letter signed but undated, indicated that they were familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by November 22, 2011. The maintained that completed what they termed as the substantial majority of the work before the City contractor appeared. Appellants believed that their work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

Appellants charged the clearance crew that the City contracted with as being derelict in their duties, damaging their roof; uprooting plants; scattering bags of fertilizer, etc. Appellant added that the Department Inspector insisted upon the removal of a tarpaulin on their roof, claiming this far exceeded the Department's jurisdiction regarding brush and vegetation to be cleared.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 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

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 give sufficient evidence to waive the Noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation is that the Noncompliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$312.00.