

LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT




JAMES G. FEATHERSTONE
INTERIM FIRE CHIEF

June 26, 2014

BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS
FILE NO. 14-072

TO: Board of Fire Commissioners

FROM: James G. Featherstone, Interim Fire Chief 

SUBJECT: PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE 2013
NONCOMPLIANCE FEE APPEALS

FOR FINAL ACTION:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved w/Corrections	<input type="checkbox"/> Withdrawn
	<input type="checkbox"/> Denied	<input type="checkbox"/> Received & Filed	<input type="checkbox"/> Other

SUMMARY

The process in which the Fire Department enforces the Fire Code is through the inspection process. Properties or businesses found not in compliance with the Fire Code during the initial inspection, a notice of noncompliance is issued indicating the violations found during the inspection.

A follow-up inspection is conducted and if the nuisance has not been abated, then a second notice is issued. At this point, the property/business owner is subjected to a Noncompliance fee. Each property/business owner is given an opportunity to challenge the imposed Noncompliance fee by completing a questionnaire and submitting it to the Fire Department.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Board:

1. Approve the hearing officers "Proposed Decision and Recommendations." (Attachment 1A, Attachment 1B).
2. Direct the Fire Department to mail the notification letter, "Granted" (Attachment 2) or "Denied" (Attachment 3), to the property/business owner regarding the Board of Fire Commissioners findings, conclusion and proposed assessment.
3. Direct the Fire Department to complete all accounting transactions.
4. Direct the Department to forward the unpaid Noncompliance Inspection Fee to the Los Angeles County Tax Collector for placement on the Los Angeles County 2014 Property Tax rolls.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Noncompliance Assessment Fee of \$352.00 is assessed once a property/business owner fails to comply by their scheduled due date or reinspection. For the 2013 Brush Clearance Season, 124 appeal requests were received from property owners electing to appeal their assessment, 14 appeals were granted and eight (8) were reduced.

For the Fire Prevention Occupancy Noncompliance Fee, six appeals were received by the Department, two were reduced.

The total amount for both Noncompliance Assessment Fees revenue is \$40,704.00.

DISCUSSION

This year the Fire Department received 130 completed questionnaires from property/business owners. The Board of Fire Commissioners designees have reviewed the questionnaires and have prepared the "Proposed Decision and Recommendation." The Board of Fire Commissioners has the authority to modify or rescind the fees, or impose and require the owner to pay the fee. In regards to the Noncompliance Fee Appeals, the Board of Fire Commissioners' determination is final.

CONCLUSION:

Upon approval of this report by the Board of Fire Commissioners, the 2013 Noncompliance Inspection Fee Appeals will be completed. Any unpaid invoices can be forwarded to the Los Angeles County Tax Collector for placement on the 2014 Property Tax rolls.

Board report was prepared by Robert Knight, Captain II, Brush Clearance Unit.

Attachments:

- Attachment 1A: Proposed Decision and Recommendation – "Brush Clearance"
- Attachment 1B: Proposed Decision and Recommendation – "Fire Prevention Occupancy"
- Attachment 2: Notification Letter - "Granted"
- Attachment 3: Notification Letter - "Denied"

**BOARD OF FIRE
COMMISSIONERS**

DELIA IBARRA
PRESIDENT

ANDREW GLAZIER
VICE PRESIDENT

STEVEN R. FAZIO
JIMMY H. HARA, M.D.
JIMMIE WOODS-GRAY

LETICIA GOMEZ
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT II

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

FIRE DEPARTMENT

JAMES G. FEATHERSTONE
INTERIM FIRE CHIEF

6262 VAN NUYS BOULEVARD
ROOM 451
VAN NUYS, CA 91401

(800) 994-4444
FAX: (818) 778-4910

[HTTP://WWW.LAFD.ORG](http://www.lafd.org)

(DATE)

(ATTACHMENT 2)

Dear Property Owner:

As President of the Los Angeles Board of Fire Commissioners, I am writing to inform you of the decision regarding your written appeal of the Noncompliance Inspection Fee assessed toward your property for the 2013 Brush Clearance Season. Due to the volume of Noncompliance Inspection Fee written appeals that were received by my office, the task of reviewing each appeal became a very time consuming job, I thank you for your patience.

Los Angeles Municipal Code, Section 57.104.12, provides the Board of Fire Commissioners the authority to review the *Noncompliance Inspection Fee Written Appeals*. The Code also provides that the determination by the Board of Fire Commissioners shall be final.

The Hearing Officer assigned to your appeal has completed a thorough review of your written appeal and the Los Angeles Fire Department records concerning your property. Based on the Hearing Officer's recommendation, the Los Angeles Board of Fire Commissioners has determined that your Noncompliance Inspection Fee Written Appeal has been **GRANTED**.

Thank you for your courtesy and patience throughout the appeal process, and please remember that brush clearance is a year-round responsibility.

Very truly yours,

Delia Ibarra, President
Board of Fire Commissioners

Attachment

**BOARD OF FIRE
COMMISSIONERS**

DELIA IBARRA
PRESIDENT

ANDREW GLAZIER
VICE PRESIDENT

STEVEN R. FAZIO
JIMMY H. HARA, M.D.
JIMMIE WOODS-GRAY

LETICIA GOMEZ
EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT II

CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA



ERIC GARCETTI
MAYOR

FIRE DEPARTMENT

JAMES G. FEATHERSTONE
INTERIM FIRE CHIEF

6262 VAN NUYS BOULEVARD
ROOM 451
VAN NUYS, CA 91401

(800) 994-4444
FAX: (818) 778-4910

[HTTP://WWW.LAFD.ORG](http://www.LAFD.ORG)

(DATE)

(ATTACHMENT 3)

Dear Property Owner:

On behalf of the Los Angeles Board of Fire Commissioners, I am writing to inform you of the decision regarding your written appeal of the noncompliance fee assessed on your property for the 2013 Brush Clearance Season.

The Los Angeles Municipal Code, Section 57.104.12, authorizes the Board of Fire Commissioners or their representative to review the Noncompliance Inspection Fee Written Appeals. The Municipal Code also stipulates that the determination by the Board of Fire Commissioners is final.

The Hearing Officer assigned to your appeal has completed a thorough review of the documentation that you provided and the Los Angeles Fire Department's records concerning your property. Based on the Hearing Officer's recommendation, the Los Angeles Board of Fire Commissioners has determined that your Noncompliance Inspection Fee Written Appeal is **DENIED**.

The **\$352.00** Noncompliance Inspection Fee must be received by (DATE). Please note that if your payment is not received by the established deadline, you are subject to a 50% penalty. Additionally, any outstanding balances are sent to the County Assessor's Office for assessment onto the property tax bill.

If you have any further questions, please contact the Brush Clearance Unit at (800) 994-4444. Thank you for your courtesy and patience throughout the appeal process. Please remember that brush clearance is a year-round responsibility.

Very truly yours,

Delia Ibarra, President
Board of Fire Commissioners

Attachment

LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT BRUSH CLEARANCE UNIT



2013 NONCOMPLIANCE FEE WRITTEN APPEALS REPORT, PROPOSED DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Page Number	APN	Owner Name	Council District
5	2017021016	MELAMED,TAMIR	12
6	2017025031	LOPEZ, AIDEE E AND	12
7	2028010013	PLUSKO, REGINALD D. AND	3
8	2028020026	JOHNSTON, CHARLES D.	3
9	2032008002	REINGOLD, LEON	3
10	2046004013	AHARI,NAZDANEH K	3
11	2078007015	DARVISH, BABAK K AND	3
12	2111004007	DUGAN,WILLIAM L	3
13	2156005017	PEPPER,JIMMIE AND SILVA N	3
14	2172021058	MENJIVAR, GUILLERMO	3
15	2172021061	SCHMIDT, BJARNE TR	3
16	2172022035	PEREZ, FERNANDO A.	3
17	2172022036	PEREZ, FERNANDO A.	3
18	2272026023	FREEDOM ASSEMBLY CDC	5
19	2277007001	MEADOW DEVELOPMENT LLC	5
20	2279024024	AGHNAMI,HASSAN	5
21	2287010061	ASHBEL LLC	5
22	2290021003	ADOLPH,ARIC K AND LAURA E	5
23	2401030001	BIDARI,TAIMOOR TR	2
24	2403020043	CHEKERDEMIAN,ANAHID CO TR ET AL	2
25	2543027021	GORDON, TARA L.	2
26	2544010008	SWEETWATER MANAGEMENT CO TR	2
27	2544010012	PYLE,GLEN TR	2
28	2552047039	RENAISSANCE MAINTENANCE CORPORAT	2
29	2559021072	MITCHELL, GLENN W. TR	2
30	2560032027	DUNN, JOHN P. AND CONNIE D.	2
31	2563007035	LAUTERBACK,STEVEN J AND	2
32	2564020028	GUY, MARY E.	2
33	2568009028	BEZIOVER, EDWARD AND LILIYA TRS	2
34	2569020023	DE YOUNG, AUGUST F. JR	2
35	2569023040	ANDERSON, LOREN R.	2
36	2606020001	KULOW,RICHARD AND BEVERLY TRS	12
37	2723006003	RAC DEVELOPMENT INC TR	12
38	2727022017	KAMARIAN, ANTRANIK AND AIDA TRS	12
39	2727022056	SETHI, JANG B. AND GURDEEP K. TRS	12
40	2734015007	BALKWILL, J. KEITH AND ANN M.	12
41	2822030021	LOOK, MAZZA, MONA D. ET AL	12
42	2871006006	STEPNER,DAVID AND KYLEE	12

Page Number	APN	Owner Name	Council District
43	2871014009	TAN,HAN SHUE AND LEE WHEI	12
44	2871015023	ANSERLIAN , OHANNES AND KATINA	12
45	2871018008	TAJYAR,ATAURAHMAN CO TR	12
46	2871019019	GOLAN,ZEEV AND IRIT	12
47	2872010004	MINOR, ROBERT L. AND YOLANDA G. TRS	12
48	4356026012	SAMUELSON,KJELL TR	5
49	4366001030	VANLEY, GREGORY T.	5
50	4366007014	NAYLOR, SUSAN M.	5
51	4371020025	WBR ASSETS LLC	5
52	437702402	CAI MULTI UNIT PCI I LLC	5
53	4382001023	3100 BENEDICT CANYON RD LLC	5
54	4382005002	AMIN, MARK TR	5
55	4385016013	SHAFFER, ALAN M.	5
56	4385020017	PARRY,NORMA	5
57	4408026016	TINKER, MARK C TR ET AL	11
58	4409002001	HAYDON, ETHEL L. TR	11
59	4409003008	MCMILLAN, PETER III AND THERESA M	11
60	4409006002	SAVAGE, GEORGE L. AND EILEEN D.	11
61	4410005017	HARRAN, PATRICK G.	11
62	4410011006	BOTTFELD, SARA AND	11
63	4410016046	CUMMINS, PAUL F AND MARY A TRS	11
64	4410020011	BECKER, RACHEL TR	11
65	4411026009	DUBAN, DENNIS L. TR	11
66	4416019022	TURBO, GREY LLC	11
67	4416019023	SIMON, JONATHAN W. CO TR	11
68	4416020025	THOMPSON, GRANT L. TR	11
69	4419001030	GARDENHIRE,OPAL	11
70	4419007032	GHOULIAN, EDMOND M	11
71	4420004014	KALLBERG, KEVIN AND CANDACE TRS	11
72	4420031001	JOHNSON, ANNIE D. TR	11
73	4420036016	HURSH, ROBIN O CO. TR	11
74	4420039002	VIG, RAJNEESH AND MARY TRS	11
75	4492026017	BEN COHEN,MANSOUR AND ASHRAF TRS	11
76	5027011006	SPARKS, ANTHONY AND	8
77	5029001009	SEQUAR, JOSEPH D AND	8
78	5206024013	SON,WOO JONG	1
79	5207019006	SANCHEZ,ERNEST AND MARILYN	1
80	5207025026	EFTEKHARI, HOSSEIN	1
81	5207025027	EFTEKHARI, HOSSEIN	1
82	5209022015	SUN,DORIS	1
83	5214008021	APARCANA, JUAN AND MARIA R.	14
84	5216012010	SHAIQ,FAWAD AND NADIA	14

Page Number	APN	Owner Name	Council District
85	5217005018	CHANG, YI DA	14
86	5217014001	MERCADO, MARIA E.	14
87	5217014017	TERRAZAS, LAWRENCE AND FRANCES P	14
88	5304005024	SILANG, WENDELL F. AND KRISTINE M	1
89	5423020011	WU, MARY Y TR	13
90	5424023009	RAMIREZ, MARION G	13
91	5433017003	BOYER, PATRICIA	4
92	5434012007	LOA INVESTMENTS LLC	4
93	5438005016	ANJ PROPERTIES LLC TR	13
94	5439030011	KINGSLEY, ALISSE R	13
95	5451024014	MOSQUEDA, JORGE	1
96	5454020028	MADRID, ALEXANDER E. AND	1
97	5460016001	VALLEE, GORDON P	14
98	5460021028	GUTIERREZ, FRANCISO	14
99	5462001002	BUNCE, AMY E	14
100	5464003013	GHALCHI, FRED	14
101	5466004007	RODRIGUEZ, HECTOR AND	14
102	5467024015	OLIVERIO, SANDRO	14
103	5471005005	ZARINKOMOGHADAM, TANIA	14
104	5475004029	SOTO INVESTMENTS INC	14
105	5480014025	TULL, DANIEL J AND	14
106	5480014034	TEITELMAN, SARA J AND	14
107	5480031020	SMITH, ALFRED E. AND RHENA S	14
108	5481004010	PELLING, JAMES E AND JUDIT TRS	14
109	5481011007	MOON, MARY V.	14
110	5551032033	GILERMAN, ERINA	4
111	5561001014	FASTLICHT, MICHAELLE	5
112	5564002029	CONVERSION OF RCCI LLC	5
113	5564008030	KJOI INC	5
114	5565015014	YELLOW FUNDING CORP	5
115	5565020034	NILCHIAN, ZAHRA AND	4
116	5569014050	LUXOR PROPERTIES INC	4
117	5570018020	LA PROPERTIES INC	4
118	5576007051	HESKE, WILLIAM G	4
119	5576013082	PATEL, CHANDU AND TARA AND	4
120	5579035014	LANG, NATHAN	4
121	5679019032	LONGORIA, VINCENT AND JULIA	4
122	5679019033	J CARBAJAL DEVT GROUP INC	4

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: MELAMED, TAMIR

MAILING ADDRESS: 8591 BIG ROCK TRL
CANOGA PARK CA 91304

SITUS ADDRESS: 8591 BIG ROCK TRL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2017021016 / INVOICE NO: BN14000145

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 30, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: LOPEZ,AIDEE E AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 9306 GALLATIN RD
DOWNEY CA 90240 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/OF23919 DEERLICK DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2017025031 / INVOICE NO: BN14000152

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he did not receive either the first or second notices, having purchased the property on September 11, 2013. County Assessor's records indicate the closing date to have been September 20, 2013. Appellant believed that the assessment is the responsibility of the previous owner, and this fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 30, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

However, it appears that the Cost of Clearance and the Administrative fees were levied against this property which the Appellant did not as yet own. The Brush Clearance obligations were incurred against the property prior to Appellant's purchase on September 20, 2013, as shown by the County Assessor's Office records. The case file indicates that the previous owner had contacted the Department that he was not owner of the property for a year prior. Therefore, it is this Hearing Officer's recommendation that the Appellant's total assessment be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3

NAME: PLUSKO, REGINALD D AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 24316 SHREWSBURY CIR
WEST HILLS, CA 91307

SITUS ADDRESS: 24316 SHREWSBURY CIR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2028010013 / INVOICE NO: BN14000178

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 September 6, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 4, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 20, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had received the notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3
NAME: JOHNSTON, CHARLES D
MAILING ADDRESS: 23320 BALMORAL LN
WEST HILLS, CA 91307
SITUS ADDRESS: 23320 BALMORAL LN
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2028020026 / INVOICE NO: BN14000186

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 15, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3

NAME: REINGOLD, LEON
MAILING ADDRESS: 6520 PLATT AVE UNIT 209
WEST HILLS CA 91307

SITUS ADDRESS: 6210 ELLENVIEW AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2032008002 / INVOICE NO: BN14000236

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property.

Appellant wrote that he purchased the property on August 21, 2013, and had not received the first and second notices of non-compliance, and requested that the assessed fee should be waived and make the responsibility of the previous owner. The property was bank owned prior to Appellant's purchase.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. However, it appears this had been a bank-owned property, who did not undertake brush clearance. Appellant purchased the property after the first notice but before the second. Fire Department notes indicate a change in ownership update only as of December 10, 2013. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3
NAME: AHARI, NAZDANEH K
MAILING ADDRESS: 5857 EL CANON AVE
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91367
SITUS ADDRESS: 5857 EL CANON AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2046004013 / INVOICE NO: BN14000277

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 17, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 24, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3

NAME: DARVISH, BABAK K AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 4430 NOBLE AVE UNIT 102
SHERMAN OAKS CA 91403 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 22601 WATERBURY ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2078007015 / INVOICE NO: BN14000335

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 9, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 8, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3
NAME: DUGAN, WILLIAM L
MAILING ADDRESS: 7553 REMMET AVE
CANOGA PARK CA 91303
SITUS ADDRESS: 7553 REMMET AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2111004007 / INVOICE NO: BN14000343

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 March 1, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on May 7, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3
NAME: PEPPER, JIMMIE AND SILVA N
MAILING ADDRESS: 5650 TAMPA AVE
TARZANA CA 91356
SITUS ADDRESS: 5650 TAMPA AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2156005017 / INVOICE NO: BN14000384

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 1, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 21, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3

NAME: MENJIVAR, GUILLERMO

MAILING ADDRESS: 9445 MELITA ST
PICO RIVERA, CA 90660

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/E OF 4419 CONSUELO RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2172021058 / INVOICE NO: BN14000640

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 29, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 25, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3
NAME: SCHMIDT, BJARNE TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 4419 CONSUELO RD
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91364
SITUS ADDRESS: 4419 CONSUELO RD
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2172021061 / INVOICE NO: BN14000657

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3
NAME: PEREZ, FERNANDO A
MAILING ADDRESS: 15947 BASSETT ST
VAN NUYS CA 91406 0000
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/OF 20902 MARMORA ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2172022035 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 September 4, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 3

NAME: PEREZ,FERNANDO A

MAILING ADDRESS: 15947 BASSETT ST
VAN NUYS CA 91406 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 20917 MARMORA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2172022036 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 September 4, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: FREEDOM ASSEMBLY CDC

MAILING ADDRESS: 10866 WASHINGTON BLVD STE 757
CULVER CITY CA 90232

SITUS ADDRESS: 3574 V/L 3923 DEER AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2272026023 / INVOICE NO: BN14000863

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 1, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on August 21, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5
NAME: MEADOW DEVELOPMENT LLC
MAILING ADDRESS: 3537 MOUND VIEW AVE
STUDIO CITY CA 91604
SITUS ADDRESS: 14974 VALLEY VISTA BLVD
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2277007001 / INVOICE NO: BN14001176

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he did not receive notices.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 22, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notices were sent to an incorrect address. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: AGHNAMI,HASSAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2550
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

SITUS ADDRESS: VL NEXT TO 3375 VISTA HAVEN

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2279024024 / INVOICE NO: BN14001242

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he did not receive any notices.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 13, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, mail was returned, although the actual address change occurred in 2011. The posting appears insufficient to provide practical notice of the obligation to clear this vacant lot, even though it may constitute legal notice. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: ASHBEL LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 15015 OXNARD ST
VAN NUYS CA 91411

SITUS ADDRESS: 3454 GREEN VISTA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2287010061 / INVOICE NO: BN14001283

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 7, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 21, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: ADOLPH, ARIC K AND LAURA E

MAILING ADDRESS: 4670 ENCINO AVE
ENCINO CA 91316

SITUS ADDRESS: 4670 ENCINO AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2290021003 / INVOICE NO: BN14001325

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, but had received no notices to indicate that her property was not in compliance. Appellant wrote that he husband had been in Dubai, and the property was rented to a tenant who never provided them any notices either.

Appellant believed that the mail was not being forwarded by the United States Post Office, had similar problems with the mail in 2012, and requested the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 21, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: BIDARI, TAIMOOR TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 19326 VENTURA BLVD UNIT 201
TARZANA CA 91356 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 8410 LA TUNA CANYON RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2401030001 / INVOICE NO: BN14001747

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 15, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 28, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: CHEKERDEMIAN, ANAHID CO TR ET AL

MAILING ADDRESS: 10043 BENARES PL
SUN VALLEY, CA 91352

SITUS ADDRESS: 10043 BENARES PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2403020043 / INVOICE NO: BN14001903

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 14, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 26, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: GORDON, TARA L

MAILING ADDRESS: 9977 WORNOM AVE
SUNLAND, CA 91040

SITUS ADDRESS: 9977 WORNOM AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2543027021 / INVOICE NO: BN14002067

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 9, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 16, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: SWEETWATER MANAGEMENT CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 9466 SUNLAND BLVD
SUN VALLEY, CA 91352

SITUS ADDRESS: 9466 SUNLAND BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2544010008 / INVOICE NO: BN14002109

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 9, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: PYLE, GLEN TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 9466 SUNLAND BLVD
SUN VALLEY, CA 91352

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L SW/OF 9466 SUNLAND BL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2544010012 / INVOICE NO: BN14002117

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 himself and with someone he hired by June 17, 2013.

Appellant believed that the Department's Inspectors were in collusion to conspire against him to harass him, and remove twelve vehicles that had been stored on his property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 9, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: RENAISSANCE MAINTENANCE CORPORAT

MAILING ADDRESS: 706 W BROADWAY 204
GLENDALE, CA 91204 1032

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L EAST OF 11128 TUJUNGA CYN

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2552047039 / INVOICE NO: BN14002208

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 11, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: MITCHELL, GLENN W TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 8937 LANKERSHIM BLVD
SUN VALLEY CA 91352

SITUS ADDRESS: 8131 CORA ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2559021072 / INVOICE NO: BN14002265

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 6, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: DUNN,JOHN P AND CONNIE D

MAILING ADDRESS: 10161 SCOVILLE AVE
SUNLAND CA 91040

SITUS ADDRESS: 10161 SCOVILLE AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2560032027 / INVOICE NO: BN14002281

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 10, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on August 9, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: LAUTERBACK, STEVEN J AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 2734 ALABAMA ST
LA CRESCENTA, CA 91214

SITUS ADDRESS: 7540 THOUSAND OAKS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2563007035 / INVOICE NO: BN14002406

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and that there were no hazards on or near his property, adding that he had been traveling out of town.

Appellant believed that there had been no clearance of any brush performed, and provided photographs, requesting the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 7, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 29, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on August 8, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: GUY,MARY E

MAILING ADDRESS: 7077 HIGHCLIFF TRL
TUJUNGA, CA 91042

SITUS ADDRESS: 7077 HIGHCLIFF TRL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2564020028 / INVOICE NO: BN14002752

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 7, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: BEZINOVER, EDWARD AND LILIYA TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 6350 LAUREL CANYON BLVD STE 307
NORTH HOLLYWOOD CA 91606 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 7323 ELMO ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2568009028 / INVOICE NO: BN14002836

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: DE YOUNG, AUGUST F JR

MAILING ADDRESS: 24042 CALVERT ST
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367

SITUS ADDRESS: 10232 HAINES CANYON AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2569020023 / INVOICE NO: BN14002950

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 19, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on August 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 2

NAME: ANDERSON, LOREN R

MAILING ADDRESS: 10357 HAINES CANYON AVE
TUJUNGA, CA 91042

SITUS ADDRESS: 10357 HAINES CANYON AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2569023040 / INVOICE NO: BN14002968

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 hiring a contractor, who completed the work on or by October 6, 2013. Appellant believed that the brush removal work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and requested that the assessed fee should be waived tree removal.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 18, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: KULOW, RICHARD AND BEVERLY TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 11979 SALEM DR
GRANADA HILLS, CA 91344

SITUS ADDRESS: 11979 SALEM DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2606020001 / INVOICE NO: BN14003206

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements having hired a gardener to clear the property by September 8, 2013.

Appellant added that her husband had recently passed and asked that the non-compliance fee be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 16, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: RAC DEVELOPMENT INC TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 150 N SANTA ANITA AVE STE 645
ARCADIA CA 91006

SITUS ADDRESS: 22231 CHATSWORTH ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2723006003 / INVOICE NO: BN14003263

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellants stated that the company did not obtain possession of the property until October 2, 2013, previously in the process of obtaining an eviction of the previous tenant who did not allow them access. Appellant contended that after gaining possession the company was able to regain access onto the property, obtaining permits to undertake needed and necessary repairs.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 8, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Information in the case file shows ownership was updated on March 14, 2013, however the timing of when the effective date of mail change shows to be August 18, 2013. This creates the possibility that Appellant presumptively did not receive the first notice, but was on title before the second. It is therefore likely that the second non-compliance notices reached this Appellant. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: KAMARIAN, ANTRANIK AND AIDA TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 22656 LENOPE PL
CHATSWORTH CA 91311

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
2727022017 / INVOICE NO: BN14003305

ASSESSOR'S ID NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant paid to request a noncompliance written appeal. No forms were attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 8, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

Appellant paid for her written appeal, unfortunately the owner did not send documentation, or pictures to substantiate her claim.

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

Total assessment due is \$352.00

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: SETHI, JANG B AND GURDEEP K TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 22550 N SUMMIT RIDGE CIR
CHATSWORTH, CA 91311

SITUS ADDRESS: 22550 N SUMMIT RIDGE CIR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2727022056 / INVOICE NO: BN14003339

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 28, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: BALKWILL, J KEITH AND ANN M

MAILING ADDRESS: 17525 ROMAR ST
NORTHRIDGE CA 91325

SITUS ADDRESS: 17525 ROMAR ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2734015007 / INVOICE NO: BN14003347

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 6, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 7, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property.

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

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: LOOK MAZZA, MONA D ET AL

MAILING ADDRESS: 11638 PALA MESA DR
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 11638 PALA MESA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2822030021 / INVOICE NO: BN14003370

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 30, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: STEPNER, DAVID AND KYLEE

MAILING ADDRESS: 18815 NAU AVE
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 18815 NAU AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871006006 / INVOICE NO: BN14003420

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: TAN, HAN SHUE AND LEE WHEI

MAILING ADDRESS: 1181 SUNLIGHT CIR
CONCORD, CA 94518

SITUS ADDRESS: 18834 DUKAS ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871014009 / INVOICE NO: BN14003446

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she was familiar as the property manager with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property on March 25, 2013; May 28, 2013, and again on October 9, 2013.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance by clearing all of the dead palm tree fronds, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 17, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: ANSERLIAN, OHANNES AND KATINA

MAILING ADDRESS: 11428 VIKING AVE
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 11428 VIKING AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871015023 / INVOICE NO: BN14003461

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 17, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: TAJYAR,ATAURAHMAN CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 18748 ACCRA ST
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 18748 ACCRA ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871018008 / INVOICE NO: BN14003479

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property, clearing the property a week after the notice.

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 may have photographs of the back yard.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 12, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department records do not indicate that any mail was returned. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The issue was not the brush in back yard but the dried palm fronds. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: GOLAN,ZEEV AND IRIT

MAILING ADDRESS: 8276 CAMINITO MODENA
LA JOLLA CA 92037

SITUS ADDRESS: 11318 DULCET AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871019019 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property as mandated by the City undertaken by a contractor, completing the work on or by January 28, 2014.

Appellant added that he believed that no professional brush clearance had been undertaken by the City contractor, as his contractor spent two days working to clear his parcel.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 12, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Additionally, the City contractor had specifically cleared dry palm fronds from the palm tree on Appellant's property, and the issue had not been the brush. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 12

NAME: MINOR, ROBERT L AND YOLANDA G TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 18970 BRASILIA DR
PORTER RANCH CA 91326 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 18970 BRASILIA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2872010004 / INVOICE NO: BN14003503

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 15, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 5, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 21, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5
NAME: SAMUELSON, KJELL TR
MAILING ADDRESS: P O BOX 17374
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90209
SITUS ADDRESS: 9924 BEVERLY GROVE DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4356026012 / INVOICE NO: BN14003669

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 26, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 4, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: VANLEY, GREGORY T

MAILING ADDRESS: 276 BENTLEY CIR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

SITUS ADDRESS: 276 BENTLEY CIR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4366001030 / INVOICE NO: BN14003719

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 7, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 14, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on September 03, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: NAYLOR,SUSAN M

MAILING ADDRESS: 225 GLENROY PL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

SITUS ADDRESS: 225 GLENROY PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4366007014 / INVOICE NO: BN14003743

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 7, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 14, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: WBR ASSETS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 28 OLD RUDNICK LN
DOVER DE 19901

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N. OF 848 BEVERLY GLEN. BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4371020025 / INVOICE NO: BN14003974

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 15, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 4, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: CAI MULTI UNIT PCI I LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 7200
LAGUNA NIGUEL CA 92607

SITUS ADDRESS: 1979 STRADELLA RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4377024012 / INVOICE NO: BN14004030

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 17, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 29, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on July 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: 3100 BENEDICT CANYON RD LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 1061 1/2 N SPAULDING AVE
WEST HOLLYWOOD CA 90046 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 3100 BENEDICT CANYON DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4382001023 / INVOICE NO: BN14004089

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that she was the manager of the LLC and the owner took possession on July 17, 2013, hiring the gardener on July 31, 2013, who cleared the property on August 31, 2013. The property was cleared by the City contractor on August 23, 2013. 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 22, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had attempted to remedy the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. However, the case file shows that the LLC did not own the property at the time of the first inspection, and ownership transferred one day before the second notice. Therefore, Appellants have provided sufficient documentary evidence sufficient to establish that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due should be waived and be \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: AMIN, MARK TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 10203 SANTA MONICA BLVD STE 300B
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

SITUS ADDRESS: 2750 BENEDICT CANYON DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4382005002 / INVOICE NO: BN14004097

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 22, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 29, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on August 26, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: SHAFER, ALAN M

MAILING ADDRESS: 8447 WILSHIRE BLVD 401
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211

SITUS ADDRESS: 2787 ELLISON DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4385016013 / INVOICE NO: BN14004253

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 17, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 30, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: PARRY, NORMA

MAILING ADDRESS: 13200 MULHOLLAND DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90210

SITUS ADDRESS: 13200 MULHOLLAND DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4385020017 / INVOICE NO: BN14004279

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 17, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: TINKER, MARK C TR ET AL

MAILING ADDRESS: 11726 SAN VICENTE BLVD STE 360
LOS ANGELES CA 90049 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VAC LOT SOUTH OF 506 LATIMER RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4408026016 / INVOICE NO: BN14004329

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: HAYDON, ETHEL L TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 1229 W AVENUE 37
LOS ANGELES CA 90065 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 14227 W SUNSET BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4409002001 / INVOICE NO: BN14004352

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 31, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 7, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: MCMILLAN,PETER III AND THERESA M

MAILING ADDRESS: 1115 LAS PULGAS
PACIFIC PALISADES, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 14219 W SUNSET BLVD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4409003008 / INVOICE NO: BN14004360

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 31, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 7, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: SAVAGE, GEORGE L AND EILEEN D

MAILING ADDRESS: 1029 VILLA VIEW DR
PACIFIC PLSDS, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 1029 VILLA VIEW DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4409006002 / INVOICE NO: BN14004386

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 September 3, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 2, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 26, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: HARRAN,PATRICK G

MAILING ADDRESS: 305 OCEAN AVE
SANTA MONICA, CA 90402

SITUS ADDRESS: 305 OCEAN AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4410005017 / INVOICE NO: BN14004444

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 27, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: BOTTFELD, SARA AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 236 W CHANNEL RD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90402

SITUS ADDRESS: 236 W CHANNEL RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4410011006 / INVOICE NO: BN14004451

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on December 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: CUMMINS, PAUL F AND MARY A TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 550 E RUSTIC RD
SANTA MONICA, CA 90402

SITUS ADDRESS: 550 E RUSTIC RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4410016046 / INVOICE NO: BN14004469

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 24, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: BECKER,RACHEL TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 410 MESA RD
SANTA MONICA, CA 90402

SITUS ADDRESS: 416 MESA RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4410020011 / INVOICE NO: BN14004477

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 24, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: DUBAN,DENNIS L TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 290 TOYOPA DR
PACIFIC PALISADES CA 90272 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 290 TOYOPA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4411026009 / INVOICE NO: BN14004501

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013. 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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 4, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 24, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: TURBO GREY LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 9033 CRESTA DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90035 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 770 PASEO MIRAMAR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4416019022 / INVOICE NO: BN14004667

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 9, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: SIMONS, JONATHAN W CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 766 PASEO MIRAMAR
PACIFIC PALISADES CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 766 PASEO MIRAMAR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4416019023 / INVOICE NO: BN14004675

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 9, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 19, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: THOMPSON, GRANT L TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 1927 S NAVAJO DR
PALM SPRINGS, CA 92264 9265

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4416020025 / INVOICE NO: BN14004691

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 9, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: GARDENHIRE, OPAL

MAILING ADDRESS: 11942 SHASTA CIR
CERRITOS, CA 90703

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/O 949 N. ENCHANTED WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4419001030 / INVOICE NO: BN14004758

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 1, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: GHOU LIAN, EDMOND M

MAILING ADDRESS: 1037 GLENHAVEN DR
PACIFIC PALISADES, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 1037 GLENHAVEN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4419007032 / INVOICE NO: BN14004808

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The owner denies having received mailed notices and claims to have had his own gardener abate the hazard. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013. 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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 2, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required and found the property in unsafe conditions. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: KALLBERG, KEVIN AND CANDACE TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 916 LAS LOMAS AVE
PACIFIC PALISADES, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 916 LAS LOMAS AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4420004014 / INVOICE NO: BN14004832

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant contends that he did not receive the August 24, 2013, notice until September 3, 2013, leaving insufficient time to comply by September 15, 2013. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013. 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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on December 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

While Palm tree trimming is a large task, the appellants' properties remain non-compliant as late as October 22, 2013. Nor is their record of any attempt to request an extension. The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: JOHNSON, ANNIE D TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 1462 LACHMAN LN
PACIFIC PALISADES, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 1462 LACHMAN LN

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4420031001 / INVOICE NO: BN14004931

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellants' property underwent construction during the period in issue making compliance impractical before the deadline. The Appellant by written appeal wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by 2013. 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 18, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

Your Hearing Examiner respects the owners' adherence to safety and practicality but the Fire Department Inspectors generally adhere to those standards as well and the file does not reflect any photographic or other visual evidence of "impracticality" or danger of timely compliance. The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11
NAME: HURSH, ROBIN O CO TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 1458 BIENVENEDA AVE
PACIFIC PALISADES CA 90272 0000
SITUS ADDRESS: 1458 BIENVENEDA AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4420036016 / INVOICE NO: BN14004956

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he has engaged the same gardeners for fifteen years and in 2013, had to instruct them in meeting the new requirements spending over \$4,000.00 to do so.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 17, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on September 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

Generally past compliance provides no waiver of the obligation to comply currently. This owner's record of compliance and current expenditures warrants a partial waiver of the noncompliance fee. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$100.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: VIG, RAJNEESH AND MARY TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 16326 SHADOW MOUNTAIN DR
PACIFIC PALISADES CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 16326 SHADOW MOUNTAIN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4420039002 / INVOICE NO: BN14004964

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he purchased the property in 2013, closing four days before the first inspection. The Fire Department record shows mail returned in June and December 2013.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 26, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant denies having received mailed notices and commits to compliance going forward. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 11

NAME: BEN COHEN, MANSOUR AND ASHRAF TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 1135 S CARMELINA AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049 5811

SITUS ADDRESS: 2444 WESTRIDGE RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4492026017 / INVOICE NO: BN14005094

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 8

NAME: SPARKS, ANTHONY AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 4777 DON PORFIRIO PL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008

SITUS ADDRESS: 4777 DON PORFIRIO PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5027011006 / INVOICE NO: BN14005128

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant contends that Inspector Guardado promised him a waiver of the noncompliance inspection fee incurred on September 11, 2013, if compliance was achieved.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 9, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Appellant appears to have misconstrued Inspector Guardado's commitment which was made after September 11, 2013, in any event and which was that the property if compliant by October 20, 2013, would not be sent to contract. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 8

NAME: SEQUAR,JOSEPH D AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 3889 S ORANGE DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90008

SITUS ADDRESS: 3889 S ORANGE DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5029001009 / INVOICE NO: BN14005185

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he can't afford to pay due to financial difficulties affecting him at this time.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 25, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Normally unsubstantiated hardship claims unaccompanied by no documentation warrant no waiver. A partial waiver is recommended here only because the owner appears to have taken his compliance obligation seriously. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$250.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1

NAME: SON, WOO JONG

MAILING ADDRESS: 125 S CAMPUS DR 14-304
FEDERAL WAY WA 98023

SITUS ADDRESS: 484 CLIFTON ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206024013 / INVOICE NO: BN14005268

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The owner claims to have received no notices having secured possession no earlier than September 30, 2013. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

Appellant believed that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 2, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The owner had possession before the second inspection and before posting. However mail was returned before the clearance apparently and the record is insufficiently clear to warrant this assessment. The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1

NAME: SANCHEZ, ERNEST AND MARILYN

MAILING ADDRESS: 424 E AVENUE 39
LOS ANGELES, CA 90031

SITUS ADDRESS: 424 E AVENUE 39

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5207019006 / INVOICE NO: BN14005276

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 29, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1

NAME: EFTEKHARI, HOSSEIN

MAILING ADDRESS: 5945 E SETTLER CT
ANAHEIM, CA 92807

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5207025026 / INVOICE NO: BN14005284

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he called the Fire Department whose Inspector confirmed continuing noncompliance adding that he would revisit the site. Apparently because the Inspector did not call him after that. The Appellant concluded that the issue was resolved.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 10, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1
NAME: EFTEKHARI, HOSSEIN
MAILING ADDRESS: 5945 JSETTLER CRT
ANAHEIM, CA 92807
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5207025027 / INVOICE NO: BN14005292

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he called the Fire Department whose Inspector confirmed continuing noncompliance adding that he would revisit the site. Apparently because the Inspector did not call him after that. The Appellant concluded that the issue was resolved.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 10, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1
NAME: SUN,DORIS
MAILING ADDRESS: 867 CABOT LN
FOSTER CITY CA 94404 0000
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5209022015 / INVOICE NO: BN14005524

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 6, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: APARCANA, JUAN AND MARIA R

MAILING ADDRESS: 17015 E CYPRESS ST
COVINA, CA 91722

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON DUDLEY WY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5214008021 / INVOICE NO: BN14005953

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he complied after the re-inspection of November 18, 2013 and left a message to that effect with the Inspector.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 18, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 18, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

Although the Appellant performed clearance in December 2013, he acknowledges having received the initial notice of noncompliance and his letter implies strongly that he received the second November 18, 2013, notice as well, as he contacted the Inspector that day. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: SHAIQ, FAWAD AND NADIA

MAILING ADDRESS: 2125 CARMONA AVE
LOS ANGELES CA 90016

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5216012010 / INVOICE NO: BN14006159

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 30, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: CHANG,YI DA

MAILING ADDRESS: 2740 N LYNNFIELD CIR
LOS ANGELES CA 90032 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217005018 / INVOICE NO: BN14006266

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that on January 28, 2014 the owner of record was changed to this owner although prior notices apparently went to Rumio Sato, evidently the owner before 1011 foreclosure. He was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by 2013.

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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 27, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Fire Department record did not change to reflect the 2013 owner until 2014. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: MERCADO, MARIA E

MAILING ADDRESS: 2432 RICHELIEU AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217014001 / INVOICE NO: BN14006316

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that between her mothers' medical problems and her sons' legal matters, she was unable to attend to brush clearance hearing. She adds that her son promised to clear the brush and that received no notices in any event

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 30, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant describes her mothers' medical problems as having distracted her through mid-June. Re-inspection however did not occur until August; she relied perhaps unreasonably given the other information about him on her son. The owner also denies having received notice, because her son barred her or at least discouraged her from visiting their property. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$252.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: TERRAZAS, LAWRENCE AND FRANCES P

MAILING ADDRESS: 6536 PICO VISTA RD
PICO RIVERA, CA 90660

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217014017 / INVOICE NO: BN14006332

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant denies receipt of notice and suspects that the property cleared was not his own.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 30, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 4, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1

NAME: SILANG, WENDELL F AND KRISTINE M

MAILING ADDRESS: 4016 BERENICE PL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90031

SITUS ADDRESS: 4016 BERENICE PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5304005024 / INVOICE NO: BN14006480

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he acknowledges all notices but was unable to act in a timely fashion because of his son's premature birth in May 2013, compliance had been due in June.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 14, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Although your Hearing Examiner recognizes the owner's primary responsibility for his son whose premature arrival and NICU stay fell squarely within the compliance period fully two months passed before re-inspection. Therefore no full waiver should be granted. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$250.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 13
NAME: WU,MARY Y TR
MAILING ADDRESS: 1651 SILVERWOOD TER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90026
SITUS ADDRESS: 1651 SILVERWOOD TER
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5423020011 / INVOICE NO: BN14006720

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant does not concur that her property was in hazardous condition if it was inspected and denies having received the second mailed notice.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 1, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 16, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 12, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 13

NAME: RAMIREZ, MARION G

MAILING ADDRESS: 1311 WATERLOO ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90026

SITUS ADDRESS: 1311 WATERLOO ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5424023009 / INVOICE NO: BN14006738

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee. Mr. Adam Gower indicated that he was purchasing the building through probate. The owner of the property in May 2002 intestate that a veteran Mr. Daniel Zachery was living in the property and no-one resided in the property to receive mail, and that he under the Hospices of the Abandoned Building inspectors of the City of Los Angeles already paid \$2,400 on December 23, 2013.

Also included by Mr. Gower was a Los Angeles Fire Department report dated April 6, 2009, indicating a fire that originated in the basement and caused significant damage. The occupants had been identified as Mr. Daniel Zachery, and Mr. John Pohwat. After the fire and resultant damage the City of Los Angeles Department of building and Safety, Code enforcement bureau had filed a Notice dated April 24, 2009 that the building was a nuisance and uninhabitable. Appellant had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by early December 2013.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 25, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 24, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 14, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The property had sustained fire damage to a level sufficient to have the property and its charred structure declared a public nuisance. The owner passed away intestate in May 2002. There is no record of Mr. Gower having purchased the property, or being on record as the new owner. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4
NAME: BOYER, PATRICIA
MAILING ADDRESS: 1553 CURRAN ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90026
SITUS ADDRESS: 2311 HYPERION AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5433017003 / INVOICE NO: BN14006787

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant provided photographs apparently taken after the second inspection and which in his judgment reflect no fire hazard.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 5, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 2, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant states that he cleared the land in May 2013 after receipt of the first notice of noncompliance. The property remained out of compliance or in any event was not compliant as of the second inspection and your Hearing Examiner concluded that a hazard did exist at that time. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: LOA INVESTMENTS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 4020 PALOS VERDES DR N STE 107
ROLLING HILLS ESTATES CA 90274 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VAC LOT WEST OF 3830 ROBLE VISTA

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5434012007 / INVOICE NO: BN14006795

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he acknowledges having received mailed notices although they identified an old LLC as owner using the same street address. The owner also questions the existence of hazard and calls the property line unclear.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 14, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 5, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Appellant seems to have relied upon her gardeners' judgment of hazard even though the governing rules make clear the need for Fire Department approval as well as the manner in which it is to be documented. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 13

NAME: ANJ PROPERTIES LLC TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 8391 SAN FERNANDO RD SP 23
SUN VALLEY, CA 91352

SITUS ADDRESS: 2412 W RIVERSIDE DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5438005016 / INVOICE NO: BN14006860

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 24, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 12, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 13

NAME: KINGSLEY, ALISSE R

MAILING ADDRESS: 2230 KENILWORTH AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90039

SITUS ADDRESS: 2230 KENILWORTH AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5439030011 / INVOICE NO: BN14006910

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he paid for work which was however found insufficient upon re-inspection in September 2013.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 21, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The Fire Department satisfied its due process obligation which as a practical matter cannot encompass returned phone calls in the manner the owner proposes in her appeal. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1

NAME: MOSQUEDA, JORGE

MAILING ADDRESS: 3317 DARWIN AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90031

SITUS ADDRESS: 430 W AVENUE 37

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5451024014 / INVOICE NO: BN14007025

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. He feels his neighbor is making complaints regarding his property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 1, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 18, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 1

NAME: MADRID,ALEXANDER E AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 3616 ALTAMONT ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: 3616 ALTAMONT ST.

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5454020028 / INVOICE NO: BN14007132

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he received notices and cleared his property and provided photographs which he believes imply that some contracted work was performed on a neighbor's property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 26, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant performed work in June 2013, re-inspection revealed noncompliance in September. The work appears to have been done upon the subject parcel. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: VALLEE, GORDON P

MAILING ADDRESS: 3552 KINNEY ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: 2547 CRESTMOORE PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460016001 / INVOICE NO: BN14007215

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote of having a hardship without providing supporting documentation and contends separately that he did not receive the second notice possibly due to mail theft.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 22, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant has complied for many years as far as he knows and says that he faces either noncompliance or erosion in effect. Your Hearing Examiner usually demands a higher level of proof of hardship but notes also the owners past expenditures and to some extent the dilemma presented by the topography all of which justifies a partial waiver. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$250.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: GUTIERREZ, FRANCISCO

MAILING ADDRESS: 3720 ACKERMAN DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: 3720 ACKERMAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460021028 / INVOICE NO: BN14007231

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant argues only the hardship of his having been out of work, for an unspecified time and that he did see to the work after the second inspection.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 1, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 18, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

It does not seem unreasonable to conclude that the owners' new job coincided with his payment for the November post-re-inspection work although he does not say so explicitly. He does describe the \$50.00 processing fee as burdensome. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$150.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: BUNCE, AMY E

MAILING ADDRESS: 5400 JARVIS ST
FAYETTEVILLE NC 28314

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 150 FT W/OF 2539 SUNDOWN

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5462001002 / INVOICE NO: BN14007249

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 14, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 9, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: GHALCHI, FRED

MAILING ADDRESS: 163 N WILLAMAN DR
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90211 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/O 3666 DIVISION STREET

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5464003013 / INVOICE NO: BN14007967

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that the photographs show no hazard on the property as of the work he performed after receipt of the first notice.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 18, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The owner's photographs are undated and although he denies having received the second notice he writes that he completed the work on or by October 2, 2013. The Department's record reflects no relevant returned mail and the map frankly is not probative on the existence of a hazard. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: RODRIGUEZ, HECTOR AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 8914 NEVADA AVE
ROSEMEAD CA 91770

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ADJ. TO 711 MOON

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5466004007 / INVOICE NO: BN14008031

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The owner received no mailed notice as mail was returned although the property was posted later. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

Appellant believed that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 18, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 7, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, Appellant requested an address change and did not reach the Fire Departments record in a timely fashion. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: OLIVERIO,SANDRO

MAILING ADDRESS: 1333 N MARTEL AVE # 304
LOS ANGELES, CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: 242 FURNESS AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5467024015 / INVOICE NO: BN14008189

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant cites the differences between the first and second notices respective requirements and writes that he should have been given additional time before this cost might be imposed.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The first and second notices do differ in scope but the record also and simply reflects non-compliance as of July 31, 2014. Although the first notice scope does not control the scope of the second inspection at which all relevant standards must be met and not only those unsatisfied at the first inspection. Considerations of due process militate in favor of a small reduction. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$250.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: ZARINKOMOGHADAM, TANIA

MAILING ADDRESS: 3630 S SEPULVEDA BLVD NO 342
LOS ANGELES, CA 90034

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S. OF 4541 SAN ANDREAS AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5471005005 / INVOICE NO: BN14008197

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that his brother cleaned the lot after the first notice as he had done for 15 years.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 6, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 1, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on November 13, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant brother undoubtedly did perform clearance work in May. The property may have experience re-growth by November even had it complied back in May, as Brush Clearance is a year-round responsibility. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: SOTO INVESTMENTS INC

MAILING ADDRESS: 18990 MALKOHA ST
PERRIS CA 92570 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N 3806 DIVISION ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5475004029 / INVOICE NO: BN14008460

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant denies having received the first notice and the Departments record appears to reflect an ownership change as of July 3, 2012, but which was not noted at the Department until after the first inspection.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 28, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived in light of the notice issue.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: TULL, DANIEL J AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 860 CRESTWOOD TER
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: 860 CRESTWOOD TER

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5480014025 / INVOICE NO: BN14008577

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant claimed hardship for both and produced documented receipt of public assistance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 31, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. The owners hardship claim is compelling it must be noted that other property owners cannot be compelled to subsidize their noncompliance for an unlimited time, if the important purpose of hazard abatement is to be upheld. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: TEITELMAN,SARA J AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 921 CRESTWOOD TER
LOS ANGELES CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: 921 CRESTWOOD TER

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5480014034 / INVOICE NO: BN14008585

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 18, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 22, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: SMITH, ALFRED E AND RHENA S

MAILING ADDRESS: 1811 UPPERTON AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: 1811 UPPERTON AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5480031020 / INVOICE NO: BN14008650

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant enclosed what appears to be a law firm-related check for gardening services, for work done before re-inspection. They deny receipt of the Second Notice and characterized this fee as a burden.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 15, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. The owners offer no support for the hardship claim.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: PELLING,JAMES E AND JUDIT TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 944 PINE GROVE AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5481004010 / INVOICE NO: BN14008684

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that his work was performed following receipt of the Second Notice, and that work continues to be done.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 14

NAME: MOON,MARY V

MAILING ADDRESS: 4835 MINDEN PL
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 4835 MINDEN PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5481011007 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 19, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on July 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: GILERMAN, ERINA

MAILING ADDRESS: 19641 ROSITA ST
TARZANA CA 91356

SITUS ADDRESS: 8031 FLORAL AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5551032033 / INVOICE NO: BN14008916

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 hiring her gardener who completed the work by May 2013. Appellant provided an invoice dated May 15, 2013 in the amount of \$300.00 for hillside cleaning and brush removal. 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 7, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 14, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: FASTLICHT, MICHAELLE

MAILING ADDRESS: 1420 RISING GLEN RD
LOS ANGELES CA 90069

SITUS ADDRESS: 1420 RISING GLEN RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5561001014 / INVOICE NO: BN14009203

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The owner says that an inspector visited the property and confirmed compliance on an unknown date. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013. 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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 14, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 17, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The notices make clear the documentation required to insure compliance. The Inspectors do not undermine that protocol as to who would compromise the effectiveness and even the existence of the Brush Clearance program in your hearing examiner experience. The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: CONVERSION OF RCCI LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 1912 E VERNON AVE
VERNON, CA 90058

SITUS ADDRESS: 8686 EDWIN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5564002029 / INVOICE NO: BN14009401

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements having purchased the property in February 2012, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property as mandated by the City.

Appellant added that no paperwork had been received indicating non-compliance, and that the property is a vacant lot. Appellant asked that the non-compliance fee be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 29, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: KJOI INC

MAILING ADDRESS: 3400 W OLIVE AVE STE 550
BURBANK, CA 91505

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 8307 SKYLINE DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5564008030 / INVOICE NO: BN14009419

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The owner acknowledges receipt of notice and provides a tree service firms invoice reflecting work done between inspections. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013. 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 29, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 29, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Fire Department fulfilled its due process obligations and the property was determined to be non-compliant at the second inspection. The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached.

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

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 5

NAME: YELLOW FUNDING CORP

MAILING ADDRESS: 8721 SANTA MONICA BLVD STE 227
WEST HOLLYWOOD CA 90069

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 8158 TIANNA RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5565015014 / INVOICE NO: BN14009468

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he had receipts to present at the meeting; however none were submitted with this written appeal.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 3, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on November 13, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: NILCHIAN,ZAHRA AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 2425 MOUNT OLYMPUS DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: 2425 MOUNT OLYMPUS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5565020034 / INVOICE NO: BN14009575

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant widowed received \$1085.00 monthly from social security and states this is her only income. She writes that she hired workers to clear the hazard in June or July 2013, after receiving the initial notice but that they must not have completed the task. The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013. 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, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The owner received all notices and the department correctly found and then abated a serious hazard. On the other hand the owner engaged workers to address the problem although she attaches no receipt reflecting their work. She borrowed money both to pay them and to pay for this appeal. Balancing each party's interest it is reasonable to waive the indicated portion of the non-compliance fee.

Total assessment due is \$100.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: LUXOR PROPERTIES INC

MAILING ADDRESS: 4751 WILSHIRE BLVD # 203
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

SITUS ADDRESS: 2251 NICHOLS CANYON

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5569014050 / INVOICE NO: BN14009716

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant explains that he has owned the property for some time seeking always to comply. The ground experience re-growth and has poison oak and ivy discouraging work crews.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 14, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on October 1, 2013
- Third Inspection performed on October 17, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

Although the Fire Department made no errors the owner discusses the poisonous nature of some of this brush as well as the illegal dumping of others. Taken in their totality and in consideration of the owners' proper attitude toward this important obligation a limited waiver is reasonable. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be partially waived.

Total assessment due is \$100.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: LA PROPERTIES INC

MAILING ADDRESS: 3685 MOTOR AVE UNIT 200
LOS ANGELES CA 90034

SITUS ADDRESS: 8030 MULHOLLAND DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5570018020 / INVOICE NO: BN14009765

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant wrote that he had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by himself and a gardener, and had completed the work by 06/17/2013.

Appellant believed that a conspiracy was formed between the Department Inspectors, who chose to harass the Appellant by forcing their way onto the property and removing twelve vehicles without any due process being afforded to the Appellant to protest.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 30, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 30, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. According to the County Assessor's information, Appellant has owned the property since July 17, 2006. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: HESKE, WILLIAM G

MAILING ADDRESS: 218 N SERRANO AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90004

SITUS ADDRESS: 6462 DEEP DELL PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5576007051 / INVOICE NO: BN14009914

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 24, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 27, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4
NAME: PATEL, CHANDU AND TARA AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 6826 W SUNSET BLVD
HOLLYWOOD CA 90028
SITUS ADDRESS: VL at 6423 IVERENE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5576013082 / INVOICE NO: BN14009922

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 November 25, 2013.

Appellant stated that they were not sure whether to cut trees that appeared dead, and were seeking permission to cut the trees by placing numerous phone calls to the Inspector. Appellants then believed that in the interim a contractor re-cleared the property and cut the trees.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on November 12, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on December 3, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4

NAME: LANG,NATHAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 213 SMOKE TREE AVE
OAK PARK CA 91377

SITUS ADDRESS: 3205 TARECO DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5579035014 / INVOICE NO: BN14009948

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. In a letter, unsigned but dated February 12, 2014, Appellant stated that he had purchased the property and it recorded on June 17, 2013, but he did not move in until September 2013, when repairs were completed on this Bank-owned property. Appellant added that the title company placed the wrong address on record, "213" Smoke Tree Avenue instead of "216" Smoke Tree Avenue (as shown on his provided driver's license).

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 11, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on August 19, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant apparently did not have notice to be able to remedy the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. However, the Appellant has provided information to show that there was an error in the listed mailing address entered into the County Assessor's records.

The Department's records do indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. However, there does appear to be an issue as to whether the Appellant was properly served and had sufficient notice. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4
NAME: LONGORIA, VINCENT AND JULIA
MAILING ADDRESS: 4026 RANDOLPH ST
BELL CA 90201
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5679019032 / INVOICE NO: BN14010052

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2013 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014 Council District: 4
NAME: J CARBAJAL DEVT GROUP INC
MAILING ADDRESS: 3520 AMETHYST ST
LOS ANGELES CA 90032
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5679019033 / INVOICE NO: BN14010060

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance 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 2013.

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 8, 2013
- Second Inspection performed on September 5, 2013
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon second inspection; therefore, a \$352.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant's current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was properly posted with signs. The Department has been able to present documentation sufficient to show that the brush clearance and abatement work had not been fully completed by the property owner according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time of the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee was incurred and attached. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU



2013 NONCOMPLIANCE FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

**REPORT, PROPOSED DECISIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

Page number	INVOICE NUMBER	Owner Name
2	LN 140000003	Jack Lee
4	IN 140000017	Jack Lee
6	LN130000019	Malcolm N. Bennett
8	LN140000002	Robert Blackwell
10	LN140000009	Benjy Manouchehr
12	LN140000022	Peyman Kohanzadeh

2014 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014

NAME: Jack Lee

MAILING ADDRESS: 5014 Jarvis Ave.
La Canada – Flintridge, CA 91011

SITE ADDRESS: 1200 N. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

INVOICE NUMBER: LN 140000003

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that his father (Jack Lee) was diagnosed with stomach cancer on June 17, 2013, and the family began rallying to get Mr. Lee well until his passing on November 22, 2013.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they do accept full responsibility for public safety as property owners, and because they do not have a history of non-compliance. The son of the property owner, Scott Lee, is respectfully requesting the City to waive the penalty fees due to the unforeseen family crisis.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on June 30, 2013, with the fire life safety violation number 46656 written and due on July 10, 2013.
- Second Inspection conducted on September 16, 2013, at no charge
- Third Inspection conducted on September 30, 2013.
- Request for Legal Action forwarded on October 1, 2013.
- Compliant on October 4, 2013, (CSSS) and October 10, 2013, (Auto Sprinkler System).
- Invoice dated April 2, 2014, with a due date of April 9, 2014, for the amount of \$352.00.
- Final Notification dated April 17, 2014, for the amount of \$402.00. Check #364 received in the amount of \$50.00 for appeal fee.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Waive the noncompliance fees, even though the property was not in compliance on the re-inspection date and at that time the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

The Fire Department record reflects that the owners were afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The evidence from the Appellant and the Fire department has been fully reviewed and considered in the decision.

Appellant indicated on the Fee Appeal form that both the first, as well as the second notices of non-compliance were received, and that correction was finally made on October 4, 2013.

Appellant is making an appeal on behalf of his father, who was the property owner, indicating that he, his mother, and his siblings only got involved in their father's affairs after he took ill.

The fact of the matter is the corrections of the hazardous conditions are imposed to meet *minimum* fire and life safety requirements. However, this Hearing Examiner believes Mr. Stan Lee has presented credible written testimony that his mother and siblings were active in their father's business affairs, and sympathetic to the illness and family circumstances that led up to their father's passage, where attention to the warehouse compliance issues may have been understandably overlooked.

Therefore, the recommendation is that the total assessment due is waived.

2014 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014

NAME: Jack Lee

MAILING ADDRESS: 5014 Jarvis Ave.
La Canada – Flintridge, CA 91011

SITE ADDRESS: 1200 N. Main St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 140000017

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that his father (Jack Lee) was diagnosed with stomach cancer on June 17, 2013, and the family began rallying to get Mr. Lee well until his passing on November 22, 2013.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they do accept full responsibility for public safety as property owners, and because they do not have a history of non-compliance. The son of the property owner, Scott Lee, is respectfully requesting the City to waive the penalty fees due to the unforeseen family crisis.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on June 10, 2013, with the fire life safety violation number 46656 written and due on July 10, 2013.
- Second Inspection conducted on September 16, 2013, at no charge
- Third Inspection conducted on September 30, 2013.
- Request for Legal Action forwarded on October 1, 2013.
- Compliant on October 4, 2013, (CSSS) and October 10, 2013, (Auto Sprinkler System).
- Invoice dated March 10, 2014, with a due date of April 9, 2014, for the amount of \$1,408.00.
- Final Notification dated April 17, 2014, for the amount of \$1,458.00. Check #364 received in the amount of \$50.00 for appeal fee. Balance due is \$1,408.00.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Impose and require the property owner to pay the noncompliance fees. The property was not in compliance on the re-inspection date and at that time the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

Appellant is making an appeal on behalf of his father, who was the property owner, indicating that he and his siblings only got involved in their father's affairs after he took ill. Appellant

The Fire Department record reflects that the owners were afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The evidence from the Appellant and the Fire department has been fully reviewed and considered in the decision.

Indicated on the Fee Appeal form that both the first, as well as the second notices of non-compliance were received, and that correction was finally made on October 4, 2013.

While being sympathetic to the illness and family circumstances that led up to their father's passage, the fact of the matter is the correction of the hazardous conditions are imposed to meet *minimum* fire and life safety requirements.

Therefore, the recommendation is that the total assessment due is upheld, and the assessment of \$1,408.00 is due.

2014 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014

NAME: Malcolm N. Bennett

MAILING ADDRESS: 11215 S. Western Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90047

SITE ADDRESS: 1663 W. 11th Pl.
Los Angeles, CA 90015

INVOICE NUMBER: LN130000019

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that they took over the building as Receivers on August 12, 2011, and that the Fire Inspection was done on May 23, 2011.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they were not in control of the property at the time of inspection (see Status Log List on last page of packet regarding history of notice and Inspector findings).

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on May 23, 2011.
- Second Inspection conducted on December 12, 2011, Inspector Gutierrez provided Mr. Bennett with the Notice of Violation.
- Third Inspection conducted on January 13, 2012, Inspector Gutierrez determined that no initial testing had been done on the following systems to date (sprinklers, fire doors, and wet standpipes).
- Compliant on February 26, 2013.
- Invoice dated May 6, 2013, with a due date of May 3, 2013, for the amount of \$312.00.
- Final Notification dated May 6, 2013, for the amount of \$312.000.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Waive noncompliance fees, even though the property was not in compliance on the re-inspection date and at that time the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

The Fire Department record reflects that the owners were afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The evidence from the Appellant and the Fire department has been fully reviewed and considered in the decision.

Appellant indicated in turn that he was court-appointed as the receiver on August 12, 2011, to collect income, and the order had additionally allowed for the employment of a management company to care for the property.

The corrections of the hazardous conditions imposed on the property were the responsibility of the previous owner, which included no fire extinguishers on any floors; stairway identification; locked rear exits, etc. Remedial measures were required to bring the building to compliance.

A "Mr. Josie Haros" submitted this appeal, included the documentation regarding the Court-appointment of Mr. Bennett as receiver. Mr. Haros further indicated that he no longer managed the building, and that the hazardous conditions had not been redressed.

Be that as it may, Mr. Bennett is correct in as far as the violations occurred prior to his Court appointment, and therefore he would not be responsible for the fees. It is the recommendation of this Hearing Officer that the assessment be waived, and that \$0.00 is due.

2014 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014

NAME: Robert Blackwell

MAILING ADDRESS: 1538 Stoner Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

SITE ADDRESS: 3305 West Adams Bl.
Los Angeles, CA 90018 .

INVOICE NUMBER: LN140000002

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that the violation was corrected on July 30, 2012. Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they corrected the conditions.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on November 8, 2011, issued notice of REG 4 with a due date of December 8, 2011.
- Second Inspection conducted on March 2, 2012, found in non-compliance for testing the Class 2 Wet Standpipe System.
- Third Inspection conducted on March 11, 2012, (see NARRATIVE by Captain Hart).
- Forwarded request for Legal Action on January 24, 2013.
- Legal case prepared and forwarded on February 12, 2013, (see CASE SUMMARY dated March 30, 2013).
- Compliant on July 30, 2012.
- Invoice dated April 1, 2014, with a due date of April 9, 2014, for the amount of \$1,640.00.
- Final Notification dated April 17, 2014, for the amount of \$1,640.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Impose and require the property owner to pay the noncompliance fees. The property was not in compliance on the re-inspection date and at that time the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

The Fire Department record reflects that the owners were afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The evidence from the Appellant and the Fire department has been fully reviewed and considered in the decision.

It appears the record is replete with numerous attempts made by the Department's Inspectors to work with the owner of record to initiate and continue dialogue and ensure the property was brought into compliance, with limited co-operation. While the property was finally brought into compliance, re-inspection and re-testing were required given the property owner's apparent obduracy.

Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the total assessment is upheld and the amount due is \$1,690.00.

2014 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014

NAME: Benjy Manouchehr

MAILING ADDRESS: 2016 E. 15th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90021

SITE ADDRESS: 2317 S. Santa Fe Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90021

INVOICE NUMBER: LN140000009

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that the violation was “retested” on November 20, 2013. Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they tried to get in contact with the Fire Department via e-mail and phone (see attached invoice dated March 10, 2014, with handwritten notes).

See also notice # 47004 which indicated Chief Regulation Number 4 Testing requirements, Non-Compliance Inspection Fees, and due date of August 24, 2013. Violation was not corrected until November 20, 2013.

Appellant states, “It is now more amazing to see they [FD] are charging for their own fault!”

Appellant indicated that after receipt of the Noncompliance notices he hired a licensed contractor immediately but there were questions he had “pending.”

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on July 24, 2013, issued notice of violation number 47004 with a due date of August 24, 2013.
- Second Inspection conducted on October 16, 2013 at no-charge.
- Forwarded request for Legal Action on October 16, 2013.
- Legal case prepared and forwarded on November 25, 2013, by Inspector Perez (see notes at bottom of Non Compliance Re Inspection Fee Form).
- Compliant on November 20, 2013.
- Invoice dated March 10, 2014, with a due date of April 9, 2014, for the amount of \$1,408.00.
- Final Notification dated April 17, 2014, for the amount of \$1,408.00.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Impose and require the property owner to pay the noncompliance fees. The property was not in compliance on the re-inspection date and at that time the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

The Fire Department record reflects that the owners were afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The evidence from the Appellant and the Fire department has been fully reviewed and considered in the decision.

Appellant places blame on the Fire department that because phone calls and emails had not been responded to in a sufficiently fast manner to please the Appellant, the time loss incurred was the fault of the Department. On the Noncompliance Fee Appeal Form, the Appellant has indicated that both the first as well as the second notices were received.

Therefore, the recommendation is that the total assessment due is upheld, and the assessment of \$1,408.00 is due.

2014 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: May 20, 2014

NAME: Peyman Kohanzadeh

MAILING ADDRESS: 830 S. Los Angeles St.
Los Angeles, CA 90014

SITE ADDRESS: 757 S. Los Angeles St.
Los Angeles, CA 90014 .

INVOICE NUMBER: LN140000022

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that the violation was corrected on January 24, 2014. Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they state in conversations with Inspector's Mason and Perez, "they had said that as long as we complied and had inspection done by the end of January we would not be fined."

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on March 26, 2013, with Mason issuing notice of violation number 46074 with a due date of April 25, 2013.
- Second Inspection conducted on April 25, 2013, at no charge
- Third Inspection conducted on May 29, 2013, at no charge, some violations corrected.
- Forwarded request for Legal Action on January 7, 2013.
- Compliant on January 24, 2013, (dry and wet standpipe system), and auto sprinklers on July 15, 2013.
- Invoice dated March 10, 2014, with a due date of April 9, 2014, for the amount of \$1,056.00.
- Final Notification dated April 17, 2014, for the amount of \$1,106.00. Check number 2315 in the amount of \$50 dated April 9, 2014, for appeals fee.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Impose and require the property owner to pay the noncompliance fees. The property was not in compliance on the re-inspection date and at that time the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

The Fire Department record reflects that the owners were afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The evidence from the Appellant and the Fire department has been fully reviewed and considered in the decision.

Peyman Kohanzadeh
LN 140000022
Page 2

In the Compliance Notes section the Department's Inspectors indicate compliance in part, and some progress pending for such conditions such as access to the fire escape being blocked; no signs showing the location of fire exits; etc. While it appears that some progress was being attempted, these actions took place after the re-inspection when the fees attached.

Therefore, the recommendation is that the total assessment due is upheld, and the assessment of \$1,056.00 is due.

.