

LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT



RALPH M. TERRAZAS
FIRE CHIEF

July 20, 2015

BOARD OF FIRE COMMISSIONERS
FILE NO. 15-080

TO: Board of Fire Commissioners

FROM: *RMT* Ralph M. Terrazas, Fire Chief

SUBJECT: PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR THE 2014
NONCOMPLIANCE FEE APPEALS

FOR FINAL ACTION:

☐ Approved
☐ Denied

☐ Approved w/Corrections
☐ Received & Filed

☐ Withdrawn
☐ 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 Inspection Fee. Each property/business owner is given an opportunity to challenge the imposed Noncompliance Inspection 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 and 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 Fire Department to forward the unpaid Noncompliance Inspection Fee to the Los Angeles County Tax Collector for placement on the Los Angeles County 2015 Property Tax rolls.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Noncompliance Inspection Fee of \$352.00 is assessed once a property/business owner fails to comply by their scheduled due date or reinspection. For the 2014 Brush Clearance Season, 133 appeal requests were received from property owners electing to appeal their assessment, ten appeals were granted.

For the Fire Prevention Occupancy Noncompliance Fee, seven appeals were received by the Fire Department, one was granted.

The total revenue amount for both Noncompliance Fees is \$54,940.00.

DISCUSSION

This year the Fire Department received 140 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 2014 Noncompliance Inspection Fee Appeals will be completed. Any unpaid invoices can be forwarded to the Los Angeles County Tax Collector for placement on the 2015 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"

**LOS ANGELES FIRE
DEPARTMENT
BRUSH CLEARANCE
UNIT**

ATTACHMENT 1A



**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS
REPORT, PROPOSED DECISIONS
AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

PAGE	APN	OWNER	COUNCIL DISTRICT #
8	2010004025	NADERI,SORAYA	CD 12
9	2017018041	ARAKELYAN,ANNA	CD 12
10	2017020042	ISAAC,MOISE C AND	CD 12
12	2028042029	FARR,EVAN A CO TR FARR AND PHIROOZJAEI TRUST	CD 3
13	2175015038	BOFA HOLDINGS LLC V.HAPNER & T.SLATER	CD 3
14	2184025030	TABIBIAN,SEAN	CD 5
15	2184036011	MARTAYAN,JOHN AND MARINEH TRS J AND M MARTAYAN TRUST	CD 5
16	2275024005	CLARK,DON W AND NAN D TRS DON AND NANCY CLARK TRUST	CD 5
18	2289025016	LEVY AFFILIATED HOLDINGS LLC	CD 5
19	2293004003	YOUSSEFI,DAVID AND TARANEH R	CD 5
20	2384015024	SWIFT,CHRISTOPHER J CO TR SWIFT FAMILY TRUST	CD 2
21	2425009038	MOIZEL,JOSEPH AND SEIJA	CD 4
22	2428023006	NERAMIT LC	CD 4
23	2429016042	SILVA,ALEJANDRO AND	CD 4
25	2538016001	BACH,PETRA I	CD 2
26	2542008004	MARSOT,VANESSA	CD 2
29	2543004014	AVENI,JANE C AVENI FAMILY TRUST	CD 2
30	2544006017	MEKHITARIAN,VOSGAN AND	CD 2
31	2552006004	RATH,FRED	CD 2
32	2552008003	GHARIBIAN,VIGEN AND SHAHBAZIAN,LOLATA	CD 2
33	2553005039	BEFU,DAVID T AND JODI L	CD 2
34	2563041026	LEVISMAN,EDIT B TR ET AL EDIT B LEVISMAN TRUST AND	CD 2
35	2563041027	CA WESTERN FINANCIAL INVES CSTDN FBO ABP GP ET AL	CD 2
36	2563041028	FARKAS,CELIA D TR ET AL CELIA D FARKAS TRUST AND	CD 2

PAGE	APN	OWNER	COUNCIL DISTRICT #
37	2563041030	LEVITT,MILTON CO TR LEVITT FAMILY TRUST AND	CD 2
38	2563041031	HDA MORTGAGE FUND LLC	CD 2
39	2564017011	LEE,LEA K	CD 2
41	2564027009	LUTZ,ARNOLD	CD 2
42	2564031003	BRENNER,ISIS S	CD 2
43	2601020026	MAHONY,MARY L TR MARY L MAHONY TRUST	CD 12
44	2822007002	UGUZ,MURAT AND ALIN	CD 12
45	2822007016	WETZEL,HERBERT AND MARTHA T TRS WETZEL FAMILY TRUST	CD 12
46	2822010014	KIRKORIAN,EDWARD AND CYNTHIA	CD 12
47	2822016008	DARABI,RAHMAT A AND LIDA TRS RAHMAT AND LIDA DARABI TRUST	CD 12
48	2871004020	SAYADIAN,SHANT AND HILDA AND	CD 12
49	2871019009	CANNON,MITCHELL	CD 12
50	4352001006	MAIM COLD LLC	CD 5
51	4355016049	TEHRANI,KIA Z	CD 5
52	4356004014	SCHENKEL,STEVEN AND LESLIE TRS SCHENKEL TRUST	CD 5
53	4370007064	AGHNAMI,HASSAN	CD 5
54	4371010019	SMITH,CALVIN L	CD 5
55	4378022001	NASRI,MOHAMMAD CO TR NASRI TRUST AND	CD 5
56	4379035015	ROLNICK,MARVIN ETAL	CD 5
58	4387003001	STRAY GATOR STUDIOS LLC	CD 5
59	4392016026	BEVERLY HILLS ESTATE LLC	CD 5
61	4404023008	BLEECHER,SUSAN W AND SUSAN TRS M AND S BLEECHER TRUST	NA
62	4416018018	SHORR,ROBERT M	CD 11
64	4426009001	VORSE,SCOT K TR VORSE FAMILY TRUST	CD 11
65	4491007005	TREADWELL,JAMES H AND PATRICIA	CD 11

PAGE	APN	OWNER	COUNCIL DISTRICT #
67	4492003006	FEDERMAN,MYKE AND NOAH C	CD 11
69	4493025020	SWINK,EDWARD L	CD 11
71	5028010024	FLANAGAN,DETROIT M CO TR FLANAGAN FAMILY TRUST	CD 8
73	5028016003	CARDENAS,JAMES	CD 8
75	5029016008	LONG,G CAROLE TR G CAROLE LONG TRUST	CD 8
77	5029023015	TURNER,ROBERT L AND SHARLENE L	CD 8
78	5029040007	OATTS,CHARLES B	CD 8
79	5031011008	HOLT,TERRY AND SANDRA TRS HOLT TRUST	CD 8
81	5206018018	EWELL, EDWARD L AND RUBY S TRS EDWARD AND RUBY EWELL TRUST	CD 1
82	5206018025	RICCI,LEONARD J TR LEONARD J RICCU TRUST	CD 1
83	5206018026	RICCI,LEONARD J TR LEONARD J RICCU TRUST	CD 1
84	5206018030	HUNG,CHI DER	CD 1
85	5206024014	SUAREZ,HENRY J	CD 1
86	5207021004	MENDOZA,JOSE A TR MENDOZA FAMILY TRUST	CD 1
87	5208013007	KWAN DEVELOPMENT CORP	CD 1
88	5208017014	RITTNER,CARLOS AND SOLOMON,REBECCA	CD 1
89	5208017015	RITTNER,CARLOS	CD 1
90	5208017016	RITTNER,CARLOS AND SOLOMON,REBECCA	CD 1
91	5208017017	RITTNER,CARLOS AND SOLOMON,REBECCA	CD 1
92	5208019032	CHU NGUYEN	CD 1
93	5208027022	TABRIZI,AMIR AND	CD 1
95	5216015031	SANCHEZ,LUIS AND BONILLA,KUWANDA	CD 14
96	5217015025	DEL TORO,JESSE TR DEL TORO TRUST	NA
98	5221025021	EVANGELISTA,NELSON JR	NA

PAGE	APN	OWNER	COUNCIL DISTRICT #
100	5221026003	WEN,JUNG F AND HSU,CHING M	NA
102	5221028010	CEBALLOS,DANIEL	NA
104	5223019018	CHURBINA INVESTMENTS LLC.	NA
105	5309004031	BRESNAHAN,CHRISTOPHER AND HILLARY	CD 14
107	5309004032	COVARRUBIAS,RAYMOND	CD 14
108	5309012041	ROMERO,DAWN L	CD 14
109	5309013034	GUZMAN,SONIA A	NA
110	5312029037	JAIN,AMRESH	CD 14
112	5438004010	ROMERO,ALEJANDRO AND ELODIA B	CD 13
114	5443024003	PERRY,LEROY III	CD 13
116	5443032014	DE LEON,REBECCA S TR REBECCA DE LEON TRUST	CD 13
118	5443032015	FILIPPI,SOBEIDA	CD 13
120	5451022010	NEWPORT PROPERTY HOLDING LLC	CD 1
122	5455006003	FINLEY,ANTHONY	CD 1
124	5455007019	LOWELL P THEARD M D INC	CD 1
126	5459021013	MISIRIAN,HAGOP AND PANOSIAN,CAMELIA	CD 14
127	5460011010	ASHRAFNIA,WALID S	CD 14
128	5460020024	GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	CD 14
129	5460020025	GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	CD 14
130	5460020026	GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORP	CD 14
131	5460020027	GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORP	CD 14
132	5460020028	GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORP.	CD 14

PAGE	APN	OWNER	COUNCIL DISTRICT #
133	5460020029	GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	CD 14
134	5460025023	SIMON,PHILLIP E CO TR SIMON FAMILY TRUST	CD 14
135	5460025024	SIMON,PHILLIP E CO TR SIMON FAMILY TRUST	CD 14
136	5460025025	SIMON,PHILLIP E CO TR SIMON FAMILY TRUST	CD 14
137	5460025026	SIMON,PHILLIP E CO TR SIMON FAMILY TRUST	CD 14
138	5460025027	SIMON,PHILLIP E CO TR SIMON FAMILY TRUST	CD 14
139	5462009010	ANTHONY CAULDER LLC	CD 14
140	5462010027	TAMAY,MARIA E	CD 14
141	5462011012	ANTHONY CAULDER LLC	CD 14
142	5466009001	NOOR,ABDUL S AND NAFISA	CD 14
143	5471004012	LENTZ,STEVEN R	CD 14
144	5471014010	ATWATER PARTNERS LLC	CD 14
145	5474038035	GPG TOLAND LLC	CD 14
146	5475003019	RIOS,MAURICIO R AND HEATHER E	CD 14
147	5479001015	URBANITE HOMES LLC	CD 14
148	5479003004	CLONTS,MATTHEW AND COLBY,KELLIE	CD 14
149	5479004007	ROS,JOE J AND RHIA	CD 14
150	5479004008	ROS,JOE	CD 14
151	5479017013	CID,JAVIER AND MARIA	CD 14
152	5480032025	PETERS,LARRY AND JOYCE C	CD 14
153	5480032026	PETERS,LARRY AND JOYCE C	CD 14
154	5563003012	DESANTO,DOMINIQUE	CD 5
155	5563003013	DESANTO,DOMINIQUE	CD 5
156	5564015043	LEVY,ARNAUD AND TANIA TRS LANDAU LEVY FAMILY TRUST	CD 5

PAGE	APN	OWNER	COUNCIL DISTRICT #
157	5565033035	NAZAR,JOSE L	CD 5
158	5569018069	YANG,TAI J AND EUN S TRS YANG FAMILY TRUST	CD 4
159	5575004009	WEYER,FRANK M	CD 4
160	5576004036	KAHANA,TAL TR TAL KAHANA TRUST AND	CD 4
162	5576013067	JZ INVESTMENTS LLC AND	CD 4
163	5579011015	HILLA GROUP LLC	CD 4
164	5582004005	WEY,KIM LONG AND OEI,TJOEI LIE	CD 4
165	5582014008	GOLD,DAVID AND SHERRY TRS GOLD TRUST	CD 4
166	5585029011	SZABO,TAMAS	CD 4
167	5586002019	FIRST AMERICAN TRUST CO TR	CD 4
169	5683025017	ROBLES,GHIL AND LEONCIA TRS GHIL AND LENNY ROBLES TRUST	CD 14
170	5683035001	10TH AVENUE LLC	CD 14
171	5690021015	MEERDINK,DOUGLAS	NA
172	5690022009	GREENE,SUSAN M	CD 14

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: NADERI, SORAYA

MAILING ADDRESS: 8986 MEGAN AVE
WEST HILLS, CA 91304 1331

SITUS ADDRESS: MEGAN AVE 8986

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2010004025 / INVOICE NO: BN15000029

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated receiving both the First and Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant indicated that financial troubles in 2014 prevented them from hiring anyone to remove the brush and trees, and undertaking the work themselves by October 3, 2014.

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, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 1, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 16, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspector 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12
NAME: ARAKELYAN, ANNA
MAILING ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 19578
LOS ANGELES, CA 90019
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO LIMEROCK TR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2017018041 / INVOICE NO: BN15000144

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance. Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property herself, completing the work by July 28, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. She added that she had purchased the property in 2009, and had undertaken the clearance with friends and family. She stated that this was no easy task, as access had to be granted through a neighbor's property. She indicated that a "Cleared by Owner" letter had been received, yet two weeks later she was again found to be in non-compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 14, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspector 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 would normally be that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed. However, the Department did send the Appellant a "Cleared by Owner" Letter, which was mailed June 2, 2014, and rescinded on July 14, 2014. This could well have sent "mixed messages" to the Appellant that her property was in compliance.

It is the recommendation of this Hearing Officer that the total assessment due be dismissed, and the amount owed is \$0.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: ISAAC, MOISE C AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 8470 HILLCROFT DR
WEST HILLS, CA 91304

SITUS ADDRESS: 8470 HILLCROFT DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2017020042 / INVOICE NO: BN15000185

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Moise Isaac, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant submitted a letter dated March 3, 2015, stating that he was surprised to have received a cost of clearance invoice. Appellant also stated that he should have been notified in advance prior to the clearance.

As proof of compliance, Appellant submitted a cleared check from his banking institution as proof the property was cleaned by his gardener.

Appellant stated that he did his best to comply before the Second inspection. Appellant further stated that he is receiving social security benefits and this financial burden is unbearable.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee.

There is no issue as to whether the Appellant received notice of Non-compliance. The Appellant is only contesting that his property should have been in compliance as he hired his gardener to complete the work and submitted evidence to prove he paid the gardener.

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.

In regards to the Appellant's request to reduce/waive the fee based on the fee being a financial burden, at this time such request cannot be granted as the Appellant did not provide any evidence to support such claim.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 3

NAME: FARR, EVAN A CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 4817 HILLARD AVE
LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE, CA 91011 1504

SITUS ADDRESS: 7156 POMELO DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2028042029 / INVOICE NO: BN15000375

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received both the First and the Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring a company to clean the area, and paying them \$1,000. No evidence was provided.

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 30, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 19, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 3

NAME: BOFA HOLDINGS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 9453 DE SOTO AVE
CHATSWORTH, CA 91311 4920

SITUS ADDRESS: 4924 QUEEN VICTORIA RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2175015038 / INVOICE NO: BN15000854

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received neither the First nor the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

In a threatening letter sent from a law firm dated February 5, 2015, the writer objecting to what were deemed to be unreasonably expensive brush clearance charges billed to his client, without what he deemed to be prior "warning or notice."

The letter also indicated that the Appellant would seek to depose the contractor, and whoever ordered the clean-up stemming from the charges, and alleged potential malfeasance and wrongdoing on the part of the City. Appellant indicated on the form that the hazards on the property were not cleared.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 29, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on November 13, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. In addition, the County Assessor Information was accessed, which revealed that BOFA Holdings, LLC, was the owner of record from 2012.

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

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: TABIBIAN, SEAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 3341 CAHUENGA BLVD W
LOS ANGELES, CA 90068 1327

SITUS ADDRESS: 4576 MARTSON DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2184025030 / INVOICE NO: BN15001019

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance. He indicated that the First Notice arrived late, having been mailed to the wrong address.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property the day after meeting with the Inspector. Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 28, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 16, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

Of note is the fact that when the Fire Department's Inspector visited the property, he was not satisfied that the contractor had not fulfilled all of the clean-up required, and had sent the Contractor back to complete the work to the Inspector's satisfaction at the Contractor's expense. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: MARTAYAN,JOHN AND MARINEH TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 4407 MEDLEY PL
ENCINO, CA 91316

SITUS ADDRESS: 4407 MEDLEY PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2184036011 / INVOICE NO: BN15001035

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by 2014. In a letter signed but undated Appellant stated that he had been in contact with the Fire Department Inspector, and was under the impression that sufficient time would be granted to him to allow him to complete the brush clearance work. He completed clearance, and provided photographs.

A few days later he stated the City contractor arrived at his front door seeking entry permission from his elderly mother, who was extremely frightened and agitated. As a City Commissioner and Special Reserve Officer with the LAPD he felt the treatment meted out by the Fire Department was egregious. 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 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 30, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 16, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: CLARK,DON W AND NAN D TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 14771 MULHOLLAND DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90077

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/O 14771 MULHOLLAND

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2275024005 / INVOICE NO: BN15001340

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Nancy Clark, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that she did not receive the 1st or Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant also stated that she has a lot of help to keep the brush down and indicated again, in her written statement, that she did not personally receive notice.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 9, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 9, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee.

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.

Although there are Department comments which indicated notices sent to the Appellant were return by the United States Post Office, the Hearing Officer cannot find such to be a dismissal of fees based on the following:

According to the Appellant's Los Angeles County Assessor Parcel Information/Detail, the Appellant has owned the property since September 13, 1990. The Brush Clearance Self Inspection Program began in 2010. Since then, property owners in "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" have been educated to the fact that although the initial brush clearance inspection begins May 1st of every year, brush clearance is a year round responsibility.

Therefore, absent notice sent via mail, as a long time property owner in the area, the Appellant should have known about the annual brush clearance inspections. It must also be noted that notice of Non-compliance was properly posted on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: LEVY AFFILIATED HOLDINGS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 201 WILSHIRE BLVD Second FL
SANTA MONICA CA 90401

SITUS ADDRESS: 4540 ESTRONDO DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2289025016 / INVOICE NO: BN15001506

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring Mr. Ruben Fuentes, who cleared the property in June and September 2014, completing all the work by October 9, 2014. Appellant provided an Invoice dated June 23, 2014, for \$1,500.00; and an Invoice dated September 3, 2014, in the amount of \$1,800.00 from Mr. Ruben Fuentes. Appellant did not provide any checks as evidence of payment.

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

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: YOUSSEFI, DAVID AND TARANEH R

MAILING ADDRESS: 16467 WESTFALL PL
ENCINO CA 91436

SITUS ADDRESS: 16467 WESTFALL PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2293004003 / INVOICE NO: BN15001555

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant written indicated he never received the First Notice, but did receive the Second Notice of Non-Compliance. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring a team, who completed the brush clearance work on or by August 22, 2014.

In a letter, unsigned but dated February 27, 2015, Appellant stated that he had been in direct communication with the Fire Department Inspector who assured him that no further action would be taken. Appellant provided a transcript of the phone message from the Fire Department Inspector dated August 18, 2014. 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 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 19, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office. According to the transcribed phone message the Inspector indication was given that a Second notice was being prepared to be issued the following day, and that the Appellant needed to reach the Inspector the very next day. Appellant stated that he called back the next day, but provided no evidence of the call having been fulfilled. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: SWIFT, CHRISTOPHER J CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 3687 ALTA MESA DR
STUDIO CITY, CA 91604

SITUS ADDRESS: 3687 ALTA MESA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2384015024 / INVOICE NO: BN15001803

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received neither the First nor the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone to do the work at a cost of \$800.00.

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

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 29, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 17, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 5, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: MOIZEL, JOSEPH AND SEIJA

MAILING ADDRESS: 3770 MULTIVIEW DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90068

SITUS ADDRESS: 3770 MULTIVIEW DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2425009038 / INVOICE NO: BN15002090

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring his gardener to do the brush clearance, completing the work by October 5, 2014. Appellant provided Invoice # 264577 in the amount of \$702.00 dated April 24, 2014; and Invoice # 316926 in the amount of \$700 dated October 13, 2014.

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, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 27, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: NERAMIT LC

MAILING ADDRESS: 2360 CORPORATE CIR NO 400
HENDERSON NV 89074

SITUS ADDRESS: VL ACROSS OF 6900 PACIFIC VIEW

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2428023006 / INVOICE NO: BN15002124

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written notice stating he had cleaned property in April 2014, and through the pictures he produced were dated March 2014, for Clearance of a small portion of the property.

The Fire Inspector made an appearance in May 2014 and found the lot to be in Non-compliance. On the Second re-inspection on September 2014, the Inspector found the property still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 30, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property has been confirmed in the amount as set forth in the notice, the Fire department record shows that the Fire Inspector made all appearance to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required.

The Fire Inspector also provided photographs showing the hazardous condition at the time of the clearance.

Total assessment due is \$352.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4
NAME: SILVA,ALEJANDRO AND
MAILING ADDRESS: 7035 WOODROW WILSON DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90068
SITUS ADDRESS: 7035 WOODROW WILSON DR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2429016042 / INVOICE NO: BN15002157

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant, Alejandro Silva, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that at the time of Non-compliance he was and still is the owner of the property. Appellant also indicated that he did not receive any notices from the Department indicting his property was in Non-compliance of brush clearance. Appellant further stated on the appeal form that he cleared the property on August 18, 2014.

Appellant also submitted an attached statement dated March 3, 2015, to the appeal form restating that he never received any brush clearance Non-compliance inspection notices.

Appellant also stated that he has had problems with missing mail. Appellant further stated that he is a new homeowner to the area and was unaware of the brush clearance policies.

Appellant closed his statement by stating he never intended to be in Non-compliance. The Non-compliance was simply a result of his being a new homeowner in the area and not being notified that his property was not in compliance when the brush clearance inspections was conducted.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 4, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 30, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee.

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant' current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was the 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 did not provide sufficient proof to prove that his property was not properly posted or the non-issuance of notice via the United States Post Office indicating the annual brush clearance inspection found the property to be in Non-compliance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2
NAME: BACH,PETRA I
MAILING ADDRESS: 10966 WICKS ST
SUN VALLEY CA 91352
SITUS ADDRESS: 10966 WICKS ST
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2538016001 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received the Second but not the First Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by working to clear the property with her daughter by August 10, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant stated that she had spoken with the Department's Inspector, who showed her the property on Google Maps, and indicating an area near the pool that needed to be trimmed. The Appellant stated she had no pool and that the property referred to must be the neighbor's yard.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 17, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 14, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 2, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: MARSOT,VANESSA

MAILING ADDRESS: 10030 MCBROOM ST
SUNLAND, CA 91040

SITUS ADDRESS: 10416 CLYBOURN AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2542008004 / INVOICE NO: BN15002280

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant, Vanessa Marsot, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that in 2014, she was and still is the owner of the property and that she received the Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant also indicated that she did not receive a Second Notice of Non-Compliance and that there were no hazards on the property. She further indicated that the inspector's findings were not a part of her "actual property". Additional information Appellant wanted the Hearing Officer to consider were the following:

1. The property was being occupied by a non-paying tenant. Therefore, she began the eviction process in September (no date or year included). Once the eviction process began, the Appellant stated she was informed she was not legally allowed on the premises per eviction rules.
2. During the eviction process, the Appellant was not receiving rent, thus presenting a financial hardship for the Appellant.

Appellant included the following documents to support her argument:

1. Complaint – Unlawful Detainer (Filed October 15, 2014)
2. Unlawful Detainer Stipulation and Judgement (Filed January 16, 2015)

Appellant included the following documents to two separate emails to support her request for fee waiver:

1. 2014 Income Tax Return
2. Property Repair Invoice dated March 2015
3. Disability Statements dated December 9, 2014 and January 15, 2015 with the claim effective date of August 23, 2014.
4. Separation Agreement and General Release

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 15, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Appellant's statements and documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee:

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant' current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was the 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.

SECOND NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANCE: The Appellant stated that she received the first notice of non-compliance but did not receive the Second notice of non-compliance. Based on the fact that the Appellant had notice, whether first or Second notice, and had not remedied the hazardous condition on her property at the time of the Second inspection of the property is no justification for non-compliance.

NO HAZARDS ON THE PROPERTY: The Appellant did not submit any documents or photographs to substantiate this issue.

INSPECTOR'S FINDINGS NOT A PART OF HER "ACTUAL PROPERTY": The Appellant did not submit any documents or photographs to substantiate this issue.

EVICTON PROCESS: According to the Complaint – Unlawful Detainer, filed on October 15, 2014, section 8a (3) indicated that the Appellant's tenant was served on September 11, 2014, after the issuance of the first and Second inspection of her property. Therefore, her statement regarding she was informed she was not legally allowed on the premises per eviction rules cannot be considered as the legal process with her tenant began after both inspection dates.

FINANCIAL HARDSHIP:

The Appellant's statement regarding hard-ship unfortunately cannot be considered due to the fact that she is the property owner and obligated to any and all financial expenses attached to the property during such ownership.

The Appellant had notice and did not remedy the hazardous condition before the Second inspection, at which time the hazardous conditions were found on the property and thus the issuance of the Non-Compliance fee.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: AVENI, JANE C

MAILING ADDRESS: 10231 LA CANADA WAY
SUNLAND, CA 91040

SITUS ADDRESS: 10231 LA CANADA WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2543004014 / INVOICE NO: BN15002371

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received both the First and Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring people who completed the clearance work by January 15, 2015.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 3, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 3, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: MEKHITARIAN, VOSGAN AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 9600 WHEATLAND AVE
SUNLAND, CA 91040

SITUS ADDRESS: 9600 WHEATLAND AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2544006017 / INVOICE NO: BN15002397

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone and doing clearance work himself, completing the work by December 23, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. He also added in his letter, signed and dated January 17, 2015, that he was deeply saddened that the Fire Department Inspector had authorized the cutting down of what he considered to be a still-living tree. Appellant provided photographs, and further claimed that his fruit trees had been destroyed by the City's contractor.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 5, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 29, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on December 10, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: RATH,FRED

MAILING ADDRESS: 6130 W FLAMINGO RD NO 401
LAS VEGAS NV 89103

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/O AIRLIE DR & TUJUNGA CYN

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2552006004 / INVOICE NO: BN15002512

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received both the First and Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring a tree service that completed the clearance work prior to the Second Inspection on June 29, 2014.

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, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on June 29, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 26, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

June 30, 2015

Council District: 2

HEARING DATE:

NAME: GHARIBIAN,VIGEN AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 11417 MOUNT GLEASON AVE
TUJUNGA CA 91042 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 11417 MOUNT GLEASON AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2552008003 / INVOICE NO: BN15002538

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the Second but not the First Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring an outside contractor, who completed the brush clearance work by July 19, 2014.

Appellant stated that he is a tax preparer that requires him to be organized, and that he believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 12, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 9, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: BEFU, DAVID T AND JODI L

MAILING ADDRESS: 10845 BURLAND AVE
TUJUNGA, CA 91042

SITUS ADDRESS: 10845 BURLAND AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2553005039 / INVOICE NO: BN15002777

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring two companies in 2014. Appellant stated that he paid a deposit of \$400.00 to the first company, who failed to return, necessitating a complaint to the Better Business Bureau. A Second company was then hired at a cost of \$1,100.00.

Appellant stated that he informed the Department's Inspector of the circumstances who in turn failed to return the call. Appellant wrote that this non-return of the call led him to believe that everything was copacetic.

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

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 17, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on December 17, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: LEVISMAN, EDIT B TR ET AL

MAILING ADDRESS: 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E OF 9741 COMMERCE AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2563041026 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated brush clearance work was completed on the property on or by August 14, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 15, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: CA WESTERN FINANCIAL INVESTOR

MAILING ADDRESS: 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2400
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/O 9741 COMMERCE AVENUE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2563041027 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated brush clearance work was completed on the property on or by August 14, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 15, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: FARKAS, CELIA D TR ET AL

MAILING ADDRESS: 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2400
LOS ANGELES CA 90067

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L (4TH) SOUTH OF 9817 COMMERCE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2563041028 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated brush clearance work was completed on the property on or by August 14, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 15, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: LEVITT, MILTON CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2400
LOS ANGELES CA 90067 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L (Second) SOUTH OF 9817 COMMERCE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2563041030 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated brush clearance work was completed on the property on or by August 14, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 15, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: HDA MORTGAGE FUND LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 1900 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2400
LOS ANGELES CA 90067 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L SOUTH OF 9817 COMMERCE AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2563041031 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated brush clearance work was completed on the property on or by August 14, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on July 23, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: LEE, LEA K

MAILING ADDRESS: 7000 SAINT ESTABAN ST
TUJUNGA CA 91042

SITUS ADDRESS: 7000 SAINT ESTABAN ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2564017011 / INVOICE NO: BN15003122

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Lea Lee, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that she received the 1st Notice of Non-compliance but did not receive the Second Notice of Non-compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 1, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee.

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 the 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 did not provide sufficient proof to prove that her property was not properly posted or the non-issuance of notice via the United States Post Office indicating the annual brush clearance inspection found the property to be in Non-compliance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2
NAME: LUTZ,ARNOLD
MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 6006
TORRANCE CA 90504
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L WEST OF 7124 HIGHCLIFF TR
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2564027009 / INVOICE NO: BN15003189

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Arnold Lutz, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st or Second Notice of Non-compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 18, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee.

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 did not provide sufficient proof to prove that his property was not properly posted or the non-issuance of notice via the United States Post Office indicating the annual brush clearance inspection found the property to be in Non-compliance. Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 2

NAME: BRENNER,ISIS S

MAILING ADDRESS: 9530 AMORET DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 91042

SITUS ADDRESS: 9530 AMORET DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2564031003 / INVOICE NO: BN15003221

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone to do the work which was completed sometime in August 2014.

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

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 1, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 15, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: MAHONY, MARY L TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 16244 HORACE ST
GRANADA HILLS, CA 91344

SITUS ADDRESS: 17401 TUSCAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2601020026 / INVOICE NO: BN15003395

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by having someone undertake the clearance work by July 1, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work she had performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant faxed a letter from Mr. Salvador Ramos who indicated that he had performed the yard work, trimming the bushes, trees, and grass areas.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 17, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: UGUZ,MURAT AND ALIN

MAILING ADDRESS: 11589 SEMINOLE CIRCLE
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326 1419

SITUS ADDRESS: 11725 DORAL AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2822007002 / INVOICE NO: BN15003718

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received both the First and Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, but had not undertaken any brush clearance work on the property because their home has no brush, only seven small trimmed palm trees.

Appellant believed that the assessed fee should be waived as the conditions posed "no hazards whatsoever."

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 14, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12
NAME: WETZEL, HERBERT AND MARTHA T TRS
MAILING ADDRESS: 11767 DORAL AVE
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326
SITUS ADDRESS: 11767 DORAL AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2822007016 / INVOICE NO: BN15003726

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements having owned the property since 1976, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone who had completed the work by December 2, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant added that he had not seen the check-marked area indicating that the palm fronds needed to be removed.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 14, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: KIRKORIAN, EDWARD AND CYNTHIA

MAILING ADDRESS: 19377 WINGED FOOT CIR
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 19377 WINGED FOOT CIR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2822010014 / INVOICE NO: BN15003742

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received both the First and Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by having her gardener complete the work sometime in April 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, but indicated that the trees she was cited for actually are on her neighbor's property, and for these reasons asked that the assessed fee be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 26, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 14, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: DARABI, RAHMAT A AND LIDA TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 19550 SINGING HILLS DR
NORTHRIDGE CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 19550 SINGING HILLS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2822016008 / INVOICE NO:
SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellants by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellants indicated they received the Second but not the First Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellants wrote that they were living in their old home while their new home was being remodeled, and that the previous owner was stopping by every three to four days to pick up mail. The First notice they contend could have been in the old owner's name. When the Second Notice reached them they realized they needed more time to find someone that could remove the trees, necessitating their need for a time extension.

Appellants stated that they finally hired a crew to remove the trees, which took place on December 15, 2014, and for these reasons asked that the assessed fee be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 9, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 17, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: SAYADIAN, SHANT AND HILDA AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 11420 YOLANDA AVE
PORTER RANCH CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 11420 YOLANDA AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871004020 / INVOICE NO: BN15003817

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the Second but not the First Notice of Non-Compliance. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone who completed the work on or by October 28, 2014.

Appellant believed that their mail was sent to the wrong address, and that they complied when they received the Second Notice. For this reason, Appellant requested that the assessed fee be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 23, 2014
- 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 had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. However, the First Inspection notice was 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 waived, as it can be presumed that the Appellant did not have the First Notice to know what needed to be done to bring the property into compliance before the Second Inspection occurred.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 12

NAME: CANNON, MITCHELL

MAILING ADDRESS: 11348 SINCLAIR AVE
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326

SITUS ADDRESS: 11348 SINCLAIR AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 2871019009 / INVOICE NO: BN15003825

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received both the First as well as the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone and doing the work themselves on or by October 14, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and had discussed same with the Department's Inspector indicating on Thursday that the workers would be back on Saturday. Appellant stated he called the Inspector, and had spent over \$2,000.00 on the clean-up work. For these reasons, Appellant asked that the assessed fee should be waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 1, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 23, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: MAIM COLD LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 25928
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

SITUS ADDRESS: 1843 COLDWATER CANYON DR

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 4352001006 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by 2014.

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 October 14, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 10, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on November 29, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: TEHRANI, KIA Z

MAILING ADDRESS: 606 S OLIVE ST STE 2110
LOS ANGELES CA 90014

SITUS ADDRESS: 1538 N BEVERLY DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4355016049 / INVOICE NO: BN15003908

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant indicated that no Notices of Non-Compliance was received and a copy of a change of address form from the Assessor's office with a date of November 26, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 21, 2014
- 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

Based upon a review of all records and documentation, it is confirmed that the notices of Non-Compliance were indeed returned undeliverable.

Therefore it is recommended that the Non-Compliance fee be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5
NAME: SCHENKEL, STEVEN AND LESLIE TRS
MAILING ADDRESS: 9925 ANTHONY PL
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90210
SITUS ADDRESS: 9925 ANTHONY PL
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4356004014 / INVOICE NO: BN15003924

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated she received the First Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that she was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone to complete the work on or by October 1, 2014.

Appellant provided an Invoice # 002611 dated October 1, 2014, and cancelled check # 2105 in the amount of \$4,000.00 to the tree care company. 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, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 30, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 7, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5
NAME: AGHNAMI, HASSAN
MAILING ADDRESS: 2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS STE 2550
LOS ANGELES CA 90067
SITUS ADDRESS: 1232 STRADELLA RD.
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4370007064 / INVOICE NO: BN15004138

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant circled on the form that he received a Notice of Non-Compliance, which he indicated was the Second, not the First non-compliance correspondence notification. Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone who completed the work on or by December 3, 2014.

Appellant believed that the assessed fee should be waived. He indicated that he considered the Second Notice as actually constituting the First Notice, whereupon he hired a landscaping company. This company performed work on November 22, 2014, upon which he contacted the Inspector who informed him the work was "OK." On December 24, 2014, he noticed individuals who were part of the City's contractor's crew who he said took five days with six personnel to complete a small area indicated by the Inspector's notes.

Appellant stated that according to his landscaper, "excessive" work was completed by the City's contractor beyond what had been originally required.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 23, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 17, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Appellant had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fees were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. However, indication was made in the Department's Office Comments that mail was 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 waived.

The total assessment due is \$0.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: SMITH,CALVIN L

MAILING ADDRESS: 3572 CANYON RIDGE DR
ALTADENA, CA 91001

SITUS ADDRESS: 10455 SANDAL LANE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4371010019 / INVOICE NO: BN15004187

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Calvin Smith, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property as indicated under the Situs Address noted above. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Non-compliance. He further stated that the brush clearance work was completed on October 24, 2014 by his gardener, Gilberto Salazar.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 30, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 17, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 29, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee. 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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by his gardener proves that the property was cleared after the Second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property. Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: NASRI, MOHAMMAD CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 6 CRUISERS BLUFF
NEWPORT COAST CA 92657 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L BENIND 2478, ET AL ROSCOMARE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4378022001 / INVOICE NO: BN15004252

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's project coordinator, Noel Rivera, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Mr. Rivera indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Non-compliance. He further stated that the brush clearance work was completed on November 24, 2014, by paid laborers.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 23, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 20, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee. 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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by his gardener proves that the property was cleared after the Second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property. Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: ROLNICK, MARVIN ETAL

MAILING ADDRESS: 8159 SANTA MONICA BLVD STE 203
WEST HOLLYWOOD CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON MULHOLLAND & NICADA

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4379035015 / INVOICE NO: BN15004278

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, Leon Gersu (handwriting regarding writing of last name is unrecognizable), by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st but not the Second Notice of Non-compliance. He stated that the brush clearance work was completed between August 27 -29, 2014, by a landscaping company. Mr. Gersu also stated that he spoke with Inspector Sesma several times prior to the inspection regarding an extension. Mr. Gersu further stated that the Inspector Sesma told him that he did not need an extension because by the time he did the inspection the property would be in compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 13, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 28, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 5, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by a landscaping company, August 29, 2014, proves that the property was cleared after the Second inspection.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: STRAY GATOR STUDIOS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 532 ALVERSON BLVD
EVERETT WA 98201

SITUS ADDRESS: 12400 MULHOLLAND DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4387003001 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, Kelly Muchoney Johnson, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property as indicated under the Situs Address noted above. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Ms. Muchoney indicated that she received the 1st and Second Notice of Non-compliance. She further stated that the brush clearance work was completed but did not give a date of compliance.

Ms. Muchoney stated that they were working with Inspector Sesma, who advised them that the City would clear some debris that was not on their property and provided access on their property for the work to be performed. She further stated that the inspector indicated they would receive a brush clearance assessment with a zero balance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 14, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 31, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on November 19, 2014
- 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 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.

According to the notes from the Department, the Non-compliance Assessment Fee was waived. Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee is considered. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: BEVERLY HILLS ESTATE LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 269 S BEVERLY DR NO 1409
BEVERLY HILLS CA 90212 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VL W OF 1307 SIERRA ALTA WY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4392016026 / INVOICE NO: BN15004583

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, Cindy O. (handwriting regarding writing of last name is unrecognizable), by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Ms. Cindy O. did not indicate whether or not she received the 1st Notice of Noncompliance. Ms. Cindy O. did indicate that she did not receive the Second Notice of Noncompliance. Ms. Cindy O. further indicated that the brush clearance work was completed on February 2, 2014, by her gardener.

Ms. Cindy O. stated on the appeal form that she was out of the country when the notices were received.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 20, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by his gardener proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District:

NAME: BLEECHER, SUSAN W AND SUSAN TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 450 S BUNDY DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90049

SITUS ADDRESS: 450 S BUNDY DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4404023008 / INVOICE NO: BN15004633

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Michael Bleecher, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant also indicated that the hazard was cleared on his property on June 10, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on April 25, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on June 9, 2014
- 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 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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared proves that the property was cleared after the Second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 11

NAME: SHORR, ROBERT M

MAILING ADDRESS: 601 PASEO MIRAMAR
PACIFIC PLSDS, CA 90272

SITUS ADDRESS: 601 PASEO MIRAMAR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4416018018 / INVOICE NO: BN15004724

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Robert Shorr, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant also indicated that the hazard was cleared on his property on May 4, 2014, and November 3, 2014.

Appellant stated that he performed the brush clearance and received a confirmation letter stating his property was satisfactory. Appellant attached a copy of such letter to his appeal form. Appellant also stated that he later received a Non-compliance letter. When the Appellant called to discuss the letter, he was told to ignore the letter as it was a computer error. He later received a penalty.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee. 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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared proves that on November 3, 2014, the property was cleared after the Second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

The Appellant's statement that he was told to ignore the letter of Non-compliance was reviewed by the Hearing Officer. According to the Department's Master Parcel Information Sheet Office Comments, on March 14, 2014 the Appellant called and was informed that the Second Notice of Non-compliance would be rescinded if he cleared his property within a reasonable time from March 14, 2014.

Appellant stated that he needed until springtime to complete the work. The Departments staff member informed the Appellant that such a request could not be honored due to the hazards needing to be abated in a timely manner.

In regards to the Appellant's statement as evidence to dismiss the fees, the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE June 30, 2015 Council District: 11

NAME: VORSE, SCOT K TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 1863 MANGO WAY
 LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

SITUS ADDRESS: 1863 MANGO WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4426009001 / INVOICE NO: BN15004914

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Scot Vorse, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st Notice of Non-compliance but did not receive the Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant also indicated that he hired someone to clear the property on the following dates: Saturday, September 20, On or around July 27th and August 4th.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 12, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 10, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee. 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.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 11

NAME: TREADWELL,JAMES H AND PATRICIA

MAILING ADDRESS: 3349 MANDEVILLE CANYON RD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

SITUS ADDRESS: 3349 MANDEVILLE CANYON RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4491007005 / INVOICE NO: BN15005093

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, James Treadwell, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st Notice of Non-compliance but he did receive the Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant also indicated that he cleared the property himself on July 27, 2014. Appellant submitted email communications with Inspector Guardado to further his appeal consideration to waive the assessed fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 19, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 12, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 12, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared proves that the property was cleared after the Second inspection.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property. It must also be noted that in regards to the email communications with Inspector Guardado, there is no indication that the inspector granted the Appellant additional time to avoid an assessment fee for Non-compliance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position.

The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 11

NAME: FEDERMAN,MYKE AND NOAH C

MAILING ADDRESS: 2169 MANDEVILLE CANYON RD
LOS ANGELES CA 90049 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 2169 MANDEVILLE CANYON RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4492003006 / INVOICE NO: BN15005101

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Myke Federman, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st or Second Notice of Non-compliance. Appellant stated he purchased the property on September 29, 2014.

Appellant also stated that he was never told about the Non-compliance and thus not aware of work that needed to be done on his property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 17, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee.

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.

According to the Los Angeles County Assessor Parcel Information, the recording date for the purchase of the property by the Appellant was recorded on September 9, 2014.

Thus, the Appellant has been able to prove that at the time of the first inspection, he was not the owner of the property and thus would not have received the 1st Notice of Non-compliance in the mail.

Based on the aforementioned. The Hearing Officer recommends that the noncompliance fee be waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 11

NAME: SWINK, EDWARD L

MAILING ADDRESS: 1336 N TIGERTAIL RD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

SITUS ADDRESS: 1336 N TIGERTAIL RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 4493025020 / INVOICE NO: BN15005184

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Edward Swink, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that the hazard was cleared on his property during various times.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 28, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant statement and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by his gardener proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

HEARING DATE	June 30, 2015	Council District: 8
NAME:	FLANAGAN,DETROIT M CO TR	
MAILING ADDRESS:	4549 DON DIEGO DR LOS ANGELES, CA 90008	
SITUS ADDRESS:	4549 DON DIEGO DR	
ASSESSOR'S ID NO:	5028010024 / INVOICE NO: BN15005317	

Appellant, Detroit Flanagan, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- ## PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection fee.

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.

71

The Appellant's own email regarding the need for rush clearance sent on September 10, 2014, to Inspector Guardado proves that the property was not cleared before the Second inspection.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 8

NAME: CARDENAS,JAMES

MAILING ADDRESS: 4506 DON MILAGRO DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008

SITUS ADDRESS: 4506 DON MILAGRO DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5028016003 / INVOICE NO: BN15005382

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, James Cardenas, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant did receive the Second Notice of Noncompliance.

Appellant also indicated that he hired someone to clear the hazard and the work was completed in August.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 12, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant' 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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 8

NAME: LONG, G CAROLE TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 5665 GLENFORD ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008

SITUS ADDRESS: 5665 GLENFORD ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5029016008 / INVOICE NO: BN15005465

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, G. Carole Long, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that she received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance.

Appellant also indicated that the property was cleared of hazards on November 7th & 8th.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 7, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 3, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by his gardener proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 8

NAME: TURNER, ROBERT L AND SHARLENE L

MAILING ADDRESS: 5200 VERONICA ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008

SITUS ADDRESS: 5200 VERONICA ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5029023015 / INVOICE NO: BN15005531

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Sharlene Turner, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 9, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property. Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 8

NAME: OATTS, CHARLES B

MAILING ADDRESS: 4131 S CLOVERDALE AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90008

SITUS ADDRESS: 4131 S CLOVERDALE AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5029040007 / INVOICE NO: BN15005572

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Charles Oatts, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above. Appellant did not submit the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, to substantiate his position.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 8, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee. 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 did not present any proof to substantiate his position that at the time the second inspection was performed his property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements. Therefore, based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 8

NAME: HOLT, TERRY AND SANDRA TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 416 HILLCREST ST
EL SEGUNDO, CA 90245

SITUS ADDRESS: 4101 DON IBARRA PL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5031011008 / INVOICE NO: BN15005614

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Terry Holt, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that he hired Brian Walsh to clear the property in November 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 23, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 15, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by his does not prove the property was cleared before the second inspection.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: EWELL, EDWARD L AND RUBY S TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 5780 BOWESFIELD ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90016

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO THOMAS

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206018018 / INVOICE NO: BN15005663

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Edward Ewell, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant did not indicate whether or not he received the 1st and/or Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant did indicate that he cleared the property himself but did not state the date the hazard was cleared from the property. Appellant did not submit any additional evidence to support he did not receive notification of noncompliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee. 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. Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: RICCI, LEONARD J TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 3202 E FOOTHILL BLVD PMB133
PASADENA, CA 91107

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE 3145 THOMAS ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206018025 / INVOICE NO: BN15005689

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal regarding the Non-compliance fee on the above numbered property.

The Fire inspector made the first inspection on May 8, 2014, and found the property in Non-compliance. The Fire Inspector's Second inspection on July 18, 2014, found the property a fire hazard and still in Non-compliance on the date the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance. The Appellant is responsible for the Non-compliance fee.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: RICCI, LEONARD J TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 3202 E FOOTHILL BLVD PMB133
PASADENA, CA 91107

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO 3145 THOMAS ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206018026 / INVOICE NO: BN15005697

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal regarding the Non-compliance fee on the above numbered property.

The Fire inspector made the first inspection on May 8, 2014, and found the property in Non-compliance. The Fire Inspector's Second inspection on July 18, 2014, found the property a fire hazard and still in Non-compliance on the date the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 11, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance. The Appellant is responsible for the Non-compliance fee.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: HUNG,CHI DER

MAILING ADDRESS: 881 MADRE ST
PASADENA, CA 91107

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO THOMAS STREET

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206018030 / INVOICE NO: BN15005713

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written objection to the Non-compliance fee. He made several calls to the Fire Inspector asking for an extension after the due date in order to avoid the clearing fee. However at that point the Non-compliance fee had already automatically attached at the Second re-inspection notice.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 24, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: SUAREZ,HENRY J

MAILING ADDRESS: 1370 E CALIFORNIA BLVD
PASADENA CA 91106 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO 2901 THOMAS

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5206024014 / INVOICE NO: BN15005747

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant through his property manager knowledge they received all notices.

They failed to completely clear the said property by the Non-compliance date when the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property has been confirmed in the amount as set forth in the notice.

The Fire Department shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a notice to Abate a Nuisance and Fire Hazard.

The Fire Inspector and City Contractor provided photographs, which depict the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: MENDOZA,JOSE A TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 335 E AVENUE 33
LOS ANGELES, CA 90031

SITUS ADDRESS VACANT LOT CLOSE TO GRIFFIN AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5207021004 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Jose Mendoza, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that he cleared the property himself on July 22, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 25, 2014
- 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' 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's only submitted a statement stating the property was cleared but a couple of bags were left on the property. The Appellant did not submit any additional evidence to substantiate his position. The Appellant's statement alone is not sufficient to waive the assessment fee. Based on the aforementioned, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee total assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: KWAN DEVELOPMENT CORP

MAILING ADDRESS: 408 BAUCHET STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L CLOSE TO 2612 N. ABRIGO AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5208013007 / INVOICE NO: BN15005820

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant failed to file a written appeal on the said property. We therefore have no evidence in opposition.

Since the Appellant had not cleared the property on the Second inspection. The Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice.

The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard.

The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: RITTNER, CARLOS AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 530 S HEWITT ST NO 520
LOS ANGELES CA 90013

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON ALTA STREET

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5208017014 / INVOICE NO: BN15005838

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellants were part of the lot cleaning process until 2013 and were not aware of the Inspections deadlines until they received Fire Inspection fines and fees for 2014.

The noncompliance fee had already automatically applied before they were aware of that deadline.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for noncompliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the noncompliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: RITTNER, CARLOS

MAILING ADDRESS: 530 S HEWITT ST UNIT 520
LOS ANGELES CA 90013 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON ALTA STREET

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5208017015 / INVOICE NO: BN15005846

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellants were part of the lot cleaning process until 2013 and were not aware of the Inspections deadlines until they received Fire Inspection fines and fees for 2014.

The noncompliance fee had already automatically applied before they were aware of that deadline.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for noncompliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the noncompliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: RITTNER, CARLOS AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 530 S HEWITT ST NO 520
LOS ANGELES CA 90013

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON ALTA STREET

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5208017016 / INVOICE NO: BN15005853

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellants were part of the lot cleaning process until 2013 and were not aware of the Inspections deadlines until they received Fire Inspection fines and fees for 2014.

The noncompliance fee had already automatically applied before they were aware of that deadline.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for noncompliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the noncompliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: RITTNER,CARLOS AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 530 S HEWITT ST NO 520
LOS ANGELES CA 90013

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L ON ALTA STREET

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 5208017017 / INVOICE NO: BN15005853

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellants were part of the lot cleaning process until 2013 and were not aware of the Inspections deadlines until they received Fire Inspection fines and fees for 2014.

The noncompliance fee had already automatically applied before they were aware of that deadline.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for noncompliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the noncompliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1
NAME: CHU NGUYEN
MAILING ADDRESS: 10259 DALE AVE
STANTON, CA 90680 1842
SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 3122 LINCOLN PARK AVE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5208019032 / INVOICE NO: BN15005952

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant states he owns the property and moves from place to place, however was at owners address during the inspections and the notices were not returned.

The Second notice with the red tag was posted as legally required and was properly notified at the time the Appellant had still not complied and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 9, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard.

The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance. The Appellant is responsible for the Non-compliance fee.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: TABRIZI, AMIR AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 2635 5TH STREET APT 2
SANTA MONICA, CA 90405 4274

SITUS ADDRESS: 3420 EMMA AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5208027022 / INVOICE NO: BN15006000

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Ghazaleh Khezri, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that they received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that they hired someone to clear the property. The work was completed on May 27, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 11, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 25, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee.

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's only submitted a statement stating the property was cleared on May 15, 2014. The Appellant did not submit any additional evidence to substantiate this position.

The Appellant's statement alone is not sufficient to waive the assessment fee as the Department found the property to still be in noncompliance on October 11, 2014.

It must be noted to the Appellant that brush clearance is a year round responsibility and not a once a year responsibility for the property owner.

Based on the aforementioned, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee total assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: SANCHEZ, LUIS AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 4900 LA CALANDRIA WAY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L CLOSE TO LA CALANDRIA WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5216015031 / INVOICE NO: BN15006190

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant affirmed that he is the owner of the property. He had a gardener maintaining his house which is two blocks away.

The Appellant was in Non-compliance on the date of the Second Inspection, therefore resulting in an assessed Non-Compliance fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 17, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: DEL TORO, JESSE TR

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 32233
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS: 2601 ADKINS AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5217015025 / INVOICE NO: BN15006307

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Jesse Del Toro, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st or Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that he hired someone to clear the property. The work was completed on May 10, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 26, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 25, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee.

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's only submitted a statement stating the property was cleared on May 10, 2014. The Appellant did not submit any additional evidence to substantiate this position.

The Appellant's statement alone is not sufficient to waive the assessment fee as the Department found the property to still be in noncompliance on July 25, 2014.

It must also be noted to the Appellant that brush clearance is a year round responsibility and not a once a year responsibility for the property owner.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: EVANGELISTA, NELSON JR

MAILING ADDRESS: 2190 GARFIAS DR
PASADENA CA 91104

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO BOHLIG ROAD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5221025021 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Nelson Evangelista, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on his property.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st Notice of Noncompliance but not the Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that the property was cleared but did not give a date of completion.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee.

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 must be noted to the Appellant that brush clearance is a year round responsibility for all property owners. The Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position that at the time the second inspection was performed his property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: WEN, JUNG F AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 18933 BRAMHALL LN
ROWLAND HEIGHTS CA 91748 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO BOHUG ROAD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5221026003 / INVOICE NO: BN15006364

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, Chien Chih Wen J. (spelling of last name handwriting is unrecognizable), by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on Appellant's property.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant's representative indicated that neither the 1st or Second Notice of Noncompliance was received. It was also indicated that the Appellant hired someone to clear the property with the date of completion of April 16, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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 must be noted to the Appellant that brush clearance is a year round responsibility for all property owners. The brush clearance inspections begin every year on or anytime after May 1.

According to office comments from the Master Parcel Information Sheet, on February 4, 2015, the Appellant's daughter contacted the Brush Clearance Department and was informed that the property had not yet been inspected.

The Appellant's own representative stated on the appeal form that the brush was cleared on April 16, 2014, before the annual inspection start date of May 1st. The Department's information clearly notes that the date of both the 1st and Second noncompliance inspections occurred after the date of clearance by the Appellant.

Based on the aforementioned, the Appellant's representative did not present sufficient proof to substantiate the Appellant's position that at the time the 1st and Second inspection was performed, his property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements.

Therefore, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: CEBALLOS, DANIEL

MAILING ADDRESS: 5015 LA CALANDRIA WAY
LOS ANGELES CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS VACANT LOT CLOSE TO LAFLER ROAD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5221028010

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Daniel Ceballos, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on his property. On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st Notice of Noncompliance but not the Second Notice of Noncompliance.

Appellant also indicated that he cleared the property on June 20th. Appellant stated that the area was cleaned and picked up properly. He also stated that he personally cut down the brush monthly.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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 must be noted to the Appellant that brush clearance is a year round responsibility for all property owners. The Brush Clearance Department begins the annual inspection on May 1. The Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position that at the time the second inspection was performed his property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: CHURBINA INVESTMENTS LLC.

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 661056
ARCADIA CA 91066 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT LOCATED ON BARNETT WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5223019018 / INVOICE NO: BN15006455

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant verified that he is the owner of said property. He stated he had cleared the property and submitted an invoice for brush clearance with no verification and no picture of before, during and after the supposed clearance.

However at the Second Inspection the property was found remaining in Non-Compliance, resulting in the assessed fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 22, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 31, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance. The Appellant is responsible for the Non-compliance fee.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: JUNE 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: BRESNAHAN, CHRISTOPHER AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 4019 BARRETT RD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/O 4019 BARRETT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5309004031 / INVOICE NO: BN15006604

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Christopher Bresnahan, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance.

Appellant also indicated that the property was cleared by someone he hired with a date of completion of June 20, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 30, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 8, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee.

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.

Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property on the Second Inspection.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: COVARRUBIAS, RAYMOND

MAILING ADDRESS: 4003 BARRETT RD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS: 4003 BARRETT RD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5309004032 / INVOICE NO: BN15006612

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The sister of the Appellant filed a protest. However, the property had not been cleared by the Second re-inspection at which time the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

The sister in her appeal asked that the Non-compliance fee be waived due to her hardship, however she is not the owner of the property and there was no hardship shown as to the owner of the property. Additionally, no documents or evidence was submitted to indicate that there is a hardship.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 3, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 8, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard.

The Fire Inspector and the City Contractor also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ROMERO,DAWN L

MAILING ADDRESS: 5353 ATLAS ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90032

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L OFF LOWELL AVENUE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5309012041 / INVOICE NO: BN15006737

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating she has cleared the property earlier in the year.

However, when the Fire Inspector visited the property for inspection it was in noncompliance and remained in noncompliance on the Second reinspection the noncompliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 30, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 8, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property has been confirmed in the amount as set forth in the notice, the Fire department record shows that the Fire Inspector made all appearance to the property and mailed and posted all notices as legally required.

The Fire Inspector also provided photographs showing the hazardous condition at the time of the clearance.

Total assessment due is \$352.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GUZMAN, SONIA A

MAILING ADDRESS: 6030 FRY ST
BELL GARDENS CA 90201

SITUS ADDRESS: 4440 STILLWELL AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5309013034 / INVOICE NO: BN15006745

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant files a written Non-compliance appeal stating that after the city contractor cleared the property they left the bamboo.

The City contractor chipped and spread the bamboo which is an option for the clearance of the property.

The Appellant had not cleared the brush by the Second inspection and the Non-compliance automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 22, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on December 2, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deem the work not complete and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$356.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: JAIN,AMRESH

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 5806
PASADENA CA 91117 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO LOMITAS DRIVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5312029037 / INVOICE NO: BN15006760

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on his property.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st Notice of Noncompliance but did receive the Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that the property was cleared with a date of completion of July 27, 2014.

Appellant stated that after he cleared his property of hazardous brush and vegetation, he contacted the LA Fire Department on July 28, 2014, and left Inspector Orona a message. Inspector Orona returned the call and informed the Appellant that the property would be re-inspected.

The Appellant left additional messages for the inspector regarding his property being in brush clearance compliance. Appellant further stated that he received a letter from the LA Fire Department on October 27, 2014 indicating his property was in compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 18, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 22, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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 Brush Clearance Department begins the annual brush clearance inspection on May 1 of every year. It must be noted to the Appellant that although annual inspections begin in May, brush clearance maintenance is a year round responsibility for all properties located in the "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone".

The Appellant's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 13

NAME: ROMERO,ALEJANDRO AND ELODIA B

MAILING ADDRESS: 727 COLUMBIA AVE
LOS ANGELES,CA 90017

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO RIVERSIDE DRIVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5438004010 / INVOICE NO: BN15006828

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, Isabel Romero, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the Appellant's property.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant's representative indicated that the Appellant received the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant's representative also indicated that the property was cleared by "me" with a date of completion of August 2014.

Appellant's representative also stated that they started the cleaning of the lot but their weedeater broke. Due to financial hardship, they did not have money at the time to purchase another weedeater. When funds became available another weedeater was purchased and the lot cleaning was completed.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 26, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 28, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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's representatives own statement regarding when the property was cleared proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant's representative did not present sufficient proof to substantiate the Appellant's position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 13

NAME: PERRY, LEROY III

MAILING ADDRESS: 1211 E ALTADENA DR
ALTADENA CA 91001

SITUS ADDRESS: 2440 N AVON ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5443024003 / INVOICE NO: BN15006984

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Leory Perry III, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property noted above as indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st or Second Notice of Non-compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 9, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 6, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 16, 2014
- 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.

Although there are Department comments which indicated notices sent to the Appellant were return by the United States Post Office, the Hearing Officer cannot find such to be a dismissal of fees based on the following:

PERRY, LEROY III
5443024003
Page 2

According to the Appellant's Los Angeles County Assessor Parcel Information/Detail, the Appellant has owned the property since May 18, 2006. The Brush Clearance Self Inspection Program began in 2010.

Since then, property owners in "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" have been educated to the fact that although the initial brush clearance inspection begins May 1st of every year, brush clearance is a year round responsibility.

Therefore, absent notice sent via mail, as a long time property owner in the area, the Appellant should have known about the annual brush clearance inspections. It must also be noted that notice of Non-compliance was properly posted on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 13

NAME: DE LEON, REBECCA S TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 3916 SUNBEAM DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF 1914 ROSEBUD AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5443032014 / INVOICE NO: BN15007024

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Rebecca De Leon, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that she never received the 1st or Second Notice of Non-compliance.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 28, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on November 14, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee.

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.

Also, it must be noted that on March 20, 2014, the Department office comments indicate that Appellant's Online e-Opt Out, indicating that a self-inspection was conducted on the property, was granted on March 20, 2014.

Such online opt out request and approval can be considered an indication that the Appellant did have notice of the upcoming brush clearance inspection.

Finally, the Appellant did not provide sufficient proof to prove that his property was not properly posted or the non-issuance of notice via the United States Post Office indicating the annual brush clearance inspection found the property to be in Non-compliance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 13

NAME: FILIPPI, SOBEIDA

MAILING ADDRESS: 4180 ELM AVE 7
LONG BEACH, CA 90807 2748

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF 1914 ROSEBUD AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5443032015 / INVOICE NO: BN15007032

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Sobeida Filippi, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he received the 1st Notice of Noncompliance but not the Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that the property was cleared on July 15, 2014.

The Appellant wrote a written statement that he hired someone to clean his property and does not understand why the City is charging him when he complied by having his property clean.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 30, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on November 14, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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 Brush Clearance Department begins the annual brush clearance inspection on May 1st of every year. Although annual inspections begin in May, brush clearance maintenance is a year round responsibility for all properties located in the "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone".

The Appellant stated that he cleaned his property on July 15, 2014. The first inspection performed was on August 28, 2014, after the date the Appellant cleaned his property. On both the first and second inspection, Appellant's property was found to be in noncompliance and proper posting was issued.

Therefore, based on the following, the Appellant has not presented sufficient proof to substantiate his position that at the time of inspection, his property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: NEWPORT PROPERTY HOLDING LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 2182 ALTON PKWY STE 10
IRVINE CA 92606 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 75' SW/OF 3881 WEST POINT DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5451022010 / INVOICE NO: BN15007172

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, Cherry Chen, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that the 1st and Second Notice of Noncompliance was received by the Appellant.

Appellant's representative also indicated that the property was cleared by a tree service company on June 27, 2014.

Appellant's representative wrote a written statement restating the information above. She also stated that someone from the company, that was hired to clear the property, spoke with Inspector Terris and he informs them that the property was okay.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 9, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 27, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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. Notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

The Brush Clearance Department begins the annual brush clearance inspection on May 1st of every year. Although annual inspections begin in May, brush clearance maintenance is a year round responsibility for all properties located in the "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone".

The Appellant stated that the property was cleared on June 27, 2014. The first inspection performed was on May 9, 2014, before the date of clearance by the Appellant's hired company.

The second inspection was conducted on October 22, 2015, after the cleaning of the property. On both the first and second inspection, Appellant's property was found to be in noncompliance and proper posting was issued.

The Appellant's representative has not presented sufficient proof to substantiate her position that at the time of inspection, the property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. He Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE

WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: FINLEY, ANTHONY

MAILING ADDRESS: 1821 KEMPER ST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

SITUS ADDRESS: 1821 KEMPER ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5455006003 / INVOICE NO: BN15007339

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Anthony Finley, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive the 1st or Second Notice of Noncompliance. Appellant also indicated that he cleared the property on February 1, 2015.

Appellant wrote a written statement stating that he was in the process of evicting his renter and it made it difficult for him to remove him from the property. Appellant also stated that he is sure the renter threw away his notices.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 29, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection fee.

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 Brush Clearance Department begins the annual brush clearance inspection on May 1 of every year. It must be noted to the Appellant that although annual inspections begin in May, brush clearance maintenance is a year-round responsibility for all properties located in the "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone".

The Appellant's own statement regarding when the property was cleared by him proves that the property was cleared after the second inspection. Thus, the property was not in brush clearance compliance when the assessment was placed on the property.

The fact that the Appellant stated that he was in the process of evicting a tenant cannot be considered as sufficient evidence to waive the inspection fee based on the fact that when the property was inspected, hazardous conditions were on his property and needed to be removed immediately.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 1

NAME: LOWELL P THEARD M D INC

MAILING ADDRESS: 3831 HUGHES AVE STE 705
CULVER CITY, CA 90232

SITUS ADDRESS: ACROSS FROM 1815 KEMPER

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5455007019 / INVOICE NO: BN15007347

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant's representative, L. Squires, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant's representative indicated that the 1st Notice of Noncompliance was received but unsure about the receipt of the Second Notice of Noncompliance.

Appellant's representative also indicated on the appeal form that workers were hired and completed the work on either October 4th or 5th of 2014. Appellant's representative wrote a written statement stating that he/she the inspected the completed work on October 6, 2014.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on September 29, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 21, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on December 4, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's representative statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Inspection Fee.

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 Brush Clearance Department begins the annual brush clearance inspection on May 1 of every year. It must be noted to the Appellant that although annual inspections begins in May, brush clearance maintenance is a year round responsibility for all properties located in the "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone".

The Appellant's representative stated that the property was cleared when he/she visited the property on October 6, 2014. It must be noted to the representative that when the inspector returned to the property to perform a re-inspection, the property was still in noncompliance.

The Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position that at the time the second inspection was performed his property was in compliance with the brush clearance requirements.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Noncompliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant's representative did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his/her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: MISIRIAN, HAGOP AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 333 RIVERDALE DR STE 17
GLENDALE, CA 91204

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO AGUILAR STREET

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5459021013 / INVOICE NO: BN15007370

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by having the clearance work completed by the City's contractor.

Appellant believed that the drought and negligible growth of the vegetation led him to believe no clearance work was necessary.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 10, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 12, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ASHRAF NIA, WALID S

MAILING ADDRESS: 864 CALLE CARRILLO
SAN DIMAS CA 91773

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO LAVELL DRIVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460011010 / INVOICE NO: BN15007412

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant filed a written appeal stating that he hired a service to clear the property and that work was completed on October 24, 2014.

However the property remained in Non-Compliance on the date Second inspection October 18, 2014, when the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on August 11, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 18, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on December 3, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT

MAILING ADDRESS: 2223 HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 3598 N INGLIS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460020024 / INVOICE NO: BN15007552

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal in which he stated that he hired someone to clear the property for him on August 25, 2014.

The problem with that is it unfortunately was too late as the fire Inspector re-inspected the property on August 13, 2014, and posted when it was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 6, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT

MAILING ADDRESS: 2223 HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 3600 N INGLIS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460020025 / INVOICE NO: BN15007560

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal in which he stated that he hired someone to clear the property for him on August 25, 2014.

The problem with that is it unfortunately was too late as the fire Inspector reinspected the property on August 13, 2014, and posted when it was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORP

MAILING ADDRESS: 2223 HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 3606 N INGLIS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460020026 / INVOICE NO: BN15007578

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal in which he stated that he hired someone to clear the property for him on August 25, 2014.

The problem with that is it unfortunately was too late as the fire Inspector reinspected the property on August 13, 2014, and posted when it was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT CORP

MAILING ADDRESS: 2223 HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 3612 N INGLIS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460020027 / INVOICE NO: BN15007586

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal in which he stated that he hired someone to clear the property for him on August 25, 2014.

The problem with that is it unfortunately was too late as the fire Inspector reinspected the property on August 13, 2014, and posted when it was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT

MAILING ADDRESS: 2223 HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 3616 N INGLIS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460020028 / INVOICE NO: BN15007594

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal in which he stated that he hired someone to clear the property for him on August 25, 2014.

The problem with that is it unfortunately was too late as the fire Inspector reinspected the property on August 13, 2014, and posted when it was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GOLD CREST DEVELOPMENT

MAILING ADDRESS: 2223 HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 3620 N INGLIS DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460020029 / INVOICE NO: BN15007602

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal in which he stated that he hired someone to clear the property for him on August 25, 2014.

The problem with that is it unfortunately was too late as the fire Inspector reinspected the property on August 13, 2014, and posted when it was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached to the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 13, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 26, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: SIMON, PHILLIP E CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 290 E VERDUGO AVE # 202
BURBANK, CA 91502

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S OF 3818 ACKERMAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460025023 / INVOICE NO: BN15007842

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had owned the five properties since 2002. He therefore, is well aware of the Brush clearance and Non-compliance process.

He stated that he hired a crew to clear the property on July 22, 2014, however, the Non-compliance due date was June 16, 2014, at which time the Fire Inspector found the property in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By later clearing the property the appellant did avoid the five clearance fees as well as the five large Administrative fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: SIMON, PHILLIP E CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 290 E VERDUGO AVE # 202
BURBANK, CA 91502

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S OF 3810 ACKERMAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460025024 / INVOICE NO: BN15007859

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had owned the five properties since 2002. He therefore, is well aware of the Brush clearance and Non-compliance process.

He stated that he hired a crew to clear the property on July 22, 2014, however, the Non-compliance due date was June 16, 2014, at which time the Fire Inspector found the property in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By later clearing the property the appellant did avoid the five clearance fees as well as the five large Administrative fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: SIMON, PHILLIP E CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 290 E VERDUGO AVE # 202
BURBANK, CA 91502

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S OF 3810 ACKERMAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460025025 / INVOICE NO: BN15007867

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had owned the five properties since 2002. He therefore, is well aware of the Brush clearance and Non-compliance process.

He stated that he hired a crew to clear the property on July 22, 2014, however, the Non-compliance due date was June 16, 2014, at which time the Fire Inspector found the property in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By later clearing the property the appellant did avoid the five clearance fees as well as the five large Administrative fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: SIMON, PHILLIP E CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 290 E VERDUGO AVE # 202
BURBANK, CA 91502

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S OF 3818 ACKERMAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460025026 / INVOICE NO: BN15007875

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had owned the five properties since 2002. He therefore, is well aware of the Brush clearance and Non-compliance process.

He stated that he hired a crew to clear the property on July 22, 2014, however, the Non-compliance due date was June 16, 2014, at which time the Fire Inspector found the property in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By later clearing the property the appellant did avoid the five clearance fees as well as the five large Administrative fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: SIMON, PHILLIP E CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 290 E VERDUGO AVE # 202
BURBANK, CA 91502

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S OF 3822 ACKERMAN DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5460025027 / INVOICE NO: BN15007883

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had owned the five properties since 2002. He therefore, is well aware of the Brush clearance and Non-compliance process.

He stated that he hired a crew to clear the property on July 22, 2014, however, the Non-compliance due date was June 16, 2014, at which time the Fire Inspector found the property in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By later clearing the property the appellant did avoid the five clearance fees as well as the five large Administrative fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 16, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ANTHONY CAULDER LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 2235
LA PUENTE, CA 91746

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/OF 2100 MOSS AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5462009010 / INVOICE NO: BN15008030

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal regarding the above numbered lot.

The Fire Inspector made a first visit and inspection of the above numbered property and found it in Non-compliance.

The Fire Inspector's Second inspection found the property still in Non-compliance and a fire risk at which time the Non-compliance fee automatic attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 17, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 9, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: TAMAY, MARIA E

MAILING ADDRESS: 11014 QUILL AVE
SUNLAND CA 91040

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF PARRISH AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5462010027 / INVOICE NO: BN15008170

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating she had cleared the above numbered property, and enclosed pictures with no automatic dates printed only some just dates written with a pen.

When the Fire Inspector made the first inspection the lot was not in compliance and on the Second inspection, finding the lot still in non-compliance he ordered a brush clearance on that same date the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 14, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 11, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 4, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ANTHONY CAULDER LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 2235
LA PUENTE, CA 91746

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/OF 3601 CAZADO ST.

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5462011012 / INVOICE NO: BN15008261

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal regarding the above numbered lot.

The Fire Inspector made a first visit and inspection of the above numbered property and found it in Non-compliance. The Fire Inspector's Second inspection found the property still in Non-compliance and a fire risk at which time the Non-compliance fee automatic attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 10, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 5, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 24, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: NOOR, ABDUL S AND NAFISA

MAILING ADDRESS: 20007 PARTHENIA ST
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91324

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/OF 739 MUSEUM DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5466009001 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal, written and filed by his brother. The brother stated that he cleared the property May 4, 2014, before the Fire department inspections.

The correct dates on the City records show that the Fire Inspector's first inspection was April 15, 2014, and the Second inspection was conducted June 6, 2014, at which time the property was a fire hazard and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached on that date.

The City Fire department records show that the property was cleaned by owner on July 16, 2014, well after the June 6, 2014, automatically Non-compliance fee attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on April 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on June 6, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on July 16, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a Notice to abate a Public Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector also provided photographs, which the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: LENTZ, STEVEN R

MAILING ADDRESS: 392 ALLENDALE RD
PASADENA, CA 91106

SITUS ADDRESS: 4200 BLK SEAVIEW DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5471004012 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had cleared brush on the above numbered lot. The Fire Inspector reported the lot was in Non-compliance on the first inspection and when the Inspector returned on the Second re-inspection on August 12, 2014, he found the lot still in Non-compliance and the fee automatically attached.

The Appellant did clear the property after the attachment on September 25, 2014, thus avoiding clearance and administrative fees.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 10, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 12, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 25, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deemed the work not complete and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ATWATER PARTNERS LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 201 W PALMER AVE APT C
GLENDALE, CA 91204 4002

SITUS ADDRESS: VL W OF 713 TERRACE 49

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5471014010 / INVOICE NO: BN15008857

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received both the First and the Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring a landscaper who completed brush clearance work by mid-June and then mid-September 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant provided a number of Invoices provided to him by his landscaper for work purported to have been performed on the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 10, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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 you acted in good faith therefore, we are going to waive the Non-Compliance fee, and it should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GPG TOLAND LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 2202 S FIGUEROA ST UNIT 522
LOS ANGELES CA 90007

SITUS ADDRESS: 4526 TOLAND WAY

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5474038035 / INVOICE NO: BN15009020

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed for a written appeal, however presented no evidence to be considered.

Therefore, as the property was in Non-compliance on the first and Second re-inspection visits the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 6, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deem the work not complete and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: RIOS, MAURICIO R AND HEATHER E

MAILING ADDRESS: 4172 PALMERO DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90065 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 4172 PALMERO DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5475003019 / INVOICE NO: BN15009061

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he had cleared the property on October 1, 2014. Therefore he thought he had avoided all fees and penalties.

The Fire Inspector visited the lot on May 15, 2014, and the lot was in Non-compliance which also was on the Second re-inspection on September 11, 2014, when the Non-compliance fee automatically attached as the Inspector had informed him.

By clearing the property on October 1, 2014, the Appellant avoided clearance and administrative fees which he misunderstood were Non-compliance fees.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 11, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deemed the work not complete and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached, in this case on September 11, 2014, before the Appellants October 1, 2014, clearance.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: URBANITE HOMES LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 4470 W SUNSET BLVD UNIT 332
LOS ANGELES CA 90027 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO WILDWOOD DRIVE

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 5479001015 / INVOICE NO: BN15009186

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant had requested to contest in-writing, and in a letter signed and dated June 16, 2015, stated that they had previously contracted with Brian Walsh Brush Clearance, one of the LAFD's listed contractors in 2012 and 2013.

Their expectation was that Brian's company would clear the property on July 21, 2014. When the City provided charges for clean-up, they contacted Brian Walsh, who informed them that they had not cleared the property.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 12, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: CLONTS, MATTHEW AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 1324 HILLSIDE DR
GLENDALE CA 91208

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 1541, 1543 WILDWOOD DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479003004 / INVOICE NO: BN15009210

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First but not the Second Notice of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he 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 July 21, 2014. Appellant indicated that the contractor had been tardy in providing him with invoices for the work performed.

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, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 12, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on September 15, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ROS,JOE

MAILING ADDRESS: 5235 YORK BLVD
LOS ANGELES CA 90042 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 1503 WILDWOOD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479004007 / INVOICE NO: BN15009236

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating that he was sorry for his late compliance which date was June 29, 2014. When the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By clearing the property on August 17, 2014, he avoided the clearance cost and administrative fees which would have been extensive.

The Appellant apologized for his Non-compliance, but did not offer any information that could be considered for any relief from the automatic fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 12, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deem the work not completer and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: ROS,JOE

MAILING ADDRESS: 5235 YORK BLVD
LOS ANGELES CA 90042 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 1503 WILDWOOD

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479004008 / INVOICE NO: BN15009236

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating that he was sorry for his late compliance which date was June 29, 2014. When the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

By clearing the property on August 17, 2014, he avoided the clearance cost and administrative fees which would have been extensive.

The Appellant apologized for his Non-compliance, but did not offer any information that could be considered for any relief from the automatic fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 12, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 25, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deem the work not complete and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: CID,JAVIER AND MARIA

MAILING ADDRESS: 5227 CORINGA DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90042

SITUS ADDRESS: 5227 CORINGA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5479017013 / INVOICE NO:

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal but due to an Administrative error the Non-compliance fee has been waived.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 19, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 8, 2014
- 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

Due to Administrative error the Non-compliance fee is waived.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: PETERS,LARRY AND JOYCE C

MAILING ADDRESS: 326 S WILTON PL UNIT 4
LOS ANGELES CA 90020

SITUS ADDRESS: 1900 N AVE 55

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 5480032025 / INVOICE NO: BN15009442

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant claimed that he did not receive notice before the noncompliance fee automatically attached on July 12, 2014.

The Fire Department acknowledged that address of this Appellant was not changed until October 3, 2014, way after noncompliance fee attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 1, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 12, 2014
- 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 noncompliance fee is waived as the Appellant received no notice. The Fire Department did all that was legally required, but had the wrong notice address at that time.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: PETERS,LARRY AND JOYCE C

MAILING ADDRESS: 326 S WILTON PL UNIT 4
LOS ANGELES CA 90020

SITUS ADDRESS: 1864 N AVE 55

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 5480032026 / INVOICE NO: BN15009459

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant claimed that he did not receive notice before the noncompliance fee automatically attached on July 12, 2014.

The Fire Department acknowledged that address of this Appellant was not changed until October 3, 2014, way after noncompliance fee attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 1, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 12, 2014
- 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 noncompliance fee is waived as the Appellant received no notice. The Fire Department did all that was legally required, but had the wrong notice address at that time.

Total assessment due is \$0.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: DESANTO, DOMINIQUE

MAILING ADDRESS: 8149 SANTA MONICA BLVD 286
LOS ANGELES, CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/OF 8972 CRESCENT DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5563003012 / INVOICE NO: BN15009673

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant lives in the Bay area and requested a hearing via conference call, which took place on July 25, 2015. Appellant stated that she has owned the contiguous properties since 1999 and due to a communications breakdown with the US Post Offices did not receive any notices regarding this property not being in compliance.

As a physician working 80 hours a week or more, Appellant stated that she just did not have the time to keep track on the conditions on her property. Appellant added she was otherwise diligent in paying her bills.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 8, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: DESANTO, DOMINIQUE

MAILING ADDRESS: 8149 SANTA MONICA BLVD. 286
LOS ANGELES, CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L W/OF 8972 CRESCENT DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5563003013 / INVOICE NO: BN15009681

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant lives in the Bay area and requested a hearing via conference call, which took place on July 25, 2015. Appellant stated that she has owned the contiguous properties since 1999 and due to a communications breakdown with the US Post Offices did not receive any notices regarding this property not being in compliance.

As a physician working 80 hours a week or more, Appellant stated that she just did not have the time to keep track on the conditions on her property. Appellant added she was otherwise diligent in paying her bills.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 27, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 8, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: LEVY, ARNAUD AND TANIA TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 8941 WONDERLAND PARK AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: 8941 WONDERLAND PARK AVE

ASSESOR'S ID NO: 5564015043 / INVOICE NO: BN15009814

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant appeared at the Brush Clearance hearing scheduled on June 26, 2014, and stated that he has spoken to a new Fire Marshall who had informed him that that his property was in compliance.

He had three primary defenses: Firstly, that for the past five years he has maintained his property; Secondly that the cost of clearance he was charged was nearly \$2,000; and that Thirdly he had taken efforts to comply, hiring a landscaper at a cost of \$2,800.00 to make the necessary clean-up.

Appellant stated that he would provide by fax a copy of this check after the hearing, which was received.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on July 28, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 9, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 5

NAME: NAZAR,JOSE L

MAILING ADDRESS: 640 S SAN VICENTE BLVD NO 510
LOS ANGELES, CA 90048

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF 8426 SKYLINE DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5565033035 / INVOICE NO: BN15009822

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee. As to the Appellant /owners complete property was found in Non-compliance at the Second inspection by the Fire Inspector, at which time the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 7, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 7, 2014
- 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 proposed Non-compliance assessment against your property has been confirmed in the amount as set forth in the notice.

The Fire Department shows that due process was afforded, the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required. The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a notice to Abate a Nuisance and Fire Hazard.

The Fire Inspector and City Contractor provided photographs, which depict the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: YANG, TAI J AND EUN S TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 7863 ELECTRA DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90046

SITUS ADDRESS: 7863 ELECTRA DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5569018069 / INVOICE NO: BN15009855

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The appellant filed a written appeal stating he was not in Non-compliance as he had cleared the property timely.

The Fire Department records show that the Second re-inspection by the Fire Inspector took place on October 8, 2014, at which time the property was in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

The Appellant cleared the property on December 4, 2014, which was two months after the Non-compliance. The Appellant by clearing the property in December did avoid cost of clearance and Administrative fees.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 19, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on December 4, 2014
- Property was found to be in non-compliance upon Second inspection; therefore, a \$356.00 Non-compliance inspection fee is assessed.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deemed the work not complete and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

**2014 NONCOMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS**

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: WEYER, FRANK M

MAILING ADDRESS: 2032 WHITLEY AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90068

SITUS ADDRESS: 2032 WHITLEY AVE

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5575004009 / INVOICE NO: BN15009921

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant elected to contest the issuance of the Cost of Clearance and Assessment Fee in writing. In a letter signed and dated June 16, 2015, Appellant set forth his written objections, namely: that immediately following receipt of the Second Notice of Non-Compliance he hired a professional contractor to cut the vegetation and comply with the regulations, bringing his property into compliance.

Six months later Appellant stated the City presented him with a bill even though now no work was needed to be performed, with no date of the proposed clean-up provided, and no proof of its performance. Appellant added that he doubted any work was completed on his property, and that the City contractor had submitted a false invoice.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 20, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on July 17, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached.

The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally 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.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: KAHANA, TAL TR

MAILING ADDRESS: 6000 TEMPLE HILL DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90068

SITUS ADDRESS: VAC LOT SOUTH OF 2138 CAHUENGA B

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5576004036 / INVOICE NO: BN15009939

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, Y. Kahana, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection Fee on the property as indicated under the Situs Address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he/she received the 1st Notice of Non-compliance but did not receive the Second Notice of Non-compliance.

Appellant also submitted an undated statement indicating that hired professional contractors cleared brush from the property from June 23, 2014, to July 5, 2014.

Therefore, when the Second inspection was performed on September 23, 2014, three months later, the contractors hired by the Department could not have found any brush or weeds.

The Appellant further stated that it is quite possible that the Second inspection occurred before the weekly monitoring/cleanup of the property.

Appellant submitted time sheets from different workers of Shooting Star International/RIKKUZ UNLIMITED for the period of June 26 to July 9 and June 11 to June 25.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 23, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee.

According to the Department records, notice was sent to the Appellant' current address, as reflected on official records pertaining to the property owner's address. The Department's records also indicate that the property was the 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.

Also, it must be noted that on March 31, 2014, the Department office comments indicate that Appellant submitted an Online e-Opt Out indicating that a self-inspection was conducted on the property and thus in brush clearance compliance. Such online opt out can be consider as evidence that Appellant had notice of the upcoming brush clearance inspection.

Finally, the Appellant did not provide sufficient proof to prove that the property was not properly posted or the non-issuance of notice via the United States Post Office indicating the annual brush clearance inspection found the property to be in Non-compliance.

In regards to the Appellant's submission of time sheets from Shooting Star International/RIKKUZ UNLIMITED, the time sheets cannot be consider as sufficient evidence as there are discrepancies regarding address and description of work performed on the property.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his/her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: JZ INVESTMENTS LLC AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 650 S HIGHLAND AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90036 3529

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L E/OF 2306 HOLLY DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5576013067 / INVOICE NO: BN15009954

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant files a written appeal stating he has owned the property forever and has been living at the same Archwood address forever 20 years. The Appellant admitted on his written appeal form that he had received the notices and no mail was returned.

The Fire Inspector made the First Inspection on May 23, 2014, and found the property in Non-compliance. The re-inspection was made on October 3, 2014.

The property still a fire risk forced the Fire Inspector to order the clearance of the said property and abate the serious fire risk and on that date the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 3, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 12, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: HILLA GROUP LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 14557 ERWIN ST
VAN NUYS CA 91411

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 3381 BLAIR CRESCENT

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5579011015 / INVOICE NO: BN15009996

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant who lives out of the U.S. came to California and found he had a lot of notices from the L.A. City Fire Department, regarding brush clearance of his property. He then hired a property manager too late for the 2014 brush clearance season.

Therefore no property was cleared for avoidance of the fire risk which forced the Fire Inspector to clear the property for brush clearance and Non-compliance as well. No legal defense was proffered.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 14, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 25, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property has been confirmed in the amount as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department shows that due process was afforded, the Appellant as all notices were sent as legally required.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the property with a notice to Abate a Nuisance and Fire Hazard. The Fire Inspector and City Contractor provided photographs, which depict the hazardous conditions that existed at the time of the clearance

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: WEY,KIM LONG AND

MAILING ADDRESS: 4471 DEAN MARTIN DR NO 3307
LAS VEGAS NV 89103 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L 30' N/W OF 2940 DURAND DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5582004005 / INVOICE NO: BN15010051

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating he cleared the property on June 29, 2014, after the first inspection was made on May 11, 2014. He did not offer any pictures as evidence dated to prove this case.

The Fire Inspector made the Second re-inspection on September 23, 2014, at which time the above numbered property was in Non-compliance and the penalty fee automatically attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 11, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 23, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deemed the work not completed and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: GOLD, DAVID AND SHERRY TRS

MAILING ADDRESS: 6526 HAYES DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90048

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L S/OF 2860 DURAND DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5582014008 / INVOICE NO: BN15010085

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed for a Non-compliance written appeal, but did not send in any evidence in opposition to be considered. Therefore, the assessment is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 15, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 23, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deemed the work not completed and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: SZABO, TAMAS

MAILING ADDRESS: 9107 WILSHIRE BLVD FL 8
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90210

SITUS ADDRESS: V/L N/O 6280 TEMPLE HILL

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5585029011 / INVOICE NO: BN15010200

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed for a Non-compliance written appeal, but did not send in any evidence in opposition to be considered. Therefore the assessment is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 30, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 18, 2014
- 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

Confirm the assessment for the Non-compliance fee as set forth in the notice. At the time of re-inspection the Fire Inspector deemed the work not completed and inadequate.

The Fire Inspector made all appearances and mailed and posted all notices as legally required, affording the Appellant due process.

When the Fire Inspector viewed the property for re-inspection and it was still in Non-compliance the fee automatically attached.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 4

NAME: FIRST AMERICAN TRUST CO TR

MAILING ADDRESS: PO BOX 1671
LOS ANGELES CA 90078

SITUS ADDRESS: 2123 N GOWER ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5586002019 / INVOICE NO: BN15010218

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant, First American Trust Co, representative, Jack Fitzgerald, by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Brush Clearance Non-Compliance Inspection fee on the property noted above as indicated under the situs address noted above.

On the 2014 Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee Appeal Form, Appellant indicated that he did not receive any notices regarding the property being in Non-compliance of brush clearance. Appellant stated that for over twenty years he has received all of his mail at a post office box. Appellant further stated that if he had received the brush clearance Non-compliance notices he would have dealt with the matter.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on October 8, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on November 12, 2014
- 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

Below are the following findings after the review of the Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Inspection Fee.

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 the 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 Appellant according to the necessary code requirements to negate the posed fire safety hazard.

Although on December 2, 2014, there is office comments showing a notice were returned by the United States Post Office, it must be noted that the owner had notice of Non-compliance as the Appellant called the Department on September 15, 2014, to discuss his property being cited for Non-compliance.

The Appellant did not provide sufficient proof to prove that his property was not properly posted or the non-issuance of notice via the United States Post Office indicating the annual brush clearance inspection found the property to be in Non-compliance.

It must also be noted that according to the Department's office comments, on July 5, 2014, the Appellant call the Brush Clearance Unit and was informed there would be an inspection on his property. On December 15, 2014, office comments also noted that Appellant was in complete agreement with the procedure that was conducted, i.e. the brush clearance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Brush Clearance Non-compliance Fee cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14
NAME: ROBLES,GHIL AND LEONCIA TRS
MAILING ADDRESS: 2313 ADDISON WAY
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041
SITUS ADDRESS: VACANT LOT CLOSE TO LOY LANE
ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5683025017 / INVOICE NO: BN15010283

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant by written appeal objected to the imposition of a Non-Compliance fee on the property. Appellant indicated he received the First and Second Notices of Non-Compliance.

Appellant wrote that he was familiar with the brush clearance requirements, and had undertaken brush clearance work on the property by hiring someone to do the work on May 31, 2014, and August 21, 2014.

Appellant believed that the work performed was at a level sufficient to ensure compliance, and that the assessed fee should be waived. Appellant provided copies of invoices for May and August 2014 from his gardener Mr. Juan Ramirez.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 14, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on August 22, 2014
- 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 had notice and had not remedied the hazardous conditions on the property at the time the Second inspection, at which time the Non-Compliance inspection fee were incurred and attached. The Fire Inspectors made all of the appearances to the property, and properly mailed out all of the notices as legally and reasonably required. No notices are shown to have been returned by the United States Post Office.

Appellant's evidence of having the cleaned the lot prior to the City's contractor were the two checks from his gardener. What detracted from the weight that could have been assigned to the two invoices was the fact that on each check the dates have been visibly altered and changed. Therefore, the recommendation of this Hearing Officer is that the Non-Compliance fee should be confirmed as noticed.

Total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: 10TH AVENUE LLC

MAILING ADDRESS: 10537 SANTA MONICA BLVD UNIT 300
LOS ANGELES CA 90025 0000

SITUS ADDRESS: 4646 WAWONA ST

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5683035001 / INVOICE NO: BN15010291

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant files a written appeal with a great deal of correspondence (11 pages) with the Fire Inspector. The Fire Inspector First inspected the property on May 24, 2014, and found it in Non-compliance. On the Fire Inspector's Second Inspection the property was still in Non-compliance, so on that date October 9, 2014, the Non-compliance fee automatically attached.

The Inspector reported that he informed the Appellant that the fees would not be voided and that the Appellant would be responsible for the Non-compliance charges.

On October 28, 2014, the Appellant cleared the property and avoided cost of clearance and Administrative charges. The Non-compliance assessment remains in effect.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on October 9, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 28, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: MEERDINK, DOUGLAS

MAILING ADDRESS: 4951 GLACIER DR
LOS ANGELES CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 4951 GLACIER DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5690021015 / INVOICE NO: BN15010333

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant files a written appeal stating that he had cleared the property which he has owned for years and had never had notice from his renters.

The Fire Inspector inspected the property on June 2, 2014, and found it in Non-compliance. The Inspector returned on September 4, 2014, and the property was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached on that date.

The Appellant claims that he paid to have the property cleared on September 11, 2014. He offered no receipts or dated photographs as evidence.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on June 2, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on September 4, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that he received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

2014 NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE
WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015 Council District: 14

NAME: GREENE,SUSAN M

MAILING ADDRESS: 5015 MONTE BONITO DR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

SITUS ADDRESS: 5015 MONTE BONITO DR

ASSESSOR'S ID NO: 5690022009 / INVOICE NO: BN15010341

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

The Appellant filed a written appeal stating she has owned the property since 2003. She stated that she received all notices.

The Fire Inspector visited the property on his First Inspection on May 24, 2014, and found it a Fire risk and in Non-compliance. The Inspector's Second visit was August 22, 2014, some three months later and the property was still in Non-compliance and the Non-compliance fee automatically attached on that date.

The Appellant cleared the property two months later, however the Non-compliance fee was already charged. The Appellant did however avoid the cost of clearance and Administrative fee.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection performed on May 24, 2014
- Second Inspection performed on August 22, 2014
- Third Inspection performed on October 2, 2014
- 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 proposed assessment against your property for Non-compliance as set forth in the notice. The Fire Department record shows that due process was afforded the Appellant, who accepted that she received all notices.

The record further shows that the Fire Inspector posted the Property with a Notice to abate a nuisance and fire Hazard, the Fire Inspector and the City contractor proved pictures, which depicted the extremely hazardous and volatile conditions that existed at the time of the Non-compliance inspection.

The total assessment due is \$352.00.

LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT FIRE PREVENTION BUREAU

ATTACHMENT 1B



2014 NONCOMPLIANCE FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

**REPORT, PROPOSED DECISIONS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS**

PAGE	INVOICE NUMBER	OWNER
3	IN 150000007	FRED MASHIAN
5	IN 150000021	STEPHEN ROSEMAN
7	IN 150000028	DAVID BARADARIAN
9	IN 150000032	LAWRENCE GRAY
11	IN 150000033	JEANNE SUDDUTH
13	IN 150000034	HYODONG JEONG
15	IN 150000037	MARGARET SOMMERS

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: FRED MASHIAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 9255 SUNSET BLVD. SUITE 630
LOS ANGELES, CA 90069

SITE ADDRESS: 2828 E. 12th STREET,
LOS ANGELES, CA 90023

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000007

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that they purchased the building on June 1, 2011, and was unaware from that time until the LAFD fire inspection on February 8, 2014, that the fire alarm was inoperative.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they complied with the notices of violation by August 5, 2014, and due to financial hardship.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on February 9, 2014.
- Second Inspection conducted on April 24, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Third Inspection conducted on May 29, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Compliant on August 5, 2014.
- Invoice dated January 2, 2015, with a due date of February 1, 2015, for the amount of \$1,584.
- Final Notification dated February 1, 2015, for the amount of \$1,584.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance fees, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department's records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire Inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-

inspections were conducted on the Appellant's property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

The Appellant's own statement, as noted above, is proof that the property was in noncompliance status after the initial inspection until the date of compliance. The fact that the Appellant stated he was unaware that the fire alarm was inoperative cannot be considered as a waiver of the penalty charges. As a property owner, especially a business property owner, he/she has a responsibility to others to ensure his/her building complies with all safety regulations, including fire prevention codes and regulations.

In regards to the Appellant's request for the fees being waived to \$100.00 due to financial hardship, such request cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient evidence to substantiate his waiver request be granted.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$1,584.00.

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: STEPHEN ROSEMAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 5075 VANALDEN AVENUE
TARZANA, CA 91356

SITE ADDRESS: 819 S. Maple Ave, Los Angeles CA 90014

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000021

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states everything on the notice of violation with exception of one item was completed on time. Mr. Roseman used a reputable tester to complete the work on the fire protection systems.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because all but one item was completed on time, and that the "court" told him not to worry since 99% of the work had been done.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on March 25, 2014.
- Second Inspection conducted on April 8, 2014, (Noncompliant Status)
- Third Inspection conducted on August 7, 2014, (Noncompliant Status)
- Compliant on October 14, 2014.
- Invoice dated April 20, 2015, with a due date of May 20, 2015, for the amount of \$2,472.
- Final Notification dated April 20, 2015, for the amount of \$2,472.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance fees, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department's records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire

inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-inspections were conducted on the Appellant's property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

The Appellant's own statement, as noted above, is proof that the property was in noncompliance status after the initial inspection until the date of compliance. The fact that the Appellant believes a penalty charge should not be assessed to his property cannot be considered as compliance is based on the property being 100% in compliance and nothing less.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$2,472.00.

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: DAVID BARADARIAN

MAILING ADDRESS: 748 E. 9th STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90021

SITE ADDRESS: 799 S. TOWNE AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90021

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000028

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states that all fire protection systems needing testing noted on Notice #1401865001 from fire inspection conducted on February 7, 2014, are complete as of October 17, 2014.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on February 7, 2014.
- Second Inspection conducted on March 11, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Third Inspection conducted on March 28, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Forth Inspection conducted on April 4, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Fifth Inspection conducted on August 13, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Sixth Inspection conducted on September 5, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Compliant on October 17, 2014.
- Invoice dated April 2, 2014, with a due date of May 20, 2014, for the amount of \$2,112.
- Final Notification dated April 20, 2014, for the amount of \$2,112.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance fee, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department's records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire

inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-inspections were conducted on the Appellant's property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

The Appellant's own statement, as noted above, is proof that the property was in noncompliance status after the initial inspection until the date of compliance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$2,112.00.

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: LAWRENCE GRAY

MAILING ADDRESS: 2277 E. 15th STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90021

SITE ADDRESS: 2245 E. WASHINGTON BLVD.
LOS ANGELES, CA 90021

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000032

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states the problem with the monitoring system was related to telephone line, not central station. Tenant did due diligence to gain compliance but was not getting cooperation from AT&T to get the phone line working in a timely manner.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they made every attempt to get line repaired and fire protection system operational.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on October 27, 2014.
- Second Inspection conducted on December 10, 2014, (Noncompliant Status).
- Compliant on February 4, 2015.
- Invoice dated May 14, 2015, with a due date of June 3, 2015, for the amount of \$356.
- Final Notification dated May 14, 2015, for the amount of \$356.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance fee, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department's records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire Inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-

inspections were conducted on the Appellant's property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

The Appellant's own statement, as noted above, is proof that the property was in noncompliance status after the initial inspection until the date of compliance. The Appellant did not present sufficient / any proof to prove AT&T was not cooperating with him to have the phone line working properly so that he could meet the compliance deadline.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$356.00.

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: JEANNE SUDDUTH

MAILING ADDRESS: 1105 E. LA DERA DRIVE
LONG BEACH, CA 90807

SITE ADDRESS: 1700 S. Santa Fe Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90021

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000033

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states "the fire department has required all new fire sprinklers and we have complied as quickly as possible."

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they "know nothing regarding non-compliance." See highlight on both notices of violation attached.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on June 14, 2014.
- Second Inspection conducted on November 12, 2013, (Noncompliant Status).
- Compliance NOT indicated in packet.
- Invoice dated May 14, 2015, with a due date of June 13, 2015, for the amount of \$1,056.
- Final Notification dated May 14, 2015, for the amount of \$1,056.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance fee, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department's records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire Inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-

JEANNE SUDDUTH
IN 150000033
Page 2

inspections were conducted on the Appellant's property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. Also, it must be noted that at the time of this recommendation, the property is still not in compliance as required by Fire Prevention Inspection Codes. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$1,056.00.

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: HYODONG JEONG

MAILING ADDRESS: 12354 DREXFORD PLACE
CERRITOS, CA 90703

SITE ADDRESS: 1149 S. BOYLE AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90023

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000034

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states “we received the permit from the City of Los Angeles Building and Safety in July of 2014.” Work is currently underway.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they are currently working on the project.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on March 28, 2014.
- Compliance NOT indicated.
- Invoice dated May 14, 2015, with a due date of June 13, 2015, for the amount of \$1,768.
- Final Notification dated May 14, 2015, for the amount of \$1,768.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant’s statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant’s objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance fee, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department’s records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire Inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-inspections were conducted on the Appellant’s property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they are currently working on the project.

The Appellant's belief that they should not be subject to a penalty charge, based on the fact that they are currently working on the project, cannot not be considered as sufficient evidence to dismiss the noncompliance fees as the property was in fact not in compliance with the fire prevention safety regulations at the time of the inspection. The Appellant's own statement, as noted above, is proof that the property was in noncompliance status after the initial inspection at the time of this recommendation, is still not in compliance as required by fire prevention codes.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate his position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$1,768.00.

2015 FPB NON-COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FEE WRITTEN APPEALS

HEARING DATE: June 30, 2015

NAME: MARGARET SOMMERS

MAILING ADDRESS: 701 WESTERN AVENUE
GLENDALE, CA 91201

SITE ADDRESS: 300 S. Avery St. Los Angeles, CA 90013

INVOICE NUMBER: IN 150000037

SUBSTANCE OF PROTEST

Appellant states, "violation notice issued on September 9, 2014. Violation corrected on October 31, 2014."

Appellant does not believe they should be subject to a penalty charge because they required second inspection on September 9, 2014, and gained compliance on October 21, 2014. However, initial inspection was conducted on June 1, 2014, and no work was done in September of 2014, causing Inspector Garifo to resend the notice of violation.

DEPARTMENT INFORMATION

- First Inspection conducted on June 10, 2014.
- Second Inspection conducted on September 22, 2014, (Noncompliant Status)
- Third Inspection conducted on September 25, 2014, (Noncompliant Status)
- Forth inspection conducted on December 19, 2014, (Noncompliant Status)
- Compliant on October 31, 2014.
- Invoice dated May 14, 2015, with a due date of June 13, 2015, for the amount of \$2,296.
- Final Notification dated May 14, 2015, for the amount of \$2,296.

PROPOSED DECISION AND RECOMMENDATION

Below are the following findings, after the review of the Fire Department and Appellant's statements and/or documents from the Hearing Officer regarding the Appellant's objection for issuance of the Fire Prevention Inspection

MARGARET SOMMERS
IN 150000037
Page 2

Noncompliance Fees, the evidence from the Fire Department and Appellant have been fully reviewed and considered in this recommendation.

The Fire Department's records reflect that the Appellant was afforded due process, as all notices were mailed and received as legally required. The Fire Inspector appeared for the initial and re-inspections at the above referenced Site Address on multiple occasions. Based on the fact that noncompliance re-inspections were conducted on the Appellant's property, fire prevention inspection noncompliance fees were automatically and properly assessed to the property on each noncompliance date.

The Appellant's own statement, as noted above, is proof that the property was in noncompliance status after the initial inspection until the date of compliance.

Based on the aforementioned, the request to dismiss the Fire Prevention Inspection Noncompliance Fees cannot be considered as the Appellant did not present sufficient proof to substantiate her position. The Hearing Officer recommends that the Total Assessment due be upheld.

Total assessment due is \$2,296.00.

**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

RALPH M. TERRAZAS
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 2014 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

RALPH M. TERRAZAS
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 2014 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 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