

CITY OF CLERMONT
CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
MINUTES
MARCH 16, 2026

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Fracasso called the meeting of the Code Enforcement Board to order on Monday, March 16, 2026, at 6:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

NEW BOARD MEMBER SWEARING IN

ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice-Chair Fracasso, Member Vallier, Member Kilburn, Member Connelly, and Member Cornett. Members Camps and Fornoles were not present.

ALSO PRESENT: Code Enforcement Officers Snodgrass and Cortez; Code Enforcement Manager Wallace, Code Board Attorney Brackins, Assistant City Attorney Dyen, Attorney Dan Mantzaris, Planning Manager John Kruse, and Planning Coordinator Rae Chidlow.

MINUTES

Motion to approve the Minutes for the November 17, 2025, Code Enforcement Board Meeting: Moved by Member Cornett; Seconded by Member Connelly. Motion passed 5-0.

OPENING STATEMENT – Vice-Chair Fracasso made the opening remarks.

SWEARING IN WITNESSES

Code Enforcement Officers, Wallace, Snodgrass, Cortez, and city staff, along with any of the public who may testify were sworn in.

Assistant City Attorney Dyen introduced the cases and stated they would be heard in order except for Items 2 and 3 which will not be heard tonight.

NEW BUSINESS

ITEM 1 – CASE NO. 2501-0024

Quan Heng and Xin Wang

LOCATION OF VIOLATION: 240 Edgewood Dr.

REQUEST: Reduction of Fine

Code Enforcement Officer Cortez explained the case. He said the property owner has been sent proper notice and Representative is present. He stated the property is in compliance as of

October 6th, 2025: City's recommendation is to reduce the fine to \$4100 to be paid within 30 days or fine will revert to original amount.

Respondent was present and sworn in.

Heng Quan, 240 Edgewood Dr., apologized for the delay in completing repairs on the property. He explained that there was never any intention of postponing the work and that repairs had been actively underway from the beginning; including both structural repairs and smaller listed items. He stated that all required work has now been completed. He attributed the delay to severe family financial hardship and said he has supporting evidence of their financial situation. He explained that both him and his wife have very limited income and mentioned providing W-2 income documentation for both. It was suggested not to submit due to social security being on the documents.

Board member Kilburn asked if this was a rental property with a tenant.

Mr. Quan stated that it was.

Member Connelly made a motion to reduce the fine to \$4100 to be paid by April 16, 2026; Seconded by Member Kilburn. Motion passed 5-0 in approval.

Respondent Heng Quan requested for an extended time to pay if he could not have full reduction of the fine.

Member Connelly made a motion to reduce the fine to \$4100 to be paid by July 16, 2026; Seconded by Member Kilburn. Motion passed 5-0 in approval.

ITEM 4 – CASE NO. 26-000031

Sunshine Properties, LLC

LOCATION OF VIOLATION: 831 Oakley Seaver Dr.

REPEAT VIOLATION: NFPA 1 Chapter 18.2.2.2 Access to Gated Subdivisions; Chapter 18.2.2.3 Access Maintenance; Chapter 4.5.8 Maintenance, Inspection, and Testing

Code Enforcement Officer Cortez and Fire Butler explained the case. He said the property owner has been sent proper notice. He stated the property is not in compliance. City's recommendation is to find Respondent in repeat violation and to assess a daily fine of \$500 for February 4, 2026, and \$500 per day starting March 16, 2026, for every day the property remains in violation.

Board member Cornett asked for the status of repairs discussed at the previous meeting in September. He recalled that there had been a list of required repairs for the property, including issues with the gate, a locking door, and several other items. He asked for clarification, stating that they assumed the other repairs had already been completed and that the gate remained the only unresolved issue.

Fire Inspector Amber Butler clarified that was correct.

Vice Chair Fracasso asked if there was a Knox box for the gate.

Ms. Butler stated they had keys inside, but they did not operate. She explained that emergency personnel had requested keys multiple times but were unable to obtain them. As a result, responders previously had to force the lock when responding to an emergency call. She stated that emergency vehicles entered through another side and had to maneuver carefully, including backing through the property. She noted that approximately eight or nine fire trucks were involved and stated that if the gate had been functioning properly, these logistical access issues could have been avoided.

Respondent was present and sworn in.

Coryn Ettinger, 831 Oakley Seaver Dr., addressed the board regarding ongoing compliance issues at the property, stating that the property had previously achieved full compliance before the recent incident involving a reported potential structure fire. She clarified that the emergency call was triggered by a burning smell caused by turning on the heat for the first time, and not sure why it was immediately assumed to be a structure fire. She explained that multiple people had been asked for keys before asking her. She provided the key but by that time a door had already been forced open. She noted that the building contains 144 units, multiple secured areas, and numerous keys due to its size and access control systems. She emphasized that they willingly provided keys for public areas and only hesitated when access to individual apartments was requested because of legal obligations to notify residents unless there is a clear emergency exception. She stated that regarding the gate issue, she was not informed about the malfunction until the day after the incident, despite fire officials and property representatives being present during the event. She argued that earlier verbal communication could have allowed the issue to be addressed more quickly if safety was truly the priority. Once notified, she arranged for a vendor to inspect and repair the gate within 24 hours and coordinated testing with the fire department because the gate operates on a radio frequency system only emergency personnel can test. She stated that the gate was tested and confirmed compliant afterward. She explained that since the repair, there had been no activity or calls indicating the gate was malfunctioning again, leaving them unaware of any continuing issue. She said they were informed of a new non-compliance issue only shortly before the hearing and immediately contacted a vendor to investigate the problem the next day. She expressed frustration that officials responded to other parts of their email correspondence but did not clearly explain what specific malfunction occurred during the latest inspection. She also noted that photographs shown during the hearing had not previously been provided to them. She clarified that they had requested the opportunity to be present during inspections only to better understand any issues and not to receive special treatment or avoid proper documentation and enforcement procedures.

Vice Chair Fracasso asked if the keypad opens the gate.

Ms. Ettinger stated that it did not open the gate.

Board member Kilburn stated that it seems very problematic that the owner or manager cannot test the gate.

Ms. Butler stated that inside the box for the gate, there should be a test button.

Board member Cornett suggested that it was in the Respondent's best interest to have the gate tested on a routine basis.

Ms. Ettinger stated that it is something they are already putting into effect and has a company who is doing a bid.

Board member Connelly questioned the maintenance and repairs of the gate.

Ms. Ettinger explained that neither she nor the current owner were involved in the original construction project or installation of the gate system because the property was purchased around 2020. She stated they do not know which company originally installed the access control. She stated that the manufacturer does not perform physical repairs, but they are using Insight Security, which is experienced and reliable. She confirmed they have an invoice documenting the repair work and technician notes and could provide it if needed. She mentioned that Ms. Butler and the technician tested the gate together, and it was functioning at that time, however malfunctioned again. She stated that an inspection is scheduled for 10:00 a.m. the following day with both parties expected to attend.

Ms. Butler stated that the repairs seem to be temporary and not a permanent solution.

Member Cornett made a motion to find the Respondent is in repeat violation and to impose a fine for the violation on February 4, 2026, of \$500, and \$500 per day for every day in violation starting March 17, 2026; Seconded by Member Vallier. Motion passed 5-0 in approval.

ITEM 5 – CASE NO. 26-000004

Kolb Trust

LOCATION OF VIOLATION: 1919 Sunset Lane

VIOLATION: Section 18-53 (2)(3)(11) Nuisances; Section 18-54 Creation of Nuisance by Property Owner Declared Unlawful; Section 18-92 Prohibition of Storage of Certain Items

Code Enforcement Officer Snodgrass explained the case. He said the property owner has been sent proper notice and is present. He stated the property is not in compliance. City's recommendation is to find Respondent in violation and to assess a daily fine of \$250 per day for every day the property remains in violation after March 26, 2026.

Respondent was present and sworn in.

Chase Kolb explained that he was appearing on behalf of his father, who owns the property and stated that he is the tenant at the property. He stated that items and debris around the carport area were currently being cleaned up and should be removed within a week. He acknowledged the recurring issues and explained that part of the problem stemmed from allowing people of a nearby homeless community to use the property to charge phones, shower, and temporarily leave belongings in the carport area while moving between locations. He stated that he was not intentionally creating a nuisance and noted that some earlier violations were related to his own

outdoor work area before he understood the applicable property maintenance codes. He stated that he has since been educated on the requirements and is working to correct the situation. Pat Woodhouse, 2010 Sunset Lane, spoke about ongoing problems associated with 1919 Sunset Lane, describing it as a persistent nuisance and safety hazard since 2022. She stated that the property has had repeated police activity, including a death from a drug overdose, SWAT team interventions, and multiple arrests, creating fear and instability for nearby residents. She thanked local police and code enforcement officials for their continued response efforts and described frequent foot traffic, alleged homeless activity, hoarding conditions, junk accumulation, and suspected drug-related issues at the property. She expressed concern about the impact on neighborhood safety, property values, and her ability to rent nearby homes she owns, noting that prospective tenants have referred to the property as a junkyard. She also raised concerns about pit bulls roaming the neighborhood, including incidents on her property late at night, and stated that residents are afraid to let children outside. She argued that the property remains occupied despite being red-tagged and urged officials to impose stronger enforcement measures, fines, and abatement actions, stating that temporary cleanups have repeatedly failed to resolve the underlying issues. She asked the Board to take decisive action to protect the neighborhood and restore safety and quality of life for residents.

Daryll Woodhouse, 2010 Sunset Lane, also expressed concerns about the property, describing it as a long-standing and recurring nuisance that has persisted for years despite repeated involvement from code enforcement. He stated that temporary cleanups occur, but conditions quickly deteriorate again, with constant traffic to and from the property at all hours of the day and night. He expressed the belief that the property owner's attempts to help homeless individuals were instead enabling ongoing drug-related activity and disorder in the neighborhood. He stated that complaints from multiple neighbors regarding noise, suspicious activity, and trash accumulation, noting that while some behavior appeared to improve after a fatal overdose occurred on the property's front lawn, but that the overall problems continue. He characterized the property as a serious nuisance that has exhausted nearby residents and urged officials to take stronger action to finally resolve the situation.

Tabatha Sullivan, 1919 Sunset Lane, stated that the man who died on the front lawn was her brother and that his death was caused by a heart attack related to ongoing health problems, not a drug overdose. She acknowledged the condition of the property and stated that she and her boyfriend have been actively working to clean it up and have removed and discarded large amounts of accumulated items. She emphasized their intention to be good neighbors and noted that areas including the garden, carport, and side yard have all been addressed as part of the cleanup effort. She stated that they are attempting to correct all violations identified by code enforcement and are actively working toward compliance.

Member Connelly made a motion to find the Respondent is in violation and to impose a fine of \$250 per day for every day after March 26, 2026; Seconded by Member Kilburn. Motion passed 5-0 in approval.

ITEM 6 – CASE NO. 25-000144

Dutes Family Trust

LOCATION OF VIOLATION: 1849 Moorings Ct.

VIOLATION: Section 101-178 (a) Development Order and Permit Required; Section 105-77 (a)(b) Violations; Enforcement; Section 105-78 Permit Required for Modification of Grade; Section 105-79 (a) Grading Plans; Section 105-84 Required Soil Conservation Measures

Code Enforcement Officer Cortez explained the case. He said the property owner has been sent proper notice and is present. He stated the property is not in compliance. City's recommendation is to find Respondent in violation and to assess a daily fine of \$150 per day for every day the property remains in violation after April 15, 2026.

A Representative was present and sworn in.

Frantz Dutes explained that he and his wife purchased property at 1849 Mooring Court with the intention of building a home and moving closer to their children and grandchildren in Clermont. He stated that they secured a construction loan through Regions Bank and entered into a contract with Westmont Homes to build the residence. He stated that Westmont Homes began construction and drew approximately \$90,000 from the loan but failed to meet numerous obligations and requirements throughout the project. He alleged that the builder failed to obtain HOA approval, comply with architectural review standards, complete construction within the timeframe required by the bank, and secure the necessary building permits before performing substantial work on the property. He also stated that the builder removed a large oak tree and failed to follow the agreed-upon construction specifications for the home. He emphasized that his family continues to pay interest on the unfinished loan while dealing with the consequences of the failed project. He acknowledged that he has some responsibility but argued that Westmont Homes bears primary responsibility for the situation and requested that the Board require the company to correct the violations, repair the property, and restore the site to code compliance.

Code Enforcement Attorney Patrick Brackins explained that while the property owners may have a private legal claim against Westmont Homes for the problems related to the construction project, the city's code enforcement authority under Chapter 162 applies only to the legal owner of the property, not to contractors or third parties. He stated that the board cannot issue enforcement orders or fines against Westmont Homes because they do not own the property. He stated that the Board does have discretion in setting a compliance deadline before fines begin to accrue. He noted that the recommended compliance date was April 15th, but the property owners could request additional time for compliance consideration. He emphasized that code enforcement actions are directed solely at property owners, similar to how renters cannot be held responsible through code enforcement proceedings against a property.

Vice Chair Fracasso asked the Respondent if he intends to continue working with Westmont Homes or engage with a new builder or architect to complete the drawings for permitting.

Mr. Dutes stated that at this time they no longer are interested in living at The Mooring and will put the property up for sale. He requested an extension to bring the property back into compliance.

Member Kilburn made a motion to find the Respondent is in violation and to impose a fine of \$150 per day for every day after June 15, 2026, if Respondent does not comply with this order.

The Respondent is ordered to contact the Code Enforcement Officer to arrange an inspection of the property to verify compliance with the order; Seconded by Member Vallier. Motion passed 5-0 in approval.

ITEM 7 – CASE NO. 25-000196

American Residential Leasing Company LLC

LOCATION OF VIOLATION: 1260 North Ridge Blvd.

VIOLATION: IPMC 110.2 Temporary Safeguards; IPMC 302.2 Grading and Drainage

Code Enforcement Officer Cortez explained the case. He said the property owner has been sent proper notice and is present. He stated the property is in compliance. City's recommendation is to find Respondent was in violation and to assess no fine at this time.

Daniel Dominguez, District Manager for American Homes for Rent, explained that after the company received notice of the violation, multiple vendors were sent to inspect the problem, but initially none were able to determine the cause. He stated that he did find a vendor who identified the issue as being related to the irrigation system, which was causing the erosion. He stated that a vendor may have assumed the caution tape already placed around the area satisfied the requirement for safeguarding the site and therefore did not take additional action. He emphasized that the company made efforts to resolve the issue as quickly as possible and offered updated contact information to help improve communication and response times in the future, noting that delays sometimes occur when messages are routed through out-of-state offices before reaching local management.

Katie Spilker stated that she rents the property along with her husband and four children. She described ongoing safety and maintenance concerns related to the erosion issue on the property. She stated that her family had reported the problem to American Homes for Rent months before code enforcement became involved, after her autistic two-year-old child fell into the hole. She stated that American Homes for Rent was aware of the dangerous condition and sent multiple contractors to inspect it, but the issue remained unresolved and worsened over time. She emphasized that it posed a serious danger to her family and could have resulted in severe injury or tragedy. She expressed frustration that no protective fencing was installed by the property management company, noting that code enforcement ultimately handled the safety measures. She also criticized the company's handling of repairs, stating that construction equipment damaged the front yard and irrigation system during remediation efforts and that repeated maintenance requests afterward were ignored. She mentioned that the company failed to show adequate concern for tenant safety despite the family paying significant monthly rent and being unable to safely use their backyard.

Douglas Spilker explained that the erosion problem was caused by the irrigation system and questioned why the issue had still not been repaired if the cause had already been identified. He stated that despite repeated calls to the property management company, little action had been taken beyond obtaining an estimate, after which communication apparently stopped. He stated the company repeatedly sent different contractors to inspect the problem rather than addressing it, seemingly seeking a more favorable answer instead of completing repairs. He emphasized that meaningful action only occurred after code enforcement became involved following a

recommendation from a neighbor employed by the City of Clermont. He stated that the property management company had been aware of the issue since August but continued delaying repairs while the hazardous condition persisted. He questioned why the irrigation system itself still had not been fixed if it was truly the source of the problem.

Mr. Dominguez stated he was not previously aware of any issues with the property other than a formal complaint or violation received around November or December. He said he would investigate the reported irrigation problem at the front of the property and confirmed he had an open maintenance work order related to the issue, though he was unable to determine its status at the time. He committed to following up with the residents and ensuring the repair request will be prioritized.

Vice Chair Fracasso criticized the property management for delays, stating that despite paying substantial rent, tenants were ignored and the issue took around three months to resolve, with multiple vendors being sent instead of direct action being taken. He stated that this approach reflected poor responsibility and lack of urgency from the landlord.

Mr. Dominguez explained that vendors were hired to diagnose the issue and that the company relies on professional assessments to determine the cause before taking corrective action.

Member Cornett made a motion to find the Respondent was in violation but currently in compliance; Seconded by Member Kilburn. Motion passed 5-0 with approval.

AJDOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:38 pm.


Chair Linda Camps

Attest:


Rae Chidlow; Planning Coordinator