

MINUTES OF THE CITIZENS CODE ENFORCEMENT BOARD
HEARING HELD AT 4:30 P.M.
MARCH 21ST, 2006
UTILITIES COMMISSION, 3RD FLOOR, DEBERRY ROOM, 200 CANAL STREET
NEW SMYRNA BEACH, FLORIDA

The Hearing of March 21st, 2006 was called to order at 4:30 p.m. Answering to roll call:

Maggie Hawk (Chairperson)
John Shelby (Vice Chairperson)
Michael E. Slayton
Jay Crocker (arrived at 4:40 pm)
Elliott Hoffman
Susan Ellis
Carol Kerrigan

Also present were Code Enforcement Supervisor Lynne Kunkle, Code Enforcement Officer Barbara Bobelak, City Attorney Frank Gummey and Administrative Specialist Inga Campbell.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Carol Kerrigan nominated Michael Slayton for Chairperson; seconded by Maggie Hawk.

Maggie Hawk nominated John Shelby for Vice-Chairperson; seconded by Susan Ellis.

Elections passed unanimously on roll call vote 6-0.

Chairperson Michael Slayton assumed his role as Chairperson.

DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS:

Members of the Citizens Code Enforcement Board are asked to please disclose, for the record, the substance of any ex parte communications that have occurred prior to this public hearing.

Chairperson Slayton stated for the record there were no disclosures.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 21st, 2006

Susan Ellis made a motion to approve the minutes as written; seconded by Elliott Hoffman. Motion passed unanimously on roll call vote 6-0.

SWEARING OF CITY STAFF:

Regina Lynne Kunkle, Code Enforcement Supervisor and Barbara Jo Bobelak, Code Enforcement Officer were sworn for testimony.

OLD BUSINESS:

C2006-0020: Charles G. Baldwin

[Served]

Violation of §74-146 of the City Code of Ordinances by permitting a Business operation (Real Estate Agent) without having paid the occupational license tax located at 216 Flagler Avenue.

October 18th, 2005: The Board continued this case until March 21st, 2006.

Chairperson Slayton stated for the record no one was present to represent this case.

Ms. Bobelak stated Mr. John Hagood approved the occupational license today and more time would be needed to complete the occupational license process. Ms. Bobelak recommended continuing this case until April 18th, 2006.

John Shelby made a motion to continue this case until the April 18th, 2006 meeting; seconded by Susan Ellis. Motion passed unanimously on roll call vote 6-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

C2006-0098: Arthur J. Sullivan, Jr.

[Served & Posted]

Violation of §38-113 of the City Code of Ordinances by permitting or causing to be permitted discarded and abandoned building materials, boat motors, machinery, waste material and trailers upon the subject property located at 306 Winefred Avenue.

Violation of §70-38 of the City Code of Ordinances by permitting or causing to be permitted discarded and abandoned building materials, boat motors, machinery, waste material, trailers, recreational equipment and a vehicle in excess of one (1) ton rated

capacity obstructing and encroaching upon a public street located at 306 Winefred Avenue.

Violation of §802.03 D. of the Land Development Regulations by permitting or causing to be permitted a truck in excess of one (1) ton rated capacity to be parked in a residentially zoned district (R2) located at 306 Winefred Avenue.

Violation of §802.04 of the Land Development Regulations by permitting or causing to be permitted the storage of more than two (2) pieces of recreational vehicles upon the subject property located at 306 Winefred Avenue.

Arthur J. Sullivan, Jr. was sworn for testimony.

Chairperson Slayton asked Mr. Sullivan if he received the notice of violation and if he understood and agreed to those violations.

Mr. Sullivan testified he did receive the notice and understood and agreed to the violations.

Mr. Sullivan stated he did have questions and had addressed them with Ms. Bobelak.

Mr. Gummey asked Mr. Sullivan if he contested or agreed with the charges.

Mr. Sullivan stated he had not taken a stand on either of the issues.

Mr. Gummey recommended Chairperson Slayton have the City present its case.

Ms. Bobelak submitted to the Board photographs of the property she took on February 8th, 2006 as well as updated photographs taken by her on March 21st, 2006. Ms. Bobelak showed the photographs to Mr. Sullivan before submitting to the Board.

Mr. Sullivan acknowledged these photographs were of his property.

Ms. Bobelak testified these violations are in progress and stated the second set of photographs show some of the progress. Ms. Bobelak stated the motor home, a boat and some boat motors have been removed. Ms. Bobelak stated Mr. Sullivan is also in the process of removing the vehicle in excess of one (1) ton. Ms. Bobelak recommended the Board continue this case until April 18th, 2006 since progress is being made and Mr. Sullivan is working with Staff.

Ms. Kerrigan asked Mr. Sullivan if he felt as though he could finish this violation in thirty (30) days.

Mr. Sullivan stated he could finish in thirty (30) days. Mr. Sullivan stated he was uncertain about the issue regarding the work truck for his small contracting business on his property. Mr. Sullivan stated he is being charged with the truck being in excess of one (1) ton and stated it is about the same size as an F350 and he thought everyone was allowed to have a truck of that size on his or her property. Mr. Sullivan stated it would be a lot easier for him to keep the truck on his property.

Ms. Bobelak stated Mr. Sullivan was not allowed to keep a commercial rated vehicle in a residential area.

Mr. Sullivan asked what determined a commercial rated vehicle.

Ms. Kunkle stated the Land Development Regulations states a commercial rated vehicle is based on rated capacity of the vehicle.

Mr. Sullivan asked what was the definition of one (1) ton.

Ms. Kunkle stated it was the rated capacity, which is the weight of what the truck can carry including a full tank of gas, the weight of the driver as well as the weight of the load.

Mr. Sullivan stated that would be every pick-up truck because they could carry more than one (1) ton.

Ms. Kunkle stated up to a one (1) ton rated capacity vehicle may be allowed on residential property and up to a one and a half (1 ½) ton rated capacity vehicle in a fully enclosed garage; however, anything exceeding that is not allowed in a residentially zoned district. Ms. Kunkle stated if the Board wanted to continue this case until the April 18th, 2006 meeting, Ms. Bobelak and Ms. Kunkle would research this issue and ask the owner to provide a copy of his registration for the truck showing exactly how the vehicle is rated.

Carol Kerrigan made a motion to continue this case until the April 18th, 2006 meeting with the condition that Staff research this issue and Mr. Sullivan provide a copy of the truck's registration to Staff showing the exact vehicle rating; seconded by Jay Crocker. Motion passed unanimously on roll call vote 7-0.

REPEAT BUSINESS:

C2006-0140: Mark Dam/Beachside Tavern

[Served]

Violation of §38-73 of the City Code of Ordinances by permitting or causing to be permitted music to be played in such a manner that it was plainly audible while standing

within the boundary limits of an adjacent property zoned for residential use on November 10th, 2005 at 22:53, November 18th, 2005 at 23:55, December 28th, 2005 at 01:04, January 19th, 2006 at 00:05, January 28th, 2006 at 23:40, January 29, 2006 at 00:22, February 3rd, 2006 at 23:59 and February 5th, 2006 at 00:56 located at 690 3rd Avenue.

September 2, 2005: The Board found this case in compliance at the time of the Hearing but found Mr. Dam had been in violation of §38-73. (12) of the City Code of Ordinances and ordered Mr. Dam to pay a fine of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) per day for each and every day a repeat offense occurred past the 2nd day of September 2005.

Mark Dam was sworn for testimony.

Chairperson Slayton asked Mr. Dam if he understood the violations.

Mr. Dam stated he understood the violations.

Chairperson Slayton asked Mr. Dam if he agreed or disagreed with the violations.

Mr. Dam testified he agreed with the violations of: November 10th, 2005, November 18th, 2005, December 28th, 2005, January 19th, 2006 and February 5th, 2006.

Mr. Dam testified he contested the violations of: January 28th, 2006, January 29th, 2006 and February 3rd, 2006.

Mr. Gummey advised Chairperson Slayton it would be appropriate to make a finding on the matters that are uncontested and then consider the contested matters.

Jay Crocker made a motion finding Mr. Dam in violation for the following dates: November 10th, 2005, November 18th, 2005, December 28th, 2005, January 19th, 2006 and February 5th, 2006; seconded by John Shelby. Motion passed unanimously on roll call vote 7-0.

Mr. Gummey advised Chairperson Slayton that the procedure was to let the City present its case on the alleged violations.

Ms. Kunkle called Officer Mathyas to testify.

Officer Michael Mathyas was sworn for testimony.

Officer Mathyas reviewed his report then testified on January 28th, 2006 at 11:40 pm he received a call of loud music coming from Beachside Tavern. Officer

Mathyas stated he responded to 715 E 2nd Avenue, which is the apartment complex directly behind Beachside Tavern. Officer Mathyas stated he parked on 2nd Avenue and walked up through the courtyard of the apartments to see if he could hear music coming from the bar. Officer Mathyas stated he stood even with the apartment building and was able to hear music coming from Beachside Tavern. Officer Mathyas made contact with the complainant who advised this had been an on-going problem. Officer Mathyas advised the complainant he would walk to Beachside Tavern and speak with Mr. Dam and ask the music to be turned down. Officer Mathyas stated he walked to Beachside Tavern and informed Mr. Dam of the violation and Mr. Dam stated the music would be turned down and that would be the end of the issues for that evening.

Officer Mathyas stated on January 29th, 2006 at 12:22 am he received a call for loud music coming from Beachside Tavern. Officer Mathyas stated he parked on 2nd Avenue and walked up to see if the music could be heard from the apartment complex. Officer Mathyas stated he was able to hear the music coming from the Beachside Tavern. Officer Mathyas stated he walked to Beachside Tavern and informed Mr. Dam that he could hear the music and Mr. Dam advised he would turn the music down and that would be the end of the noise for the evening. Officer Mathyas stated their policy states every time an officer gets called to Beachside Tavern and observe a violation a report is required.

Mr. Gummey stated Mr. Dam could ask any questions he had for this officer.

Mr. Dam stated he had no questions for this officer.

Ms. Hawk asked Officer Mathyas if he was able to distinguish words within the music.

Officer Mathyas stated he did not recall but on one occasion he was there he could hear the words but he was unsure of the date.

Ms. Hawk asked if the music was live music or recorded music.

Officer Mathyas stated he believed both times were live music.

Ms. Kunkle called Officer Dorothy Kirby to testify.

Officer Dorothy Kirby was sworn for testimony.

Officer Kirby testified when a call is received on Beachside Tavern a report must be written if the violation is heard. Officer Kirby stated on February 3rd, 2006 at 11:59 pm her report stated she heard the bass coming from the Beachside Tavern. Officer Kirby stated she made contact with Mr. Dam then stood by to see

that the music was turned down. Officer Kirby stated most of the noise was people laughing and yelling coming from the parking lot.

Chairperson Slayton asked Officer Kirby where she was located when she first heard the noise.

Officer Kirby testified she approached from 2nd Avenue and Horton Street from the condominium property.

Ms. Hawk asked Officer Kirby if she was able to distinguish the words to the music.

Officer Kirby stated she could just hear the bass vibrating.

Ms. Hawk asked if the music was live or recorded.

Officer Kirby stated it was live music. Officer Kirby stated once she told Mr. Dam the music was too loud he walked over and turned the music down. Officer Kirby stated she stayed for a while and the music did cease. Officer Kirby stated she drove by later that evening the noise was mostly from patrons in the parking lot.

Mr. Dam stated he just wanted to read the narrative that was in the police report. Mr. Dam stated the narrative read as follows: "I responded to Beachside Tavern in reference to a noise complaint. Upon my arrival I went to the rear of the business where the complainant lives and stood by for a few minutes. I did hear a bass noise coming from Beachside Tavern and made contact with the complainant and the manager of Beachside Tavern. The manager advised he would have the band turn the bass down and stood by at the corner of Cooper and 3rd Avenue waiting to see if the music was too loud and could not hear anything. I drove by the front of the business and still could not hear the music. Note: Most of the noise I heard from Beachside Tavern was loud talking, laughing and vehicle engines starting up from people leaving." Mr. Dam asked Officer Kirby if this was the case.

Officer Kirby stated she believed that is what she just said.

Mr. Dam stated after reading the narrative, he felt the music was not louder than people talking or laughing.

Officer Kirby stated when she approached the complainant, who lives right behind the building, which was where she parked and could hear the bass from there. Officer Kirby stated she exited the car and she believed Mr. Dam was in their parking lot when she met him.

Ms. Kunkle asked Officer Kirby about the note on her report stating the noise was mostly loud talking, laughing and vehicle engines and wanted to know if this was from the first time she was there or when she drove by the second time that evening.

Officer Kirby stated that noise was going on the entire time for both visits.

Ms. Kunkle stated she had no further witnesses or further testimony.

Mr. Dam stated he would like the February 3rd, 2006 case dismissed based on the fact that he believes the narrative on the police report does not support a noise violation. Mr. Dam stated on the prior report with Officer Mathyas he felt at least one of those cases should be dismissed based on the proximity of time of the reports.

Chairperson Slayton asked Mr. Dam if he turned the music down after the officer requested him to on the January 28th, 2006 incident.

Mr. Dam testified he was certain the music was turned down. Mr. Dam stated in Officer Mathyas' report it stated that he told the officer the band was done and he would assume that if he stated the band was done then the band was done so he is a little confused. Mr. Dam stated he does not recall verbatim what happened that evening other than what is on the police report.

Ms. Hawk asked Mr. Dam if the music was live how could that be turned down.

Mr. Dam stated he now required all bands to plug into his mixer and he has control over that mixer. Mr. Dam stated most of these incidents stem from a big band. Mr. Dam stated there had been meetings following all these incidents and he felt a conclusion had been reached that remedied the situation further. Mr. Dam stated he monitors the situation and turns the music down when he feels it is getting too loud.

Mr. Hoffman stated the incident on January 28th, 2006 the officer appeared and Mr. Dam stated he would cut down the music but another call came in 45 minutes later, which became January 29th, 2006 and the noise was still there. Mr. Hoffman asked Mr. Dam how he cut the music down then get another call for a complaint.

Mr. Dam stated that is what he is contesting because he was certain the music was turned down.

Ms. Ellis asked Mr. Dam what time the band usually stopped playing.

Mr. Dam stated the bands now stop playing at midnight; however, in the past the bands played until 2 am. Since September 12th, 2005, the bands played until 1 am but now the bands stop at midnight.

Ms. Ellis asked Mr. Dam if the band stopped playing at midnight on January 28th and January 29th, 2006.

Mr. Dam stated he was not stating that they did or did not because he told the officer he would stop the music and ordinarily if he says he will stop the music then he will stop the music. Mr. Dam stated it is not a recurring instance where an officer had to come back once they have made contact with him. Mr. Dam stated beyond that he feels it is a same business day violation and that is what he is contesting.

Ms. Kerrigan asked Mr. Dam if the officer came back again and had another discussion with him.

Mr. Dam testified that is what the police report stated.

Ms. Kerrigan asked Mr. Dam if he did not recall having a second discussion with a police officer 40 minutes later.

Mr. Dam testified this incident was 50 days ago.

Ms. Kerrigan stated she believed the average person would remember if a police officer came to their facility twice in one night.

Mr. Hoffman stated he appreciated what Mr. Dam was saying that the two incidents were the same day but this is two separate days separated by 45 minutes. Mr. Hoffman stated this was at night time so the officer must have responded to another call that came in to the police station that he returned at that time.

Mr. Dam stated for him it was the same business day.

Mr. Crocker stated Mr. Dam mentioned meetings that might have come to some sort of resolution or remedy to the problem and asked who attended these meetings.

Mr. Dam testified on February 10th, 2006 he had a meeting with Commander Drossman, the neighbors that were affected, Lynne Kunkle and Barbara Bobelak. Mr. Dam stated since that meeting there have been no violations and he believes the situation is under control. Mr. Dam testified he is waiting for architectural drawings to come through and he felt as though he is in compliance.

Mr. Crocker asked Mr. Dam if it was his testimony today that since February 10th, 2006 none of those neighbors, if asked, would state that there had been any noise ordinance violations.

Mr. Dam testified he had the police report stating there had not been any violations; however, he believes they are happy.

Mr. Crocker stated it might help Mr. Dam's case if he had the residents present and could call them to testify.

Mr. Dam called June Whaley to testify.

June Whaley was sworn for testimony.

Mr. Crocker asked Mr. Dam if he wanted to inquire of Ms. Whaley or if he wished for him to inquire of her.

Mr. Dam stated Mr. Crocker could inquire of Ms. Whaley.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Whaley if she lived in Callalisa Apartments.

Ms. Whaley stated she lived in Callalisa Apartments approximately 25 feet from the bar.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Whaley if she had problems with the noise out of Mr. Dam's bar in the past.

Ms. Whaley stated she has had problems with the noise for approximately a year and a half.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Whaley if she met with Mr. Dam on February 10th, 2006.

Ms. Whaley stated she was in attendance at the meeting.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Whaley if Mr. Dam made promises to make the noise go away.

Ms. Whaley stated not exactly. Ms. Whaley testified the meeting was with the Code Officers, the other residents from the condominium that are affected, Commander Drossman, Mr. Dam and his attorney. Ms. Whaley testified that Commander Drossman informed Mr. Dam that it would be zero tolerance from here on out and that if Mr. Dam did not comply he would go to jail. Ms. Whaley stated since that meeting she has not had a problem. Ms. Whaley stated every once in a while she would hear something but it is not bad enough to make a

fuss. Ms. Whaley stated they still have a problem with the parking lot, cars, trash, noise and fights. Ms. Whaley stated she had not been bothered with the music.

Mr. Dam asked Julie Lloyd to testify.

Julie Lloyd was sworn for testimony.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Lloyd if she lived in Callalisa Apartments.

Ms. Lloyd stated she did.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Lloyd if she had been bothered by noise in the past.

Ms. Lloyd stated she had been bothered in the past by noise.

Mr. Crocker asked if Ms. Lloyd had appeared before this Board before.

Ms. Lloyd stated she had.

Mr. Crocker asked if Ms. Lloyd had met with Commander Drossman, Mr. Dam and Mr. Dam's attorney on February 10th, 2006.

Ms. Lloyd stated she was present at the meeting.

Mr. Crocker asked what promises were made to Ms. Lloyd during this meeting.

Ms. Lloyd stated she did not think any promises were made but the problem was talked about without coming to a lot of resolution. Ms. Lloyd stated Commander Drossman was very clear that if the noise did not stop or get a lot better that more severe consequences would take place.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Lloyd if since February 10th, 2006 she had been bothered by noise out of Beachside Tavern.

Ms. Lloyd stated she had heard noise from Beachside Tavern on a couple of occasions; however, it has not been as extreme. Ms. Lloyd stated she called the police one evening but the noise was coming from Clancy's who was having a fundraiser.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Lloyd if she recalled what night that was.

Ms. Lloyd stated it was in February sometime maybe being around the 25th.

Mr. Crocker stated the night she had called the police it was important.

Ms. Lloyd stated her and her husband went out to speak with two officers when they realized it was not Beachside Tavern.

Mr. Crocker stated the reason he asked the date of the night Ms. Lloyd had called the police was because he was in the Beachside Tavern on that night right after attending the concert at Clancy's.

Mr. Crocker asked Ms. Lloyd if she had not been bothered since February 10th, 2006.

Ms. Lloyd stated she had not been bothered enough to call the police.

Mr. Dam stated the meeting was intended originally to see if everyone affected to come to some sort of resolution. Mr. Dam stated at the September meeting where the \$500.00 fine was established, his attorney Ty Harris and himself, tried to meet with the neighbors affected but they did not want to meet; therefore, February 10th, 2006 was the first opportunity he had to meet with them.

Ms. Kerrigan stated violations from January 28th, 2006, January 29th, 2006 and February 3rd, 2006 are all repeat violations. Ms. Kerrigan stated the only thing that changed this was that Mr. Dam was told he would be arrested. Ms. Kerrigan stated this in her mind clinches the fact that all of these violations should apply. Ms. Kerrigan stated the police department had to continuously go on calls to Beachside Tavern, Code Enforcement has heard from the neighbors repeatedly and this has absorbed a lot of Staff time. Ms. Kerrigan stated Mr. Dam should have understood from the last time before this Board what the fines were and she would not support any motion that would exclude Mr. Dam from these additional three dates.

Mr. Crocker stated he would like to go ahead and resolve the issue of violation and would like to hold off on the penalty phase of this case.

Mr. Crocker made a motion to find Mr. Dam in violation on the January 28th, 2006, January 29th, 2006 and February 3rd, 2006 offenses; seconded by John Shelby.

Mr. Hoffman asked Mr. Gummey if anything could be brought up at this meeting about the health safety involved in the community based on the first testimony about the fighting in the parking lot of their condo association.

Mr. Gummey stated this Board is dealing with violations of the specific codes at this meeting and there are circumstances that could be taken into consideration in the penalty phase but in the violation phase the interest is in testimony relevant to the violations of §38-73 of the City Code of Ordinances.

Motion passed unanimously on roll call vote 7-0.

Mr. Crocker stated now the Board can discuss the penalty phase and whether or not it should be imposed today or if the penalty should wait to see if Mr. Dam is able to build up a track record and possibly persuade this Board to provide some sort of mitigation and leniency. Mr. Crocker stated that Mr. Dam has been found in violation at whatever time, whether it is today or next month, the Board can charge Mr. Dam up to \$500.00 for each violation. Mr. Dam might feel this is incentive to abide by the agreement.

Chairperson Slayton stated Mr. Dam knew there was a \$500.00 possible violation every time there was an offense past September 2005.

Mr. Crocker stated there was testimony since February 10th, 2006 meeting Mr. Dam had kept the noise down. Mr. Crocker stated ultimately this Board wants people to be in compliance and this is not all about the money.

Mr. Dam stated he is not trying to avoid this issue but waiting on architects to provide him plans for renovation that includes soundproofing but it has taken three (3) months to get any drawings.

Mr. Gummey stated the Board could either impose penalties or as Mr. Crocker suggested continue the case for determination of the penalties to a future time.

Elliott Hoffman stated he wanted to refer back to the meeting of September 2nd, 2005 in dispute with Mr. Crocker. The wording stated, *"The Board found this case in compliance at the time of the Hearing but found Mr. Dam had been in violation of §38-73. (12) of the City Code of Ordinances and ordered Mr. Dam to pay a fine of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) per day for each and every day a repeat offense occurred past the 2nd day of September 2005."* This motion did not say "up to" it says \$500.00 a day past the 2nd day of September 2005 and there have been eight (8) offenses that totals \$4,000.00. Mr. Hoffman stated there are no second chances this is \$4,000.00.

Mr. Crocker stated he was not certain that was necessarily accurate because it has been the practice of this Board to not determine what the Board would do in advance and he would like to check the minutes. Mr. Crocker stated he believed there was a very good chance that what the Board said was that the Board warned him that because any future violations would be a repeat violation he would be subject up to \$500.00.

Ms. Kerrigan stated this Board had warned Mr. Dam and we are here now with exactly what this Board warned him what was going to happen so she agreed with Mr. Hoffman.

Chairperson Slayton asked Staff if Mr. Dam had already had one repeat violation.

Ms. Kunkle stated that was correct and she has the Board's Order that it was the further order of the Board that the above captioned individual shall pay a fine of \$500.00 with a repeat violation.

Mr. Hoffman stated that Mr. Dam has had quite a few chances and this Board has backed off a few times but at the September 2nd, 2005 meeting he felt this Board put it in black and white that this is a repeat offense of the music and noise. There was a total of eight (8) offenses since that time and eight (8) offenses times \$500.00 equals \$4,000.00. The City paid for the police officers and code enforcement officers to go there for violations and Mr. Dam has had enough time to soundproof that building or do something with that building all this time.

Mr. Hoffman made a motion to fine Mr. Dam \$4,000.00; seconded by John Shelby. Motion passed on roll call vote 5-2 with Jay Crocker and Susan Ellis being the dissenting votes.

DISCUSSION:

No discussion.

ADJOURNMENT:

John Shelby made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Maggie Hawk. All agreed and the Board adjourned at 5:25 pm.

Pursuant to Florida statute 286.0105, if an individual decides to appeal any decision made by the Citizens Code Enforcement Board with respect to any matter considered at this hearing, a record of the proceedings will be required and the individual will need to ensure that a verbatim transcript of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based. Such person must provide a method for recording the proceedings.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), persons needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the Administrative Specialist of the Citizens Code Enforcement Board listed below prior to the hearing:

Inga Campbell
Administrative Specialist
% City Hall
210 Sams Avenue
New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168-9985
Telephone: 386.424.2265
Fax: 386.424.2143