

April 9, 2008

The regular meeting of the Santa Rosa County Building Code Board of Adjustments and Appeals was held April 9, 2008, at 2:30p.m. in the conference room of the Santa Rosa County Building Inspection Department located at 6051 Old Bagdad Highway, Milton, FL 32583. Board members present were Mr. James "Larry" Hall, Chairman; Mr. Frank Harold, Vice Chairman; Mr. William J. Blackman, Mr. Danny Holt and Mr. Charles "Pete" Southerland.

Building Inspection Department staff in attendance was Mr. Skip Tompkins, Compliance Division Superintendent; Mr. Randy Jones, Compliance Investigator; Mr. Bobby Burkett, Compliance Investigator and Mrs. Robyn Leverton, Administrative Assistant I.

Mr. Tom Dannheisser, County Attorney, was not present for the meeting.

A court reporter was not present for the meeting.

Mr. James "Larry" Hall, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

There was a slight rearrangement of the agenda. Mr. Southerland made a motion to accept the amended agenda. Mr. Harold seconded the motion. The motion carried with a unanimous vote.

Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Blackman made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 12, 2008, meeting. Mr. Holt seconded the motion. The motion carried with a unanimous vote.

Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled meeting is Wednesday, May 14, 2008, at 2:30 p.m. in the Building Inspection Department Conference Room.

New Business – Probable Cause

Santa Rosa County vs. Brad A Davis d/b/a West Coast Metal Roofing

Randy Jones introduced the case. Randy said Mr. Davis and the homeowner are both in attendance. The homeowner was not referenced in the complaint because he wasn't part of bringing the complaint to the Board. He needs a leak repaired and wants his roof to pass a final inspection. The original permit was issued 10.24.05; an inspection was requested 10.31.05. This is a 3-story building; no one was there to meet the inspector therefore our inspector could not get on the roof, the inspection failed. No one from West Coast followed-up on the failed inspection and the permit expired 6 months later. The permit was reinstated November 2006 and the same steps happened again. The inspection was requested a second time and it was turned down a second time due to no one meeting the inspector on-site. Mr. Spears contacted the Building Inspection Department right around that time. Randy said he made several calls to Brad Davis and received no response. When he was finally able to talk to Mr. Davis, Mr. Davis seemed concerned and said he would take care of the problem. Another permit was issued in January 2008, an inspection was requested and apparently the same steps happened again. However, there is a note on the permit to call prior to the inspection, supposedly so they can meet the inspector on-site.

Randy summed things up by stating that there is a permit; Mr. Davis needs to meet with us and we'll set a time and get the roof inspected for the homeowner. The problem, at this point, is how the inspection can be done.

Mr. Southerland made a motion to table the case until the next meeting. If all is handled by the next meeting, no additional meeting on this case would be required. Mr. Holt seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

New Business – Probable Cause

Eileen Nohava vs. John Mallory Simms III d/b/a Sims Construction Co., Inc.

Randy introduced the case. This case deals with a reroof to an existing house and a small Florida room addition. Simms is working with the owner, but is being brought before the Board because he is the general contractor on the job. There are some issues with his subcontractor which is the 2nd portion of Ms Nohava's complaint. Mr. Simms had the building permit and was issued a roofing permit as well. When we discovered the roof type, the roof permit was inactivated because Mr. Simms isn't licensed to do that type of roof. That is when Randy believes Mr. Ellis became involved because he roofed the house. Randy said Simms is working on the job today and he recommends the Board treat this case the same as the previous and table it until the next meeting.

A discussion ensued between the Board and Ms Nohava. Photos of the problem areas were shown.

Ms Nohava said Mr. Simms doesn't feel like he should be fixing the leak because he feels it's a roofing issue; he isn't the roofer on the job, but he wants to clear up the case therefore he's taking over and completing the repairs himself.

Mr. Southerland made a motion to table the case until the next meeting. If all is handled by the next meeting, no additional meeting on this case would be required. Mr. Holt seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

New Business – Probable Cause

Eileen Nohava vs. Michael Keith Ellis d/b/a All Metal Construction

Randy introduced the case. The original roof permit was issued to Mr. Ellis to reroof the house in September 2005. There was never an inspection requested for that permit. The permit expired. Mr. Simms contracted with Ms. Nohava for the addition. When the roofing permit that he pulled was inactivated (because he learned he wasn't qualified to install that roof type), the open permit for the house roof was

discovered. Mr. Ellis was asked to roof the Florida room so he reinstated the expired permit to include the Florida room roof. Randy said that one of his biggest concerns is that he doesn't believe Mr. Ellis was paid for the job. All the checks went to Budget Construction who Ms. Nohava said did the work. All Metal Construction pulled the permit for her roof, but Budget Construction actually did the work. Budget Construction is an unlicensed contractor. Randy said if this case goes to a formal hearing he plans on amending the changes to include aiding and abiding an unlicensed contractor. Randy said that he has only spoken to Mr. Ellis once; he has for the most part been unsuccessful in contacting him.

A discussion continued while viewing photos.

Michael Ellis was present and came before the Board. He was asked by the Board if he pulled the permit for this job. He stated that he did.

Mr. Blackman made a motion to table the case until the next meeting. If all is handled by the next meeting, no additional meeting on this case would be required. Mr. Southerland seconded the motion. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

Open Forum

The Compliance Division is working on the fine recommendations to present at the next meeting.

Mr. Blackman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Harold seconded the motion. The motion carried with a unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35p.m.