# 3G-2

## PALM BEACH COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

# AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

| AGENDATTEM SUMMARY  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Meeting Date: Marc  | zh 1, 2016   | [X] Consent [ ] Workshop   | [ ] Regular<br>[ ] Public Hearing   |  |  |  |  |
| Department: Office  | e of Financial Mana  | gement & Budget  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | <u>I. E</u>  | EXECUTIVE BRIEF  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Motion and Title: Samount of \$20,000.0 Paula D. Garcia on A  | 00 for the full satisfa  | motion to approve: a negotian action of a Code Enforcement   | ted settlement agreement in the<br>Lien that was entered agains   |  |  |  |  |
| on property owned b<br>Compliance. The pro-<br>with the CESM's Or<br>\$50.00 per day was i<br>2006. Code Enforcent<br>total accrued lien am<br>totaled \$71,824.17,                         | y Ms. Garcia giving perty had been abander was not achieved imposed. The CESM nent issued an Affidationnt through Marclof which Ms. Garci  | ial Magistrate (CESM) entered to her until March 7, 2006 to broad and was in disrepair where do by the ordered compliance of then entered a claim of lien avit of Compliance for the proph 15, 2015, the date on which ia has agreed to pay the Countreement Lien. <u>District 3</u> (PM)                                | ing the property into full Code<br>on she purchased it. Compliance<br>late and a fine in the amount of<br>against Ms. Garcia on April 5<br>perty on February 15, 2008. The<br>settlement discussions began<br>onty \$20,000.00 (28%) for ful  |  |  |  |  |
| the severely rundown code compliance or a Enforcement on Mar was then entered agastating that the cited CESM's Order. The son in April, 2009 to years, Collections recof the code lien. Col | a structure. The Spectar fine of \$50.00 per ch 10, 2006 confirm winst Ms. Garcia. Or code violations were Collections Section discuss the outstand seived a letter from Nections, after extendiforcement, has agr | cial Master gave Ms. Garcia un day would begin to accrue. A sed that the property was still not rebruary 15, 2008 an Affidate corrected and the property was of OFMB (Collections) was faling code lien balance. After now. Garcia's attorney on Marchasive review, evaluation, and deteed to present a proposed settle. | til March 7, 2006 to obtain full follow-up inspection by Code ot in compliance so a code lier wit of Compliance was issued as in full compliance with the first contacted by Ms. Garcia's additional contact for several 15, 2015 to discuss settlement discussions with Ms. Garcia's |  |  |  |  |
|   | (0   | continued on page 3)   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | ÷  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachments:  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Recommended by:   | Department Direct  | eth Blasse   | 2/3/16<br>Date  |  |  |  |  |
| Annroyed by   | MPALL  | tic  | Date Of Marie   |  |  |  |  |

**County Administrator** 

## II. FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

| A. FI  | ve xear Summary of                           | riscai impact:   |                    |                               |                     |                  |
|--|--|------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Fiscal   | l Years                                      | <u>2016</u>      | <u>2017</u>        | <u>2018</u>                   | <u>2019</u>         | <u>2020</u>      |
|  | al Expenditures<br>ating Costs               |                  |                    |                               |                     |                  |
| External Revenues Program Income (County) In-Kind Match (County) |  | (\$3,333.33)     | (\$5,714.28)<br>   | (\$5,714.28)<br>              | (\$5,238.11)<br>——— |                  |
|  | FISCAL IMPACT                                | (\$3,333.33)     | (\$5,714.28)       | (\$5,714.28)                  | <u>(\$5,238.11)</u> |                  |
|  | DITIONAL FTE<br>TIONS (Cumulative)           |                  |                    |                               |                     |                  |
|  | m Included In Curren<br>et Account No. Fund_ |                  | Yes<br>Department_ | No <u>X</u> 600 Unit          | <u>6241</u> Obj     | ject <u>5900</u> |
| Repo   | rting Category                               |                  |                    |                               |                     |                  |
| В.   | Recommended Sour                             | ces of Funds/S   | Summary of Fi      | iscal Impact:                 |                     |                  |
| C.   | Departmental Fiscal                          | Review:          |                    |                               |                     |                  |
|  |  | III. <u>REV</u>  | IEW COMME          | ENTS                          |                     |                  |
| A.   | OFMB Fiscal and/or                           | Contract Dev     | v. and Control     | <b>Comments:</b>              |                     |                  |
| XIII^  | of MB 0 0 1 2 1 4 1 6                        |                  |                    | N/A Contract Dev. and Control |                     |                  |
| В.   | Legal Sufficiency:                           | 120              |                    |                               |                     |                  |
|  | Assistant County Att                         | l/WW[)<br>torney |                    |                               |                     |                  |
| C.   | Other Department R                           | deview:          |                    |                               |                     |                  |
|  | Department Director                          | •                |                    |                               |                     |                  |

#### **Background and Policy Issues Continued**

The mitigating factors considered during our review and evaluation are as follows.

- 1. Ms. Garcia purchased the overgrown and severely rundown property on December 10, 2002 from the estate of the former owner. She immediately began to clear the overgrown vegetation that consumed the entire property and then filed the initial application for a building permit on May 28, 2003 with the intent of converting the Single Family Dwelling (SFD) into a triplex. Obtaining the necessary approvals for converting a SFD to a triplex is a lengthy process. Her goal, from the time she purchased the property, was to construct a triplex which would greatly transform and improve the property and the surrounding neighborhood.
- 2. The first contractor she hired to do the construction quit soon after the building permit application was submitted. She then had to find another licensed contractor to do the project. The building permit, which required zoning and variance approvals, was subsequently issued for a triplex, on March 18, 2007. Regular building inspections of the new structure began on April 23, 2007 with the final inspection being done on March 26, 2009.
- 3. Although full code compliance was not deemed fully achieved until February 15, 2008, construction of the new building was well underway in April 2007, with regular inspections being conducted by the Building Department showing that proactive efforts to obtain full code compliance was proceeding forward. A Code Enforcement officer went to the property on May 10, 2007 for a follow up inspection and noted that the work on the structure was being done but full code compliance with the CESM order had not yet been achieved.
- 4. Ms. Garcia had to borrow funds from family and friends to complete the building which has greatly transformed the property as well as substantially increasing the value. Further, the three (3) units provide much needed and affordable workforce housing in the area.
- 5. Ms. Garcia will begin paying the County monthly installments in the amount of \$476.19 until such time she has paid off the proposed settlement amount. The County's code lien will remain intact on the property until the full settlement has been received. Ms. Garcia is still paying back the funds she borrowed from her family and friends for the construction of the triplex.

An Affidavit of Compliance has been issued by Code Enforcement and states that the cited violations were corrected as of February 15, 2008 and that the property is in full compliance with the CESM's Order. Further, the cited violations did not involve any health/safety issues. In light of the above stated circumstances, staff believes that the proposed settlement is fair and in the best interest of Palm Beach County.

Settlement offers of any debt, when the full amount of the debt due to the County is over \$2,500, require the approval of the Board of County Commissioners, per Countywide PPM# CW-F-048. The total amount due to Palm Beach County pertaining to this settlement exceeds the \$2,500 limit and requires Board approval.