



**II. FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**A. Five Year Summary of Fiscal Impact:**

Fiscal Years	2021	2021	2023	2024	2025
Capital Expenditures					
Operating Costs					
External Revenues	(\$20,000)				
Program Income(County)					
In-Kind Match(County)					
NET FISCAL IMPACT	(\$20,000)				
#ADDITIONAL FTE					
POSITIONS (CUMULATIVE)					

Is Item Included In Current Budget?      Yes X      No       
 Does this item include the use of federal funds?      Yes           No X

Budget Account No. Fund 0001 Department 600 Unit 6241 Object 5900

**B. Recommended Sources of Funds/Summary of Fiscal Impact:**

**C. Departmental Fiscal Review:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**III. REVIEW COMMENTS**

**A. OFMB Fiscal and/or Contract Dev. and Control Comments:**

*Line Item 5/19/21*  
 OFMB  
 AP 5/19    RB 5/13/21    QA 5-19-21  
 MJD 5/13/21

N/A  
 Contract Dev. and Control

**B. Legal Sufficiency:**

  
 Assistant County Attorney

**C. Other Department Review:**

N/A  
 Department Director

**Background and Justification Continued (Mark H. and Tonya M. Pignato) Page 3**

The factors considered during staff's review and evaluation of this settlement are as follows:

1. The initial notice of violations was entered on January 31, 2013 for livestock in a residential area and erecting/installing roofed, wooden cage type structure without obtaining required building permits. A Code Enforcement Special Magistrate Hearing was held on June 5, 2013 and the Pignatos were given (30 days) until July 5, 2013 to reach compliance. During a site inspection on July 8, 2013, it appeared that the chickens were gone, but the coop remained on the property and no permit was registered with the building department.
2. Per Mr. Pignato, the major contributing factors that resulted in the delay for obtaining compliance were due to the death of his parents and the end of his marriage.
3. Mr. Pignato is currently in the midst of refinancing his home to lower the existing interest rate on the mortgage. The County's Code Enforcement lien must be satisfied before the refinancing can proceed.
4. The subject property is Mr. Pignato's homestead property and the only property that he owns.
5. The code violations did not involve any life safety issues and did not adversely impact the neighboring property owners

An affidavit of compliance was issued by the Code Enforcement Division stating that the cited code violations were fully corrected as of February 8, 2021 and the property is in full compliance with the CESM's Order.

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 that reduce any debt amount due to Palm Beach County by more than \$2,500 require the approval of the Board of County Commissioners, per Countywide PPM# CW-F-048.