

# City of Port St. Lucie

## Special Magistrate Hearing

### Meeting Minutes - Final

121 SW Port St. Lucie  
Blvd.  
Port St. Lucie, Florida  
34984

---

Wednesday, April 10, 2024

9:00 AM

City Hall, Council Chambers

---

#### \*Addition of Item 14A\*

1. Meeting Called to Order

A SPECIAL MAGISTRATE HEARING of the City of Port St. Lucie was called to order by Special Magistrate Keith Davis on April 10, 2024, at 9:00 a.m., at Port St. Lucie City Hall, 121 SW Port St. Lucie Boulevard, Port St. Lucie, Florida.

Present:

Keith Davis, Special Magistrate

Makenzie Spittler, Budget Specialist

Aron Biehl, Code Compliance Supervisor

Jason McElveen, Code Compliance Supervisor

Wesley Armstrong, Code Compliance Manager

Rachel Knaggs, Code Compliance Officer

Steve Owens, Code Compliance Officer

Matthew Williams, Code Compliance Officer

Michael Dickerson, Code Compliance Officer

Melissa Huckstable, Code Compliance Officer

Spencer Scott, Deputy City Attorney

Evelyn Rojas, Finance

Daisy Ruiz, Deputy City Clerk

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The Special Magistrate led the assembly in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Swearing in Code Specialist and/or Building Investigators

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to the Code Specialists.

4. Approval of Minutes

4.a Approval of the 3/13/2024 Special Magistrate Hearing  
Minutes

[2024-339](#)

The Special Magistrate approved the minutes of the March 13, 2024 Special Magistrate Hearing.

---

5. Late Abatements and/or Postponements

Ms. Spittler advised that there were no late abatement or postponement cases for today's hearing.

6. Approval of Agenda

The Special Magistrate approved the agenda.

(Clerk's Note: At this time Special Magistrate announced he would be calling Item 13.a Hear Modification and Vacate Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation.)

7. Introduction of Cases

8. Code Violation Cases

**8.a** Hear Code Violation Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation

**2024-340**

(Clerk's Note: This Item was heard after Item 13.a Hear Modification and Vacate Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation.)

OWENS 23-19041 246 SW PORT ST. LUCIE BOULEVARD

Code Specialist Steve Owens, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendation into the record. He presented the photos that were taken of the inspection showing the subject property and provided an explanation of his investigation findings. The Special Magistrate inquired if the wires depicted actively carried electricity, to which Mr. Owens stated the cables had wire nuts and were taped off.

The Deputy City Clerk provided the Oath of Testimony to William Griffith, Area Coach/District Manager. He presented a cost estimate for the work that he needed to complete. Mr. Griffith stated that they would require 4 to 6 weeks to deliver materials and installation. He requested a 90-day extension to allow time for compliance.

The Special Magistrate inquired if the work required a permit, to which Mr. Owens stated he did not know as the lights were previously there and would only need replacing. Mr. Owens indicated they had no objection to entering the Cost Estimate/Contract Invoice dated April 9th provided by Mr. Griffith as evidence in this case. The Special Magistrate asked if the City objected to providing a 30-day extension, to which Mr. Owens responded in the negative. The Special Magistrate asked why the case was presented in April if the case initiated in January 2024, to which Mr. Griffith explained the inspection was completed a few days prior; however, he had a few companies not show up to provide a quote.

The Special Magistrate stated he would provide give a new compliance date until the end of May. The City stated that they did not have any objection.

The Special Magistrate found that the City had proper notice and based on the evidence the property was properly noticed and remained in violation as cited. The Special Magistrate extended the compliance date to May 31, 2024, if not in compliance by that date, a fine in the amount of \$50/day would be due every day the violation continued, not to exceed \$5,000 along with the administrative cost of \$411.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler advised that they would be hearing Item 11a.)

WILLIAMS            23-14541            737 SW COLLEGE PARK ROAD

Code Specialist Matthew Williams previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendation into the record. He presented the photos that were taken of the inspection showing the subject property and provided an explanation of his investigation findings.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to the Respondent, Patricia Guthey, who explained that the vehicle was always registered as a commercial vehicle and that they were attempting to sell the vehicle but have not been able to. She added that she cannot afford to register the vehicle.

The Special Magistrate stated that the City had proper notice and that the Respondent, Mrs. Guthey was present. He indicated that based on the testimony and evidence the property remained in violation as cited. The Special Magistrate gave the Respondent a 30-day extension, until May 15, 2024 but if not in compliance by then he would assess \$25/day not to exceed \$2,500 and \$411 in administrative costs.

WILLIAMS            24-02412            410 SW DAUPHIN AVENUE

Code Specialist Matthew Williams previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendation into the record. He presented the photos that were taken of the inspection showing the subject property and provided an explanation of his investigation findings.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to the Respondent, William Dean. Mr. Dean explained that the utility trailer shown

was for the storage of a drag car and the flatbed trailer was no longer at the property as it was in Tennessee. He asked if the flatbed trailer could remain on the case as he would like to have a permit for the flatbed trailer. Mr. Dean stated that there had been a dispute regarding the flatbed trailer being a recreational vehicle or a utility trailer. He handed the Special Magistrate a print out of City Code Section 73.01 definition of a recreational vehicle, a Florida Vehicle Registration for 1970 Mustang and photographs of the Jeep, Flatbed trailer and the Mustang. The City did not object to making Mr. Dean's documents part of the record. Mr. Dean indicated that his lots were contiguous and not a vacant lot. Mr. Dean provided the Special Magistrate with copies of the City Code Section 153.03 Accessory Use or Structure and Section 73.04 Parking in a Residential District, and 158.211 and 158.217 Storage and Accumulation of Materials. He added that the trailer had been parked there for 24 years, he stated that in 1999 there was a similar issue when he first moved in. City Staff indicated that they did not have an objection to the documentation presented. Wesley Armstrong, Code Compliance Manager, previously sworn, discussed permitted principle structures which would only be one per lot and stated that no vehicle could be parked on a vacant lot. The Special Magistrate asked that Mr. Armstrong explain a contiguous lot, to which he explained what that process consists of. The Special Magistrate requested that City Staff address the argument stating that it is not a Utility Trailer but rather a recreational vehicle, to which Mr. Armstrong indicated that the City would amend the violation. The Special Magistrate asked City Staff to address the argument regarding the outdoor storage violation, to which Mr. Armstrong provided an explanation. Mr. Dean advised that he eventually would complete the Unity of Title but stated that there was nothing in the code that states that had to be done. He explained that nowhere within the accessory definition did it state that he had to complete a Unity of Title. Mr. Dean advised that no where within the code did it state he was allowed to park his vehicle on a vacant lot, to which Mr. Armstrong explained that the City Ordinance did not prohibit parking on a vacant lot. Mr. Dean advised that the City Ordinance did not prohibit parking of RV either, to which Mr. Armstrong stated that per City Code it was prohibited. He stated that it would have to be parked on a paved driveway, parked to the side or rear of a principle structure if there was a 10-foot set back on the rear was maintained. Mr. Dean argued that his property was a contiguous lot and that it was the same and should be treated the same per the City Code. He stated that there was no reason to combine the lots because he had been parking his Utility Trailer there for the last 24 years. Mr. Armstrong stated that the lot did not have a permitted principal structure. Mr. Dean inquired where it was stated that he needed to have a principal structure, to which Mr. Armstrong stated that it was under City Code Section 73.04 (b). Mr. Armstrong read Section 73.04(b)

aloud. The Special Magistrate indicated that he understood there needed to be a principal structure to which it could be on the side or rear of. Mr. Dean stated that the reason he brought up the definitions, he stated that on the same lot regarding the Accessory Uses of Structures shall be construed as the same or a contiguous lot in the same ownership and stated that they were bound together. He argued that there was no mention stating that if he were to get a Unity of Title it would still be legal.

The Special Magistrate indicated that regardless of the contiguous nature of the lots and assuming that the trailer was a Recreational Vehicle he stated that it was not parked to the side or rear of a principal structure and was not parked on a paved driveway. He explained that based on how he read the City Code it cannot be parked where it currently was even though it was a contiguous lot, it did not meet the requirement of where it was located on a paved driveway, or the side of a principal structure.

Mr. Dean asked that the vehicle be called a Recreational Vehicle. He stated that Code Compliance Staff called the vehicle a Utility Vehicle but would like it to be referred to as a Recreational Vehicle, as he demonstrated it is a Recreational Vehicle.

The Special Magistrate inquired what would be the Code Section instead of Utility Vehicle for it to be referred to as Recreational Vehicle, to which Mr. Armstrong stated that it would be City Code Section 73.04(b) and read the code aloud. The Special Magistrate found that the Recreational Vehicle was not parked properly and advised that if the City and Mr. Dean agreed with amending the Notice of Violation at today's hearing to change the Code Section from 72.10(b) to 73.04(b) or if there was not an agreement to make the change the City would have to re-notice under the new City Code section and start the process again. The Special Magistrate stated he had no objection to doing either option. He stated that he agreed with Mr. Dean's proof that the vehicle was a Recreational Vehicle and not a Utility Vehicle. Mr. Armstrong stated that the City agreed to the Respondent's request, to which Mr. Dean agreed as well. The Special Magistrate found that the violation of City Code Section 72.04(b) existed and would amend the documents to reflect the same. Mr. Armstrong noted that both previously classified as Utility Vehicles were not allowed to be parked on the property. Mr. Dean stated that if he were to obtain Unity of Title for his properties, he would like the City to commit to him being allowed to park his Recreational Vehicles on his property. Mr. Armstrong advised Mr. Dean that he would have to marry both properties and would need to be classified as one parcel lot. Mr. Dean advised that was not what he was told by the City's Legal Department. Mr. Armstrong advised that he must only have 1 Parcel ID through the St. Lucie County Property

Appraiser's Office and that currently there were 2 Parcel IDs, one for the home and another for the vacant lot. The Special Magistrate indicated that the Unity of Title would probably be the first step. Mr. Armstrong stated the Unity of Title would be the first process and then he would have to go to the St. Lucie County Property Appraiser's Office to marry both properties. The Special Magistrate stated that he was not stating that was correct or incorrect as the Special Magistrate but that he would rule on the case before him. Mr. Dean called upon the Deputy City Attorney to confirm. The Special Magistrate encouraged Mr. Dean to speak to City Staff offline to confirm compliance.

Code Specialist Williams asked the Special Magistrate if he wished to give Mr. Dean additional time as he previously emailed Mr. Dean about how to go about merging both lots together. He stated that had Mr. Dean completed that process he would have paused his case to get him to compliance. The Special Magistrate stated that he would provide Mr. Dean with a 90-day extension to comply with the violation.

The Special Magistrate found that the City had proper notice and confirmed the Respondent was present. He stated that based on the testimony, evidence and party's agreement he found that the violations 158.211 regarding the outside storage and violation 73.04(b), he provided Mr. Dean a 90-day extension to cure the violations. He stated that if compliance was not achieved by July 17, 2024, he would certify the fine in this case, in the amount of \$50/per day, up to a maximum of \$5,000 and if compliance was not achieved by July 17th, he would also order a \$411 in administrative costs. The Special Magistrate advised Mr. Dean if he was working towards compliance and needed additional time, to keep in touch with Code Compliance Specialist Williams. The Special Magistrate stated he would be happy to consider that request if needed.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler called Item 10.a Hear Vacant Lot Violations Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation.)

#### 9. Code Violation Special Requests

**9.a** Hear Code Violation Special Request Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation

[2024-342](#)

WILLIAMS 24-02773 202 SW CHERRY HILL ROAD

Code Specialist Matthew Williams, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendations into the record. He presented the photos that were taken at the time of the inspection showing the subject property and violations.

The Special Magistrate inquired if the property was occupied, to which Mr. Williams responded in the negative and confirmed vacancy. He asked if this was a case with a previous maxed out lien, to which Mr. Williams stated there was an active lien already on the property for maintenance violations regarding the building.

The Special Magistrate noted the Respondent was not present, he found that proper notice was achieved. The Special Magistrate stated that the property remained in violation and ordered that the Respondent comply by March 20, 2024, if not in compliance by that date a fine in the amount of \$50/day would be due every day the violation continued, not to exceed \$5,000 along with the administrative costs of \$411. He authorized the City to enter the property to abate the violation and assess the costs.

Ms. Brown indicated this was the only case with a special request.

(Clerk's Note: The Special Magistrate requested we move to Item 14. How parties are notified.)

(Clerk's Note: This case was heard after Case 23-17962.)

KNAGGS            24-02907            1866 SW DAVIS STREET

Code Specialist Rachel Knaggs, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendations into the record. She presented the photos that were taken at the time of the inspection showing the subject property and violations. Specialist Knaggs indicated that the Respondent had passed away but the granddaughter lives in the home.

The Special Magistrate stated that the Respondent was not present and found that the City had proper notice and based on the testimony and evidence the property remains in violation as cited. He noted that the violation regarding High Grass and Weeds caused a threat to the public health, safety and welfare and required compliance by April 17, 2024. He stated that if not in compliance by April 17, 2024, a fine in the amount of \$150/day would be assessed until compliance was achieved or the maximum accrual of \$15,000. He awarded the City \$411 in Administrative Costs due and payable if compliance was not achieved by April 17, 2024. The Special Magistrate authorized the City to abate the property after April 17, 2024.

KNAGGS            24-02919            437 SW TULIP BOULEVARD

Code Specialist Rachel Knaggs, previously sworn, read the case

presentation and staff's recommendations into the record. She presented the photos that were taken at the time of the inspection showing the subject property and violations. Specialist Knaggs stated that she had been in contact with the owner who lived out of town. She noted that the Respondent did achieve compliance in some of the violations but had since stopped when it came down to the facia and soffit due to the rotting being too far gone. She did explain she spoke to the Respondent regarding the High Grass and Fence but he had not complied or communicated with him. Specialist Knaggs explained that the Respondent did cut the grass every couple of months. She indicated that the fence needed to be removed or fixed.

The Special Magistrate asked if this was a rental property or unoccupied property, to which Specialist Knaggs explained it was an unoccupied property. She explained that the Respondent did not have a permanent address.

The Special Magistrate confirmed that the Respondent was not present and found that the City had proper notice. Based on the testimony and evidence he found that the property remains in violation as cited. The Special Magistrate found that violation of City Code 41.08(b) constituted a threat to the public health, safety, and welfare and required compliance by April 17, 2024. He stated that after April 17th, he would require a fine in the amount of \$75/day not to exceed \$7,500 or until compliance was achieved and ordered the Respondent to pay City's \$411 Administrative Costs if not in compliance.

WILLIAMS      24-01519      2441 SW HINCHMAN STREET

Code Specialist Matthew Williams, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendations into the record. He presented the photos that were taken at the time of the inspection showing the subject property and violations.

The Special Magistrate confirmed that the Respondent was not present. He found that the City had proper notice and remained in violation. He found that Violation 41.09(b) constituted a threat to the public health, safety and welfare and required compliance by April 11th, 2024. The Special Magistrate ordered that if compliance was not achieved by such date, he ordered a fine in the amount of \$50/day would be assessed not to exceed \$5,000 until compliance was achieved. He ordered that the \$411 in Administrative Costs be awarded to the City if compliance was not achieved after April 11, 2024. The Special Magistrate authorized the City to enter the property and abate the health, safety, and welfare violations

and assess the appropriate costs.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler called Item 14.a Hear Certification of Fines Special Requests Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendations, Case 23-14854.)

10. Vacant Lot Violation Cases

**10.a** Hear Vacant Lot Violation Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation

[2024-343](#)

HUCKSTABLE 24-03002 2974 SE BAKERSFIELD STREET

Code Specialist Melissa Huckstable, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendations into the record. She presented the photos that were taken at the time of the inspection showing the subject property and violations.

The Special Magistrate inquired what the City would need to have cleared, to which she stated that they are requesting the left-hand side of the property to be cut back. The Special Magistrate asked Specialist Huckstable to provide additional information regarding the abatement request, to which she indicated that there have been complaints of rodents and wildlife entering neighboring properties.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to Respondent, Rao Cherukuri. Mr. Cherukuri reported that the work to cut down the property had been done. He reported that the landscaper cleared 20 feet on the left along with the front of the property. Mr. Cherukuri stated he also cleared 15 feet on the right of the property. The Special Magistrate stated that the City would need to come out to the property to confirm compliance with the violation. Mr. Cherukuri added that he had photos on his cell phone of the property but had been unable to print them to submit at today's hearing. He showed the cell phone pictures to Specialist Huckstable and Special Magistrate Davis.

The Special Magistrate ordered a compliance deadline for April 25, 2024, as requested to allow time for the City to go out and inspect the property. Mr. Cherukuri explained that he wanted to have the entire lot cleared but the landscaper bailed out on the job. Specialist Huckstable stated that she would confirm with Mr. Cherukuri once she completes the inspection of the property.

The Special Magistrate stated the City had proper notice, the Respondent was present and based on the testimony and evidence he found that the property was in violation beyond the notice date. He set a compliance date

of April 25, 2024, to allow the Specialist to inspect the property. If the inspection does not result in determination of compliance, he ordered that a \$25/daily fine not exceeding \$2,500. He stated he would not enter an abatement order based on the photos shown by the Respondent. The Special Magistrate ordered the \$411 in administrative costs if not in compliance by April 25, 2024.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler called Certification of Fine Case 23-17962.)

#### 11. Certification of Fines Cases

**11.a** Hear Certification of Fines Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation

[2024-344](#)

(Clerk's Note: This case was heard after Item 8.a)

KNAGGS            23-08112            731 SW DEL RIO BLVD.

Attorney Ashland Medley appeared via Zoom.

Code Specialist Rachel Knaggs, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendation into the record. She presented the photos that were taken of the inspection showing the subject property and provided an explanation of her investigation findings.

Attorney Medley advised stated that she represented the Bank, who had a loan on the property. She advised that there was a pending foreclosure proceeding pending and that the Respondent, Ms. Hooper, was deceased. Attorney Medley advised that the Bank had taken care of previous code enforcement issues except for the roof violation. She explained that they were unable to apply for a permit as they are not the title owner of the property. Attorney Medley added that for the Bank to be the title owner they would have to have a foreclosure sale. She explained that a recent 4th District Court of Appeals (DCA) opinion stating that if there was no personal representative was not named in a foreclosure proceeding or any legal proceeding, the effect of such proceeding would be null and void. Attorney Medley stated that they are waiting for the rehearing on the new opinion provided by the 4th DCA and would like additional time for the resolution of their case through the foreclosure case.

The Special Magistrate indicated that he would be certifying the fine. Attorney Medley asked for clarification as to the fine amount and if the Special Magistrate would make the fine effective within a month from today's date, based on the potential of the judgement reversal. The Special Magistrate stated he would not be inclined to grant her request unless the

City agreed with her. City Staff stated they would not agree to delaying the Certification of Fine. Deputy City Attorney Scott advised they would be able to seek a modification request for the lien if needed in the future.

The Special Magistrate found that the City had proper notice. He noted that the Respondent was not present and Attorney Medley was present on behalf of the bank. The Special Magistrate found that based on the testimony and evidence, he found that the property remains in violation. He certified the fine and ordered a fine in the amount of \$25/day, not to exceed \$2,500 and \$411 in administrative costs. The Special Magistrate asked Attorney Medley if she requested a copy of the order, to which she responded in the affirmative and asked that it be delivered to her via email.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler returned to Item 8.a Hear Code Violation Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation.)

(Clerk's Note: This item was heard after Vacant Lot Case 24-03002.)

WILLIAMS 23-17962 1633 SW BELLEVUE AVENUE

Code Specialist Matthew Williams, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendation into the record. He presented the photos that were taken of the inspection showing the subject property and provided an explanation of his investigation findings.

The Deputy City Clerk administered the Oath of Testimony to Matthew Kramer, 1641 SW Bellevue Avenue. He explained that he initiated the complaint on this property. He explained the discontent of his complaint regarding this property. Mr. Kramer suggested that the City provide a welfare check to the resident as he observed an electric cord going through his bathroom window. He stated that he believed that the Resident had no Air Conditioning or running water. Mr. Kramer expressed the need for someone to help the Resident based on a previous interaction where police provided a welfare check.

The Special Magistrate stated that the Respondent was not present and noted that the City had proper notice. He stated that based on the testimony and evidence provided he found that the property remained in violation but he found that Section 154.05(c) regarding Responsibility and Overgrowth and Section 158.211 regarding Storage and Accumulation of Waste Materials, he found that those two code violations had risen to constitute a threat to the public health, safety and welfare. He noted that the violations pertaining to the Roof Damage and Inoperative Vehicle, he stated he would not make that finding. The Special Magistrate certified the

fine in the amount of \$100/day not to exceed \$10,000 and awarded the City's Administrative Cost of \$411 and authorized the City to enter the property at its discretion and abate the violations and assess those costs. Code Specialist Williams asked the Special Magistrate if he would consider approving an abatement order to remove the dangerous open storage, to which Special Magistrate stated that he just did that in this case. He stated that he found Violation 154.05(c) and 158.211 to be threats to the public health, safety and welfare and authorized the City to abate those violations at the City's discretion. The Special Magistrate indicated that he would take the requests as they come before him and noted that this case was easy to make that determination.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler called Item 9.a Hear Code Violations Special Requests Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendations.)

12. Solid Waste Certification of Fines Cases

**12.a** Hear Solid Waste Certification of Fines Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation

[2024-355](#)

There were no cases heard under this portion of the Agenda.

13. Modification and Vacate Cases

**13.a** Hear Modification and Vacate Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation

[2024-349](#)

Evelyn Rojas, Lien Services Department, stated that the Modification requests on the agenda, Code Compliance Case Numbers: 23-13425, 23-01574, 23-13087, and 20-28004-BL were heard as a matter of City Policy and were mandated by Florida Statute. She explained that the City Council held liens and were considered assets of the City. Ms. Rojas indicated that per the City Ordinance the Special Magistrate had authority to modify the liens. The Special Magistrate stated he would approve the modification and sign the appropriate modification order.

Ms. Rojas stated that the Vacate requests on the agenda, Code Compliance Case Number: 21-28996-BL, was found to be invalid and require Special Magistrate signature.

The Special Magistrate inquired if there were any Respondents present for Solid Waste Cases, to which Ms. Spittler stated there were no one present. She asked if it would be okay to state how parties were Notified for the Solid Waste cases.

Ms. Spittler stated that a Notice of Hearing or Notice of the Certification of

Fine was sent to the violator by Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested to the address listed in the Tax Collector's Office for tax notices or to the address listed in the County Property Appraiser's Database. If the green card was returned, it was placed in the file and was either signed, unsigned or unclaimed. Ten days before the hearing, an agenda was posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of Port St. Lucie City Hall. Also, a Notice of Hearing was posted on the property in question, along with an Affidavit of Posting, which included a copy of the notice posted and the date and places of its posting. If the certification card was not returned to the Office of Solid Waste, within ten days before the Hearing, posting was completed in the same manner as if the card was returned unclaimed as stated above. The photos shown at the hearing were kept and maintained as public records of the City of Port St. Lucie's Office of Solid Waste.

The Special Magistrate found proper notice of the procedure and stated he would sign the appropriate orders. Ms. Spittler read the following cases into the record:

24-01052      952 SW Jasper Ave.  
24-00423      2243 SE Seamist St.

(Clerk's Note: The Special Magistrate advised he would hear Item 8.a Hear Code Violation Cases and Approve the Staff Recommendation.)

14. Certification of Fines Special Request Cases

**14.a** Hear Certification of Fines Special Request Cases and  
Approve the Staff Recommendation

**2024-379**

WILLIAMS      23-14854      1167 SW GARDENA AVE

Code Specialist Matthew Williams, previously sworn, read the case presentation and staff's recommendations into the record. He presented the photos that were taken at the time of the inspection showing the subject property and violations.

The Special Magistrate confirmed that the Respondent was not present. He stated the City had proper notice and noted that the property remained in violation. The Special Magistrate certified the fine.

(Clerk's Note: At this time, Ms. Spittler heard Item 16. Introduction of Cases without Parties Present.)

15. How Parties are Notified

Ms. Spittler stated that a Notice of Hearing or Notice of the Certification of Fine was sent to the violator by Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested to the

address listed in the Tax Collector's Office for tax notices or to the address listed in the County Property Appraiser's Database. If the green card was returned, it was placed in the file and was either signed, unsigned or unclaimed. Ten days before the hearing, an agenda was posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of Port St. Lucie City Hall. Also, a Notice of Hearing was posted on the property in question, along with an Affidavit of Posting, which included a copy of the notice posted and the date and places of its posting. If the certification card was not returned to the Neighborhood Services Department, then within ten days before the Hearing, posting was completed in the same manner as if the card was returned unclaimed as stated above. The photos shown at the hearing were kept and maintained as public records of the City of Port St. Lucie's Neighborhood Services Department.

16. Introduction of Cases Without Parties Present

The cases without parties present:

Code Violations:

24-02093	2634 SE Edgarcce St.
24-02417	577 NW Prima Vista Blvd.
23-15123	1985 SW Capeador St.
24-01082	1526 SW Paar Dr.
24-02220	1874 SE Mantua St.
24-02914	4000 SW Balleto St.
23-19014	701 SW St. Lucie West Blvd.
24-00974	10180 S US Highway Blvd.
24-02301	9801 S US Highway Blvd.
24-01037	11731 SW Monterrey Blvd.
24-01180	840 SW Durham Ter.
24-01202	1634 SW Morelia Ln.
24-01501	252 SW Oakridge Dr.
24-03119	2248 SW Monterrey Ln.

Vacant Lot Violations:

24-02294	5013 NW Rugby Dr.
24-02554	1430 SW Bartell Ave.

The Special Magistrate indicated he would sign the appropriate orders for the above cases.

17. Public to be Heard

There were no comments from the public.

18. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:54 a.m.

---

Daisy Ruiz, Deputy City Clerk