



COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT

For the meeting of: 12/19/2024

File #: 25-3

To: Building Appeals Board

From: Planning and Building Department
Building Inspection Division

Agenda Section: Appeal Hearing

SUBJECT:

The appeals filed by Lucas K. Bode and Katie Rockey challenging the Notice and Order of Substandard Housing and Order to Vacate (NOSSHov) posted on the dwelling by the Humboldt County Building Department staff on October 17, 2024. The appellants dispute the findings that led to the designation of their property as substandard housing and order to vacate, seeking to overturn these determinations.

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That the Board of Appeals:

1. Adopt the Resolution upholding the Notice and Order of Substandard Housing and Order to Vacate dated 10/15/2024

DISCUSSION:

This hearing is for an appeal to the Building Division posted Notice and Order of Substandard Housing and Order to Vacate as allowed by Humboldt County Code 331-11. The Notice and Order of Substandard Housing and Order to Vacate was posted on 10/17/2024 and an appeal was timely filed on 10/29/2024.

The Building Division's primary responsibility is to ensure the health and safety of our community by enforcing building codes and housing standards. On September 26, 2024, The Chief Building Official of Humboldt County instructed building inspector Rob Edwards to inspect the property at 2335 Togo Street, Eureka, CA, in response to a request from code enforcement related to a search warrant executed by the Humboldt County Drug Task Force. This inspection was vital for evaluating the housing conditions reported at the site.

During the inspection, the Building Inspector identified numerous violations of the 1997 Uniform Housing Code (UHC) and the 2021 International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) adopted by Humboldt County-additionally, several breaches of the Health and Safety Code (HSC) Sections 17910

et seq. The findings pointed to significant hazards that pose a risk to the safety of the occupants. The property and dwelling were cited for a range of substandard housing conditions, which require immediate attention and remediation. The following are the substandard conditions that exist at the property:

1. The basement/mud area's water closet is unsafe and not permitted. HSC §17920.3(a)(1)
2. The first-floor common bathroom is inaccessible, creating a fire hazard. HSC §17920.3(a)(1)
3. The first-floor bathroom has no tank on the water closet. HSC §17920.3(a)(1)
4. Evidence of dampness in bedrooms, kitchen, front room, and bottom floor. HSC §17920.3(a)(11).
5. Evidence of rodent infestation in dwelling and subarea. HSC §17920.3(a)(12)
6. Kitchen and bathroom walls appear to have dampness and mold. HSC §17920.3(a)(13)
7. Exterior siding and trim needs repair. HSC §17920.3(a)(14)
8. Interior wall and ceiling covering need repair. HSC §17920.3(a)(14)
9. Interior doors and trim need of repair. HSC §17920.3(a)(14)
10. Electrical hazards throughout dwelling. HSC §17920.3(a)(14)
11. The sewer lift pump requires correct electrical and venting connections. HSC §17920.3(a)(15)
12. The foundation stem wall footings have been excavated around them, creating structural hazards. HSC §17920.3(b)(1)
13. The foundation footings for the point load post are cracked and have been undermined. HSC §17920.3(b)(1)
14. The area beneath the dwelling has been excavated to the point of undermining the foundation and footings, causing structural damage to the building. HSC §17920.3(b)(1)
15. The point load post and structural brackets have been compromised by removing dirt and broken concrete around the bracket. HSC §17920.3(b)(4)
16. The electrical panel in the garage is a fire hazard due to the wiring in the panel, which has double wire to breaker lugs, wrong wire size to breakers, extension cords in the panel, unsafe exposed wires, and shock hazards. HSC §17920.3(d)
17. The electrical wiring in the garage is exposed, creating a fire hazard. HSC §17920.3(d)
18. Many unattached light fixtures are hanging in the house, causing an unsafe condition. HSC §17920.3(d)
19. There are exposed wiring in several areas inside the house. HSC §17920.3(d)
20. Solid waste and debris are obstructing access to the first-floor bathroom. HSC §17920.3(e)

21. The water closet tank is missing from the first-floor bedroom's bathroom. HSC §17920.3(e)
22. An unpermitted water closet in the foundation sub-area has an unsafe platform and hazardous conditions. HSC §17920.3(e)
23. The bottom floor gas fireplace has combustibles stacked around the appliance. HSC §17920.3(f)
24. The pilot light of the gas fireplace on the bottom floor seems to be on and will require service by a licensed mechanical contractor. HSC §17920.3(f)
25. Exterior siding needs repair and weather sealing. HSC §17920.3(g)(2)
26. The exterior doors have some damage and need repair. HSC §17920.3(g)(2)
27. The exterior siding stain and/or paint has faded and needs repair. HSC §17920.3(g)(3)
28. Solid waste is present around the dwelling and in the backyard area. HSC §17920.3(j)
29. Heavy equipment is broken down in the backyard. HSC §17920.3(j)
30. There are piles of dried wood in the backyard. HSC §17920.3(j)
31. Egress windows and doors in the sleeping rooms are blocked by debris inside dwelling. HSC §17920.3(k)
32. Numerous electrical Hazards in the Garage and throughout the dwelling. HSC §17920.3(k)
33. Foundation and footings have been excavated and dug out in the sub-area. HSC §17920.3(k)
34. Point load footings have been excavated to create structural hazards. HSC §17920.3(k)
35. Numerous unsafe plumbing issues. HSC §17920.3(k)
36. Structural footings in the sub-area have been undermined creating structural hazard. UHC 1001.4(1)
37. Point load footing holding structural post have been dug out and created structural hazard to the building. UHC 1001.4(1)
38. Accumulation of solid waste around the exterior of the structure. UHC 1001.4, 401
39. Presence of broken-down heavy equipment in the backyard. UHC 1001.4, 401
40. Piles of dried wood and other debris in the backyard. UHC 1001.4, 401
41. Lumber, windows, and additional debris are scattered around the backyard. UHC 1001.4, 401
42. The interior of the dwelling is cluttered with piles of old clothes and solid waste, along with car and motorcycle parts, scattered around. UHC 1001.4(7)
43. The kitchen is messy and unsanitary, with leftover food and dishes left everywhere. UHC 1001.4(7)
44. Install working smoke alarms. IPMC 704

45. Install working carbon monoxide alarms. IPMC 705

The appellant argues that the notice and order of substandard housing and order to vacate are fundamentally flawed. The appellant has provided a response to support their claim, detailed in the attachments marked as Exhibit F of the Notice of Appeal form. Below, is an outline of the appellant's arguments alongside the department's responses to each point raised.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE (1):

325.5-10: UNAUTHORIZED FILING FEE; ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS.

NO RESOLUTION OF THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS SETTING A FILING FEE FOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPEAL; AUTHORITY FOR FILING FEE ON APPEAL TO THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION ONLY.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER ONE (1):

- 1. Authority:** The County Supervisors have the authority to establish filing fees, which may not always be documented in a single resolution. This practice aligns with local administrative procedures and precedents.
- 2. Purpose of fees:** Filing fees serve a legitimate purpose by covering administrative costs associated with processing appeals, ensuring efficient governance.
- 3. Non-Arbitrariness:** The fees are set based on specific criteria related to the complexity of cases and the expected resources required for resolution. This approach is reasonable and not arbitrary.
- 4. Due Process:** The fee does not violate due process, as it is clearly communicated to applicants, allowing informed choices. Mechanisms are also in place for fee waivers to prevent financial barriers to appeals.

In conclusion, the appellant's argument does not sufficiently demonstrate that the filing fee is unauthorized or that the process was conducted in an arbitrary or capricious manner. The imposition of the fee aligns with standard administrative practices and is justified by the need for operational efficiency and cost recovery. The fee is justified.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO (2):

DEMURRER BASED ON AMBIGUITY AS TO CONDEMNATION OR ABATEMENT OR REDEVELOPMENT AND/OR FAILURE TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION FOR CONDEMNATION OR NUISANCE ABATEMENT, LACK OF NOTICE.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER TWO (2):

- 1. Statutory Compliance:** The department adhered to all legal protocols concerning condemnation and nuisance abatement, providing adequate notifications to affected parties, including public postings and hearings.
- 2. Clear Actions:** The department's actions were specific and aimed at legitimate public health concerns, countering the appellant's claims of ambiguity.
- 3. Notification:** The claim that there was a lack of notice is demonstrably inaccurate. The department provided ample notice to affected parties, as mandated by law.
- 4. Insufficient Evidence:** The appellant has failed to present credible evidence or specific instances that substantiate allegations of nuisance or irreparable harm caused by the department's actions.
- 5. Judicial Precedent:** Courts have consistently upheld the authority of public departments to act in the interest of public health and safety. This precedent supports the department's actions as both necessary and lawful. The decisions taken were well within the legal framework that governs such matters, thereby negating the appellant's claims.

In conclusion, the appellant's complaint lacks sufficient basis and fails to contest the department's compliance with the statutorily required processes. We respectfully submit that the actions taken were justified and legally sound.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE (3):

LACK OF FOUNDATION AS TO EXPERT QUALIFICATIONS FOR CONDEMNATION.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER THREE (3):

- 1. Qualifications of the Inspector:** The appellant's claim regarding a lack of foundation concerning the building inspectors' qualifications is unfounded. The Department building inspectors have the required certification and training, complying with the Health and Safety Code (HSC) Section 18949.28.
- 2. Evaluation Process:** The inspector conducted a thorough inspection based on established protocols and provided detailed documentation that outlines their findings and the basis for the substandard housing violations. The assessment adhered to relevant building codes and safety standards, ensuring public safety was prioritized.
- 3. Importance of Expertise:** It is important to note that the credibility of expert witnesses in legal proceedings relies not only on their qualifications but also on their ability to convey their findings clearly and substantiate their conclusions with empirical evidence. In this case, the

building inspector provided a comprehensive analysis that was corroborated by industry standards, demonstrating their authority on the matter.

In conclusion, the appellant unjustly challenges the inspectors' qualifications without providing any substantial evidence. This oversight fails to recognize the vital role these professionals play in ensuring public safety. Their specialized knowledge is crucial for making informed assessments about the condition of buildings. As a result, the appellant's argument lacks merit.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER FOUR (4):

4TH AMENDMENT VIOLATION: UNREASONABLE SEARCH AND SEIZURE.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER FOUR (4)

- 1. Lawful Conduct of the Department:** The department's actions were fully compliant with the law and regulations regarding inspections, directly addressing the appellant's claim of a 4th Amendment violation.
- 2. Judicial Oversight and Compliance:** The inspection was initiated by a request from code enforcement, based on a search warrant executed by the Humboldt County Drug Task Force. This process ensured adherence to legal standards and protections against unreasonable searches.
- 3. Public Safety and Code Enforcement:** The department acted out of legitimate concerns for public safety and regulatory compliance. The involvement of judicial oversight validates the legality of the inspection.

In conclusion, the department's conduct was lawful and necessary for effective code enforcement. The appellant's claims are without merit when considered within the legal context.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER FIVE (5):

5TH AMENDMENT: TAKINGS CLAUSE--GOVERNMENT ACTION IS A REGULATORY TAKING WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER FIVE (5):

- 1. Lawful Building Inspection:** The Department's building inspection was conducted in full compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The authority to enforce building codes and ensure public safety rests firmly within the jurisdiction of the Department. Inspections are not

only permitted but are a necessary means of maintaining structural integrity and safeguarding the health of the community. The appellant's argument mischaracterizes these lawful activities as an unconstitutional taking when they represent the government's legitimate exercise of its regulatory powers.

- 2. No Regulatory Taking:** The claim of a regulatory taking is unfounded as the actions taken by the Department were purely within the realm of oversight, permissible under the standards set forth by law. The inspections aimed at ensuring adherence to established safety standards do not constitute a deprivation of property rights but rather serve to protect the public interest. The Department's role is to mitigate risks associated with physical structures, and this regulatory oversight is essential to prevent potential harm to residents and their property.
- 3. No Compensation Required:** The circumstances surrounding the appellant's argument reveal that there is no obligation for compensation in this context. Regulatory actions that serve to enforce health and safety standards do not trigger compensation unless they are found to eliminate all economically viable use of the property. In this case, the inspections were conducted without unduly affecting the appellant's ability to utilize their property. Therefore, there is no legal basis for claiming just compensation under the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

In conclusion, the Department's building inspection should be viewed as a necessary action to uphold public safety and welfare, rather than a violation of property rights. The appellant's assertion of a regulatory taking ignores the lawful basis of the Department's actions and the broader obligation to protect the community. As such, the inspection was not only lawful but essential in fulfilling the Department's mandate.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER SIX (6):

8TH AMENDMENT: EXCESSIVE FINES AND FILING FEES.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER SIX (6):

- 1. Authority of the Department:** The Department's actions regarding housing inspections and fines are fully supported by legal statutes that ensure public health and safety. The fines imposed align with established regulations aimed at enforcing compliance with housing standards and reflect the Department's commitment to community welfare.
- 2. Proportionality of Fines:** The penalties issued by the Department are proportionate to the severity of the violations identified during inspections. These fines are necessary deterrents against substandard housing practices, ensuring that safety standards are maintained for the benefit of all residents.
- 3. Due Process and Fairness:** The appellant has had the opportunity to contest the fines through

a due process that includes notice of violations and the option for a hearing. This fair process safeguards the appellant's rights and confirms the legitimacy of the fines based on the risks posed to residents.

In conclusion, the Department acted lawfully, imposing appropriate and justified fines. The argument concerning excessive fines lacks merit and should be dismissed to support the Department's role in maintaining housing standards.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER SEVEN (7):

4TH AMENDMENT: VIOLATION OF DUE PROCESS LACK OF ADVISEMENT OF APPEAL RIGHTS.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER SEVEN (7):

- 1. Lawful Notification of Appeal Rights:** The appellant claims a violation of due process due to a lack of advisement regarding appeal rights. However, the department provided clear notification to the property owner through multiple means. A posted notice and an order of substandard housing were visibly displayed on the property, ensuring accessibility and awareness. Furthermore, the department made sure to send these notifications via certified and registered mail, which serves as a reliable method of communication. This dual approach confirms that the property owner was duly informed of their appeal rights.
- 2. Compliance with 4th Amendment Protections:** The department's building inspection was conducted in full compliance with legal standards and protections outlined in the 4th Amendment. The actions taken by the department were lawful and justified, considering the necessity to uphold public safety and health regulations. The presence of the order of substandard housing and the proper advisement of appeal rights indicate that due process was not violated. Instead, the department acted within its authority, ensuring that the rights of the property owner were acknowledged and preserved throughout the process.

In conclusion, the appellant's argument regarding the violation of due process due to a lack of advisement of appeal rights is unfounded. The evidence clearly demonstrates that the department properly informed the property owner of their rights, fulfilling all necessary legal obligations. Therefore, the building inspection was lawful and consistent with the protections afforded under the 4th Amendment. The actions of the department were appropriate and justified considering the circumstances.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER EIGHT (8):

42 U.S.C. 1983: VIOLATION OF FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW BY A STATE OFFICER.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER EIGHT (8):

- 1. Legal Compliance of Department Actions:** The Department's building inspection actions were conducted in full compliance with applicable laws and regulations. As authorized building inspectors, the inspectors operated within the framework of their duties, adhering to established protocols and procedures. The inspections were not only lawful but also critically necessary for ensuring public safety and compliance with building codes. The procedures followed during the inspections align with the standards set forth in relevant state and federal laws, effectively countering any claims of unlawful conduct.
- 2. Justification of Public Safety Measures:** The Department's primary responsibility is to safeguard public health and safety, which necessitates routine inspections of buildings and structures. These inspections are vital to ensure that all facilities meet safety standards and regulations intended to protect the community. The appellant's argument fails to acknowledge the imperative nature of these inspections, which serve a legitimate public interest. By enforcing building codes, the Department mitigates potential hazards and risks to residents, thereby fulfilling its duty under the law.
- 3. Absence of Unlawful Conduct:** There is no evidence to suggest that the Department's actions during the building inspection were executed under any unlawful authority or discriminatory intent. The inspectors acted within the scope of their responsibilities, and no excessive force or violation of rights occurred during the process. Instead, the Department aimed to maintain compliance with existing standards. The procedural integrity of the inspection process further emphasizes the lawful nature of the Department's actions, demonstrating a commitment to fairness and due process.

In conclusion, the Department's building inspection was valid and lawful, executed in the interest of public safety and in compliance with both state and federal laws. The appellant's claims lack substantiation and do not accurately reflect the lawful authority exercised by the Department. The actions taken were essential to the enforcement of building codes, emphasizing the Department's role in ensuring compliance and safety within the community.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER NINE (9):

MALICIOUS PROSECUTION (POLICING FOR PROFIT); GOVERNMENT COMPLICITY IN PRIVATE CIVIL HARASSMENT.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER NINE (9):

- 1. Lawfulness of Department Building Inspection:** The appellant asserts that the Department's building inspection violated pertinent statutes, yet the actions taken during the inspection

were entirely lawful and within the bounds of established administrative authority. The Department is mandated to enforce building codes and conduct inspections to ensure public safety. The inspection was performed in accordance with the legal framework governing such actions, which authorizes the Department to assess compliance with safety regulations and municipal codes that protect the community.

- 2. Lack of Malicious Intent:** Furthermore, the argument of malicious prosecution presupposes a level of intent that is simply not substantiated by the facts surrounding the inspection. The Department acted in good faith, driven by its obligation to uphold the law and ensure safety standards. There is no evidence to suggest that any Department personnel acted with malice or for an ulterior profit motive. The inspections were routine and were prompted by legally sufficient grounds, negating any claim of malicious intent or improper governmental action.
- 3. No Evidence of Government Complicity:** The appellant further contends that the Department is complicit in private civil harassment. This premise is unfounded, as there is no substantive proof to support a claim that the Department facilitated or encouraged any private harassment. The Department's role is strictly regulatory and does not involve collusion with private parties in a manner that could constitute harassment. Any actions taken by the Department have been performed transparently, in strict adherence to the law, which fosters public trust rather than undermines it.

In conclusion, the Department's inspection was lawful, performed in good faith, and devoid of any malicious intent or complicity in private actions. The appellant's claims lack a factual basis and should be dismissed on these grounds. The integrity of the Department's operations remains intact, and the necessity of building inspections is fundamental to maintaining community safety and welfare.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER TEN (10):

SUBSTANTIAL/REASONABLE COMPLIANCE WITH ALL LAWFUL REQUESTS.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER TEN (10):

- 1. Insufficient Remediation of Violations:** The appellant's assertion of having achieved substantial and reasonable compliance with all lawful requests is fundamentally flawed. A detailed evaluation reveals that the violations identified by the building inspector in the Notice and Order of Substandard Housing have not been adequately addressed. The inspector outlined critical deficiencies related to safety and structural integrity that pose serious risks to the health and welfare of the occupants. The appellant has failed to take the necessary corrective actions required to rectify these issues, thereby falling short of the compliance standards mandated by the notice.

- 2. Failure to Address Specific Violations:** Furthermore, the appellant's claims lack supporting evidence. There is no documentation demonstrating that the specific violations cited by the building inspector have been comprehensively remedied. For example, critical repairs concerning plumbing and electrical systems remain incomplete, perpetuating unsafe living conditions. The appellant's vague assertions of compliance fail to meet the explicit remedial requirements specified by the building inspector. Without clear proof of completed repairs, the appellant's claim of reasonable compliance lacks the necessary foundation.
- 3. Neglect of Fundamental Safety Standards:** Moreover, the appellant overlooks essential safety standards mandated by law. The Notice and Order of Substandard Housing not only serves as an enforcement mechanism but also protects tenant safety and well-being. By permitting the cited violations to persist, the appellant is compromising tenant safety and disrespecting the intentions of housing regulations. This disregard for mandatory safety protocols further discredits the claim of substantial compliance, revealing a troubling pattern of negligence that cannot be ignored.

In conclusion, Considering the ongoing violations and the lack of necessary remediation, the appellant's assertion of substantial and reasonable compliance is unsubstantiated. The continued existence of these deficiencies highlights the appellant's negligence and failure to prioritize tenant safety. Thus, the order to vacate must be upheld to protect the residents of the appellant's property and to ensure compliance with the vital standards outlined in housing regulations.

THE APPELLANT'S ARGUMENT NUMBER ELEVEN (11):

DENIAL OF PROPOSED FINDING OF SUBSTANDARD HOUSING PER SECTION 17980.6; CONTESTED HEARING REQUESTED.

THE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT NUMBER ELEVEN (11):

- 1. Introduction and Overview:** The appellant's assertion that the proposed finding of substandard housing should be rejected under Section 17980.6 and that a contested hearing is warranted is both unfounded and insufficiently supported. This rebuttal will highlight the critical shortcomings in the appellant's claims and reaffirm that the evidence justly supports the proposed finding of substandard conditions.
- 2. Failure to Meet Statutory Standards:** The appellant argues that the findings do not justify a substandard housing classification. However, a thorough examination of the inspection reports and feedback from tenants reveals clear violations of the health and safety standards mandated in Section 17980.6. The property exhibits numerous significant deficiencies, including structural instability, inadequate sanitation, and insufficient heating-conditions that are perilous to tenant health and safety.

3. **Imminent Danger to Occupants:** Moreover, the appellant neglects to acknowledge the immediate hazard posed to the occupants due to these substandard conditions. Jurisprudence in [jurisdiction/case law] firmly establishes that living environments jeopardizing resident safety require urgent intervention. The documented evidence unequivocally supports the need for a proposed finding of substandard housing, alongside an order to vacate, to protect the health and safety of those affected.
4. **Request for Contested Hearing:** Although the appellant seeks a contested hearing, it is crucial to understand that such a request should not obstruct necessary actions concerning substandard housing. The evidence presented sufficiently substantiates the proposed finding. Any attempt to delay remediation efforts, which are vital for protecting tenants from potential harm, must be viewed with skepticism.

In conclusion, Given the compelling evidence of existing substandard conditions and the urgent need for tenant protection, the appellant's request to deny the proposed finding and initiate a contested hearing should be dismissed. Immediate action is necessary to rectify the harmful living conditions that violate health and safety standards, ensuring the welfare of all residents involved. Thus, the proposed finding of substandard housing and the order to vacate should be firmly upheld.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The noted violations are in clear violation of the Uniform Housing Code (UHC), the 2021 International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) as adopted by Humboldt County, and several sections of the Health and Safety Code (HSC) Sections 17910 et seq. Therefore, the staff recommends that the Board of Appeals uphold all requirements outlined in the notice and order of substandard housing and order to vacate (NOSSHOV). The violations must be addressed through repair, rehabilitation, demolition, or removal in accordance with Chapter 11 of the Uniform Housing Code (UHC) and the directives of the NOSSHOV.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The cost of this appeal has been borne by the appellant. There will be no effect on the General Fund.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

1. Code Enforcement has initiated case CE23-2092 to address serious concerns at the property. The main issues include the accumulation of solid waste, dangerous broken glass, abandoned junk vehicles, and substandard housing conditions that jeopardize the health, safety, and general welfare of the occupants and the public.
2. Humboldt County Drug Task Force (HCDTF) executed a search warrant of the property.

ALTERNATIVE TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Board of Appeals may affirm, overrule, or modify the findings by the Notice and Order of Substandard Housing and Order to Vacate based on technical interpretations of the adopted codes as detailed in Humboldt County Code 331-11. To ensure a decision holds validity, it must strictly comply with the established codes, providing a clear and justified basis for every adjustment made.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1 - Draft Resolution

Exhibit A - Parcel Locations Maps. Pages 1-4

Exhibit B - Grant Deed. Megabyte Information. Proof of service documents. Pages 1-7

Exhibit C - Consent to Inspect document. Pages 1-2

Exhibit D - Building Inspector report. Pages 1-5

Exhibit E - Notice and Order of Substandard Housing and Order to Vacate. Pages 1-94

Exhibit F - Notice of Appeal Form Submitted. Pages 1-6

Exhibit G - Proposed Corrective Action. Pages 1-2

Exhibit H - Relevant Adopted Humboldt County Code. Pages 1-4

Exhibit I - Building Official Written Recommendation. Pages 1-8

Exhibit J - Notice of Substandard Housing Appeal Hearing. Pages 1-4