

TAB J

Mr. Miller asked if Mr. Cope could elaborate on the report. Mr. Cope stated he was not an expert on mold, and would have to limit himself to the first page of the report dated September 11, 2007. He referred to the paragraph that stated, "It is my opinion that air quality within the house is unsafe due to the high levels of toxic spores... . It is my recommendation that anyone entering this residence, wear a full face respirator fitted with P100 HEPA filters."

Ms. Cozzolino clarified that the property owner had requested and paid for the report. Mr. Cope stated that was correct. He explained the property owner had asked the Building Department to perform an inspection on the inside of the building, particularly the concern with mold in the building. He explained he did not want to send any of his inspectors inside the building until they received verification it was safe. He had advised the property owner that in order for the Building Department to consider going inside the premises, they would need a report from a mold specialist, which had generated the report. He stated that based on the results, he informed the property owner he would not send any of his inspectors inside at this point.

Ms. Cozzolino asked about the reason the property owner had requested the Building Department to go inside the premises and look at the mold problem. Mr. Cope stated the property owner wanted a list of violations found on the inside to go along with the list of violations noted on the outside to use as justification as to the condition of the building.

Mr. Dunphy stated that upon hearing that, his question would be where did the Commission go from here, and what was the next step? Mr. Cope stated that from the Building Department standpoint, they had held off because of the interest on the owner's part to try and pursue some remediation. However, since the mold report had been received, nothing had happened. The Building Department was aware the property would be scheduled for a Historic Districts Commission meeting, and thought that would be the appropriate time to discuss the property with the Commission.

Mr. Cope stated there were certain aspects of the outside of the building that the Building Department considered unsafe and that should be taken care of, although that might not be to the extent the Commission felt necessary to bring the premises to a state of "mothballing".

Mr. Delacourt stated that on behalf of the Commission, Staff had sent a letter notifying the property owner of his obligation to maintain and repair the historic property and to request some response. He stated the letter was sent because the property had become an issue as the Building Department was dealing with it, and it was important to remind the property owner of the historic designation.

Mr. Delacourt stated the Commission, based on a finding that the integrity of the structure was in danger, could make a motion in relation to demolition and enforcement of demolition by neglect, which would put the City in a position to require the owner, through Code Enforcement and Violation Notices, to repair. Ultimately, the City could be put in a position to enter the property, and make the repairs itself. He pointed out that was more of an enforcement issue, and the Commission could make the motion whenever it felt it had the appropriate information based on the photographs or investigation by the Building Department. He explained if the Commission felt the structure of the property reached that plateau, the Commission could make that motion.