

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

K #: 11-024 Miami Springs Code Enforcement Issue

Date Opened: Feb. 11, 2011 Date Closed: March 29, 2011

Name of investigator: Karl Ross
.....

ALLEGATION: On or about Feb. 10, COE received a tip on the hotline from a Miami Springs resident concerning alleged “favoritism” by local officials as it relates to code enforcement issues for a property at 120 South Drive. The caller – who identified himself as Charles Adams – alleged a garage had been improperly converted into a residential unit and that officials “refuse” to take appropriate action.

INVESTIGATION: After attempts to re-contact Mr. Adams were unsuccessful, COE did contact the Building & Code Compliance Department for Miami Springs to inquire as to whether any complaints had been filed against the property at 120 South Drive. Mr. Tex Ziadie, supervisor for said department, advised that a Mr. “Chuck” Adams had recently filed complaints about the property and that, following a review of the property files and an inspection of the property, the complaint was deemed “invalid.” He noted that the property had been issued permits by the city on two occasions to modify the property. He said the first permit was issued in 1964 and authorized the conversion of an attached garage into a one-bedroom, one-bathroom living quarters. He said a second permit was issued in 2000 and authorized the “enclosure” of a detached garage. He said that a “re-occupancy” inspection was conducted in 2004 at the time when the property had been sold and that no violations were found at that time. He said that Mr. Adams made other allegations that were outside of the jurisdiction of the city’s code enforcement office – tax evasion, etc. – and that no further action was taken.

At the request of COE, Mr. Ziadie provided copies of records pertaining to both permits issued for the property on South Drive, along with a case history report documenting the complaint made by Mr. Adams on or about January 3, 2011. The latter document showed that the complaint was investigated and concluded two days later. The report stated: "Case closed due to invalid complaint." Mr. Ziadie further advised in an e-mail dated March 28 that Adams made his complaint verbally and did not put anything in writing at that time and that Adams did not leave a contact phone number.

Subsequent efforts were made to reach Mr. Adams to review the preliminary findings of the COE investigation and the available contact numbers were no longer valid.

CONCLUSION: Based on the available information, it would appear that Mr. Adams' allegations are unsubstantiated in that 1.) City officials did act on his complaint and conduct a review of the property's enforcement file as well as a physical inspection, and that 2.) The official review determined that the subject property was in compliance with the city's building code, and had properly obtained permits prior to making any modifications. Accordingly, it is recommended that the investigation be closed at this time.

###