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CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Good morning. The Vacant Property Review Committee is about to get started. My name is Susie Jarmon.

I would like to add the addendum to the agenda. I also checked the taxes this morning, so I'll let the individuals know what taxes are owed on the property.

Are there any attorneys in the room?

(Hands raised.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Come up.

(Witnesses approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: This property is on the addendum. New Kensington was the applicant -- 2036 East Susquehanna, 1832 East Oakdale, 2105 East Cumberland, 2109 East Cumberland.

Can you state your name for the record?

MR. JAMPEL: Hi. My name is Joseph Jampel, that's, J-A-M-P-E-L. I'm an attorney for New Kensington Community Development Corporation. With me today, I have Brian Horne, who is a construction associate at New Kensington. And additionally, we have Judy Berkman, who is another attorney at Regional
Housing Legal Services -- is here with me today.

I'm here about the four properties that the Chairwoman mentioned. These are properties that New Kensington currently owns, subject to VPRC restrictions. We would like to develop these properties as affordable housing. And in order to move forward with those plans, we're respectfully requesting that the VPRC restrictions be released.

I do want to note at the end of my remarks, I'd like to make one clarification to one of the items in the letter that I sent to the Chairwoman on Friday.

So I think the properties should be considered in pairs. They were -- two of them were conveyed via one deed and two via another. So the first two that I'll talk about are 1832 East Oakdale and 2036 East Susquehanna.

So those properties were conveyed to New Kensington in April of 2009. New Kensington acquired them with the purpose of maintaining them. And then if they were able to secure funding, developing them as part of a larger,
mixed income home ownership development.

Over the past 10 years, New Kensington has maintained these properties. Unfortunately, 2009 was during the housing downturn. And funding for home ownership program was drastically cut.

Additionally, when New Kensington did try to move forward with developing this project, they encountered some community opposition, which stalled the project. For those reasons, they weren't able to move forward with it at that time.

But New Kensington did meet its commitment to maintain the properties and to pursue the development. And therefore, we're asking that the restrictions be released so that it can now move forward to develop affordable housing on these properties.

The other two properties are 2105 East Cumberland and 2109 East Cumberland. Those properties were acquired by New Kensington in 2002 for the purpose of off street parking.

Since that time, New Kensington has maintained these properties. It has fenced
them off to prevent any illegal dumping or
other activity that would be deleterious to the
neighborhood and has used them intermittently
to park a trailer and other materials that it
uses for its work.

New Kensington has complied with the terms
of the VPRC restrictions and therefore is
asking, respectfully, for those restrictions to
be released so that it can move forward in
developing affordable housing on those
properties.

So one last note on that clarification
that I mentioned in the letter that I sent to
the Chairwoman on Friday, I wrote that the
properties would be developed and that there
would be affordability restrictions on the
properties -- just to clarify, that's referring
to a purchase price subsidy mortgage that would
be on the properties. Thank you very much.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question. You
said you have two lots on Cumberland that were
used for parking. Was it rezoned for parking?

MR. JAMPEL: So my understanding is the
properties were not zoned for parking, but the
properties were not used as a parking lot.

They weren't -- they were used for storing, basically, this one trailer.

And my understanding is that over the course of the period that New Kensington used the properties in this manner, they were never informed by anyone from the City or otherwise that they were not using this property in a conforming way.

MR. PADILLA: I've got a few questions.

What was the amount that you paid for these properties?

MR. JAMPEL: To the VPRC?

MR. PADILLA: It says a nominal transaction?

MR. JAMPEL: Yeah.

MR. PADILLA: And you have a PRA restriction or a...

MR. JAMPEL: So the properties were -- I mean they were conveyed --

MR. PADILLA: It just says here, conveyed through PRA.

MR. JAMPEL: To the PRA and then from the PRA -- yeah.
MR. PADILLA: When were you supposed to complete the proposed development?

MR. JAMPEL: So the proposed development was supposed to be -- it was contingent on receiving funding.

And so what New Kensington committed to do was to maintain these properties as open green space. And they were hopeful that they would get funding to do this development. And unfortunately, they did not.

So they didn't commit to doing it during any specific time period. What they committed to do was to use their best efforts to get that funding and to move forward with the development. And they do did so. And unfortunately, they didn't get that funding.

But, now we're here today to say that we do have funding to do this, so we'd like to move forward.

MR. PADILLA: So you're saying the restriction did not have a time constraint?

They typically do.

MR. JAMPEL: So the restrictions does have it. The VPRC restrictions, in the context of
this, would mean that during the five year period that the restriction was in place, that New Kensington needed to maintain the properties and also look for funding, which they did do during that period.

MR. O'DWYER: The restrictions that were on it, are the ones consistent with side yards or green space, not development.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: So there's a restriction to develop, maintain and occupy?

MR. JAMPEL: Sorry?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: There was a restriction to develop, maintain and occupy for a period of five years?

MR. JAMPEL: So I believe that that was the wording. And in the context of what you would see in the transcript, what that meant was to maintain this as open green space and look for funding to develop it.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. But on the other two, the proposal was to develop off street parking.

MR. JAMPEL: There was no development anticipated. The proposal was to use this as
off street parking for New Kensington. 

And I'll also say that, I think, in 2002 when this was the contemplated use, New Kensington thought that there would be more demand on their part for parking than there ended up being. I think they have more employees now who are using public transportation to get to work, who are walking to work. And therefore, they don't have the same need for that that they might have in 2002.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question. What level of affordability is the proposed project?

MR. JAMPEL: We're proposing that these will be single-family homes that will be affordable to families with area median incomes between 60 and 80 percent.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So my question is, why wouldn't you just carry the restriction over to the new development to ensure affordable...

MR. JAMPEL: So I think that -- so first of all, for financing purposes, in order for a lender to be comfortable financing this, they are going to need to know that this Committee
is not going to use its reversionary interest
in a way that would threaten these properties.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: We subordinate interest
all the time.

MR. PADILLA: Yeah. And we still have to
keep that until the development is completed
anyway.

MR. O'DWYER: If New Kensington met their
obligations, what basis would we have to put
new obligations on or not rescind the
obligations that we put on 15 years ago?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: What is their obligation?

MR. O'DWYER: For the properties on
Susquehanna and Oakdale that were given as
green space, I think that it's pretty clear
that they did.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: If they clean it.

Because it's kind of a mess, the one on
Oakdale.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Can I get a
recommendation or are there any other
questions?

MR. KOONCE: I have a question. For
the -- what are you building on for four
affordable units?

MR. JAMPEL: On the core properties?

MR. KOONCE: Yeah.

MR. JAMPEL: So each property will be a single-family home to be sold to a family with an income between 60 and 80 percent AMI.

MR. KOONCE: What's the development cost?

MR. JAMPEL: The development cost, I don't think that we have those exact numbers at the moment. Do we, Greg?

MR. HORNE: So -- Brian Horne from NKCDC. So for this project, we are doing two additional houses, which will be at market rate, included in this project overall. And those will be used to help subsidize the four other properties.

So for the total development costs, we're looking at $1.8 million for all six units.

MR. PADILLA: I think, personally, my concern is -- and this goes to precedent -- when people pitch a project, they should be ready to also produce a budget, sources and uses, so that we're clear as to what's going at that site with a timetable. And I don't see
that here today.

MR. JAMPEL: So I think, you know, our request was for a release of the restrictions. I think that if what this Committee is comfortable with is extending the restrictions and entering into a subordination agreement that would make a lender comfortable moving forward with this and also providing some sort of letter of assurance to the lender that if New Kensington does move forward with the project, as contemplated today, that the VPRC would not exercise its reversionary interest.

I think that would make sense going forward. And certainly, if in order to ultimately release those restrictions, you wanted more information about the project that we don't have right at this time, we'd definitely provide that.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I think at this point, we can't negotiate the terms here. But you're asking us for the City to forego any reversionary action that could be discussed here.

MR. O'DWYER: I don't think that -- I've
been on this Committee for a while -- I don't think that we generally do. If somebody's met their obligations, then we generally -- if this was a private seller who had maintained it as a side yard, wanted to sell it for development, we wouldn't require that developer to come and show project plans.

MR. PADILLA: We have before.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think the question is, have they fulfilled their obligations and what were the actual, original proposals.

MR. O'DWYER: According to the transcript that I looked at, they agreed to maintain it as green space, open space, and then aspirational goal of affordable housing contingent on --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: What about the other two?

MR. O'DWYER: The other two, they said they were going to use it for parking, off street parking for their office space.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: And the restriction rezoned it and it's supposed to build it as Code, correct?

MR. O'DWYER: That is correct. So perhaps the first two, we should remove the
restrictions and the second two, enter into a subordination agreement?

   MS. JOHNSON: They were all acquired for a nominal fee.

   MR. O'DWYER: But they were acquired through two separate transactions.

   MS. CUNNINGHAM: And two were acquired for different purposes than the other two. So I think that they've probably met their obligation on the two that they were supposed to maintain and keep as open green space. I'm not convinced that they've met their obligation on the two for off street parking.

   MR. JAMPEL: I have some pictures of the two for off street parking.

   MS. CUNNINGHAM: We have pictures of it. My understanding is that off street parking -- when you propose off street parking, you need to have it rezoned for parking and paved.

   MR. KOONCE: And a curb cut.

   MS. CUNNINGHAM: And a curb cut. So otherwise, the cars are just driving on the sidewalk.

   MR. JAMPEL: So I believe that there is a
curb cut here. I'll pass around pictures. I have three for the Committee to look at.

MR. DALFO: In a particular instance, though, the two lots that were supposed to be set aside for parking -- and under the strict terms and conditions, they need to be rezoned to development in an appropriate matter.

And in this case, you're proposing to put houses on those parking spots?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Yes.

MR. DALFO: Then why would we make them put a parking lot there to tear it out?

MR. O'DWYER: We're not.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I don't think we would.

I think what we would do is keep the restrictions until it's been developed into the housing and subordinate our interest to the lender. I don't think we are going to ask them to build a parking lot no now, no.

MR. KOONCE: But I think if we do subordinate, we need some kind of a timeline.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Agreed.

MR. O'DWYER: Well, we'd have to subordinate and grant an extension for six
months. And then they'd have to come back in
six months.

MR. PADILLA: We can't do that here,
right?

MR. O'DWYER: We can't grant an extension?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Sure.

MR. PADILLA: Well, why didn't they ask
for an extension earlier?

MR. O'DWYER: I think that he said they
weren't aware that they weren't using the space
consistent with City Code. They have never
been told that they weren't, so they thought --

MR. PADILLA: Isn't that in the
restriction and the deed?

MR. O'DWYER: I'm not 100 percent sure
what the restrictions say exactly. It says
consistent with the comprehensive plan or
whatever.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: If I could make a
suggestion that we would allow them time to
come back with a proposal and more details
about the affordable housing.

I think this body is supportive of
affordable housing. And it's just a
timetable -- what do you think. You're saying you only have 60 to 80 percent. Where's the income qualifications, how do we know, you know?

What's the time line if you're saying that two properties have to be built and sold to finance the other four? That's at least 18 to 24 months of development time before you put a shovel in the ground for the other four.

So I think to my colleague's point, what's the time line and what's the financing, is this real --

MR. PADILLA: The two that were open space, is it 2105 Susquehanna?

MR. O'DWYER: 2036 and 1832.

MR. PADILLA: Okay.

MR. KOONCE: I would suggest that we approve those two.

MR. HUNTER: They haven't been really maintained. I mean, the sidewalk is not present for part of the lot. The grass is growing into the sidewalk. There's no fence there. There's nothing on the lot.

And the one on East Oakdale, it's covered
in debris. I don't know if it's been
maintained as open space or sidewalk.

MR. HORNE: If I may state to a point that
was before made before, as far as the time
line, we have been working on this project
since July of last year. And we have entered
into a contract with an architect and gotten
the required zoning permits.

At this point, we are looking to bid out
the project in April or May to begin
construction. And so I think it would be -- we
fully respect the decision of this Committee,
so whatever further information you require to
move forward, you know, we're more than happy
to pass that along.

MR. PADILLA: So any delay on the other
ones, it shouldn't delay your process. If
you're that advanced, then you should be able
to produce plans, your proposed development,
your sources and uses. I mean, this is real
estate development 101. Come prepared. If
you're pitching something, come prepared to
demonstrate what you're doing.

MR. JAMPEL: So I do have some sketches of
plans for the Committee to see, which I can
pass around, too.

MR. PADILLA: I'd rather see a quick four, five page proposal -- when is that going to happen. We just want to avoid -- we want to facilitate you, as well, and avoid coming back for any future extensions, because it is bound by time. And development can be uncertain depending on conditions.

So we just want to be very efficient and effective in what we're trying to do. So I think -- are we ready to move on something?

MR. HUNTER: I want to just add to that. If you're proposing affordable housing, there needs to be some sort of binding agreement saying it's going to be affordable housing.

MR. PADILLA: That would have to be part of it, absolutely. And it's going to impact your development.

How long are you going to maintain, you know, affordability at 60 to 80 percent. 60 to 80 percent require most definitely some type of subsidy. Where is that coming from, you know? We just need it spelled out a little bit
MR. O'DWYER: So it sounds like we're ready to move forward on Susquehanna and Oakdale and then we want to table the Cumberland properties.

MR. PADILLA: Correct.

MR. O'DWYER: So I move that we issue a Certificate of Completion for 2036 East Susquehanna Avenue and 1832 East Oakdale Street, contingent upon the lots being cleaned to the satisfaction of the Chair.

And that we table 2105 and 2109 East Cumberland Street until the next meeting.

(Duly seconded.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

MR. JAMPEL: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any other attorneys in the room?

(Witness approached podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Hi. Can you state your name for the record?
MR. KRIK: My name is Justin Krik.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: And you're here for?

MR. KRIK: I'm here for 5427 Delancey Street.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: We just added this, this morning. It looks like taxes of 2019 is $629.91 on the property.

MR. KRIK: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: And you're here representing...

MR. KRIK: I'm here representing Soco Properties II, LLC. I have a member, Matt Soloff with me.

And we are here this morning seeking a release of the reversionary interest that was placed upon the property by deed in 1980, when the City of Philadelphia transferred the property to the RDA.

Since that time, the property has changed plans about three different times. It is currently a single-family residential dwelling that is used as a rental property. Soco Properties would like to clear up title as they are transferring this property in a bundle
of -- in a portfolio of properties.

We believe that the restrictions and criteria were met in the development of this property by previous owners several years ago, several decades ago.

And again, we're here just to seek that this Committee authorized a release of that restriction.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any question from the Committee?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is this a PHCC property?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: It was a PHCC. They transferred it out through the applicant. And at the time, it was a single family dwelling.

MR. O'DWYER: And it's currently occupied, you said?

MR. KRIK: It is currently occupied.

MR. PADILLA: And then the applicant sold it to a third party?

MR. KRIK: The original person sold it several times down the road.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: And these restrictions are almost 40 years old.

MR. O'DWYER: I move that we issue the
Certificate of Completion.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Contingent upon all
municipal encumbrances and liens being paid,
and that when we see a photograph that the
property is not falling down.

MR. KRIK: Sure. I can present that.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: We looked at it this
morning. I'll send you guys the picture when
my inspector brings it back to me today.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Thank you.

MR. KOONCE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you. Any other
attorneys in the room?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Let's get started on
Page 2. We have one Urban Garden Agreement,
1511 North Myrtlewood Street. May I get a
recommendation?

MR. O'DWYER: Move that we accept the
agreement.
(Duly seconded.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: The next are properties being transferred to the Redevelopment Authority on 40th Street.

MR. PADILLA: I'm going to recuse myself from this vote. These are properties that are being transferred to the PRA in support of a request for a proposal, a multi-facet housing development.

MS. JOHNSON: Does it, also, include the properties on Page 4?

MR. PADILLA: That's correct. 805 North 40th and 818 North 40th Street. Those are from the Philadelphia Land Bank.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Recommendation?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I do have a suggestion that we bundle the land bank transfers with these.

MR. PADILLA: Page 2, J and K?

MR. KOONCE: Motion to transfer of the
properties to the Land Bank, item J and K, as well as the properties?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Two recused.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Next items are properties to be transferred from the Land Bank to applicant as side yards on Page 2 through to 3.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Madam Chairwoman, I have to recuse myself from this.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Can I get a recommendation?

MR. KOONCE: On just the side yards, motion to approve, unless there's -- I haven't checked the taxes.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: There's only one, letter E, and it's a low amount. It's like $136. And they are from 2015.

I just have one quick question about G, about West Harold Street. Ms. Waddell has a trust and a life estate in the property. And
so in her property -- so she has a life estate,
but is it her or is it the beneficiary of the
life estate or the trust that wants the side
yard?

MR. RODRIGUEZ:  I would have to follow up
on this. Typically, they have to ask owner
occupied and verify that.

MS. CUNNINGHAM:  I mean she occupies.

MR. RODRIGUEZ:  She would have been the
applicant in this process.

MS. CUNNINGHAM:  And just make sure that
they are aware that they can't convey that
right into the trust.

MR. RODRIGUEZ:  Yes. This is a 30 year
restriction on the property. On all of these
properties, it's restricted. The restriction
still follow with the land.

MS. CUNNINGHAM:  I'm saying her current
house, her primary residence, is a life -- is
in trust for the beneficiary that will convey
on operation of law after she dies. It won't
be subject to probate.

MR. KOONCE:  Are they family members?

MS. CUNNINGHAM:  I don't know. It just
has names. The deed has names. I don't know
who they are.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: This would automatically
attach to her trust so --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: But it does say we
courage them to consolidate.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I doubt that.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: The recommendation?

Mike, you made the recommendation?

MR. KOONCE: I'm still a little bit
confused. You're saying the if we approve this
to Jannie Waddell at probate, who's going to
own the property?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Jannie Waddell.

MR. KOONCE: Okay.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: But not her house. Her
house will convey upon her death without be
being subject to probate differently than if
they try to consolidate them.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Her heirs would still have
to come back to the restricted use.

MR. KOONCE: Motion to approve the subject
to payment -- I'd like to have payment of taxes
for 3411 North 7th.
MR. PADILLA: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Next item is a request for extension of time, 2147 Federal, 2723 Oakford, 2727 Oakford. Ms. Siani(ph) is not here. We're going to table this item.

Next items are Certificates. The first address is 2728 West Master Street.

(Witness approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Good morning. State your name for the record.

MR. QARKAXHIA: My name is Eli Qarkaxhia. I'm the real estate agent from Berkshire Hathaway. I have a member of the LLC, 2728 West Master, David Ross.

We are seeking approval of the sale of the property and removal of the VPRC restriction.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: We have attached the Certificate of Occupancy and a picture.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So moved.

MR. O'DWYER: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in a favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you.

MR. QARKAXHIA: Would it be possible to obtain a letter of --

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: That it was approved today?

MR. QARKAXHIA: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. I'll ask the attorney to do it.

MR. QARKAXHIA: Can we email that?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. I'll email it.

MR. QARKAXHIA: Thank you so much.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: No problem. 1922 East Oakdale?

MR. O'DWYER: The property has a Certificate of Occupancy.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: And the property has been developed. Can I get a recommendation?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So moved.

MR. O'DWYER: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?
(No response.)
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: 730 Daly Street. We have a Certificate of Occupancy for this one. And it was recently developed.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: So moved.
MR. O'DWYER: Second.
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?
(AYE.)
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?
(No response.)
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: 5621 Beaumont Street. She's the heir. She's the wife of the deceased.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: I have a question.
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: Do you want to come up?
(Witness approached the podium.)
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: Did you have a question?
MR. RODRIGUEZ: I was wondering if she resides in the property
CHIARWOMAN JARMON: Can you state your
name for the record?

MS. BRYANT: Patricia Bryant.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Do you occupy the property?

MS. BRYANT: Not now. We're not occupying it.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Because?

MS. BRYANT: We had a little fire. And there was some damage.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. And your husband is deceased. So you're the heir to the property?

MS. BRYANT: I didn't hear you.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: This was your husband, Joseph?

MS. BRYANT: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. All right.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: How long ago was the fire?

MS. BRYANT: About a year.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: And we transferred this out to your husband in 1995.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I move we grant the certificate.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I second.
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: It was approved. So we'll be in contact with you.

The next items are properties that are in Land Bank's ownership, 2449 Marston and 2518 North Hope Street. They have the restrictions from the City.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Madam Chairwoman, I'm going to have to recuse myself. We're planning on going to settlement as soon as the restriction is lifted. This is a typical situation where we transferred properties in from VPRC. And upon title search, found out that there was long-standing restrictions.

MR. O'DWYER: I move that we issue a Certificate of Completion.

(Duly seconded.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you. Next item, 522 West Susquehanna Avenue. This was
transferred in 2000. It looks like the lot
needs to be cleaned.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Was this a side yard or a
development lot? What was the transfer?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: I'm not sure. I don't
have the answer. It was transferred in 2000.
I want to say it was a side yard, but I'm
not sure. And it's not that entire lot.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Can we table this one?

MR. O'DWYER: Yeah, without knowing. I
don't know how we can do it.

MS. JOHNSON: There was an agreement of
sale on this.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Mm-hmm.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Next item, 2346 Fawn.
This was a single-family dwelling, still is.
They are asking to sell 39,000.

MR. O'DWYER: I move that we issue the
Certificate of Completion.

(Duly seconded.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Next item is 2831 Coral Street.

(Witnesses approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Can you state your name for the record?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sure. My name is Matt McLaughlin. I'm the current owner of the property.

We acquired the property at an auction, one time auction, a couple years ago -- my wife and I. Our intent was to develop. We kind of didn't understand how hard it would be for just two people to develop. We haven't been able to secure loans or get the capital to do any development.

Over that time, we've had offers to buy the property, which we declined, because, again, our intent was to develop on the property.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So when you purchased the property at auction, you went to settlement at the auction?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: So I think this was in
2015. I think it's a typo on the acquisition or disposition date. So it should say June of 2015.

MR. O'DWYER: How much did you pay for the property?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: At the auction, we paid 1,750.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: What are all the tires?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: We were notified about the tires. So we went and we were told that a neighbor in the house right next to the lot, he put the tires up. He parks there, but he maintains it to stop trash and illegal dumping. I have other pictures that show vacant lots right next to it that have illegal dumping. And then he put a fence in the back, as well, to stop people from getting further back to do drugs.

MR. PADILLA: But if it's your lot, you have to maintain it.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. We were just made aware of that. We went up -- we left a note with the neighbor. He wasn't there. Another neighbor was telling us who had
it. So we left a note with him saying it was requested for us to clean the lot and clear it. But, actually, he's doing a pretty good job, I think.

    MR. RODRIGUEZ: How much did you buy it for?

    MR. McLAUGHLIN: At auction, $1,750.

    MR. O'DWYER: And now you're selling it for ten times that amount?

    MR. McLAUGHLIN: That's just the market value right now. And like I said, we weren't really going to sell.

    Mr. Murphy, here, is with me. He's part of the development group. He approached us a few times, too. And we said, no. But then he came to our house and kind of laid a plan out saying he wants to develop the neighboring properties, too. We thought we're having a hard time doing it. He's got a really good plan to put something nice, we feel.

    MR. PADILLA: Is this property under construction one of yours right now next to this lot? There's a property here in the picture -- okay.
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: No.

MR. O'DWYER: So when you came here, originally, we told you that you had a year to build, and that you had to come back for an extension if you weren't done in a year. I don't think you ever came back, did you?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: No. I'm sorry.

MR. O'DWYER: Why didn't you?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I didn't realize I needed to ask for an extension.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: This was an auction property?

MR. O'DWYER: But he came before the VPRC. I'm looking at the meeting minutes right here. There will be one deed restriction if it isn't done in a year. You can come back and ask for an extension. Mr. McLaughlin, Okay.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I apologize. I really didn't understand that was...

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Recommendation of the Committee?

MR. MURPHY: Would I, actually, be able to add information that may be able to help with the Panel's decision?
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: One second, sir.

MR. KOONCE: I'm okay with letting it go as long as the reversionary interest goes to the new owner.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: So yeah. What they are asking is that -- if we're able to keep that year restriction in the deed. And then you come back in a year, and then we'll remove the restriction off the deed. Once you've done your development.

MR. MURPHY: Unfortunately, that will not work. I'm Charles Murphy. I'm a real estate agent and also a developer with Nova Contracting, real estate agent and developer, who happens to also own the adjacent lot, 2829 Coral Street.

Now, these lots are extremely small. They are 33 foot lots. What our plan is to combine both 2831 and 2829 to build one house. The street, also, does not have parking on it. Therefore, our intent was to not only build the house, but have a house with parking.

Unfortunately, from a financing perspective, because it's an encumbrance with
this rider, we're asking that it be removed in its entirety with our intention to develop both properties as one unit.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: What's the square footage on the lot?

MR. MURPHY: It's the same. It's 33 foot lots. And unfortunately -- and that's with an improved variance to build a 28 foot house first floor at 21 foot house, second and third floor. It just doesn't work.

MR. KOONCE: Either the buyer, the original buyer, needs to clean the land and get a Certificate of Completion, or come back to us and we'll release the reversionary. Or the buyer needs to take on the reversionary interest. And we will subordinate our mortgage to the buyer.

MR. MURPHY: So the first option would be that we ask the neighbors to remove all the tires and fencing?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: And then provide proof.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Contact us.

MR. MURPHY: And the at that point, it
MR. HUNTER: The restriction wasn't to keep it as developed --

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I'm a little bit confused. They said it was an auction, but was it? Or was it just --

MR. McLAUGHLIN: This was an auction.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: It was a Fisher's Auction.

MR. O'DWYER: Do you remember the auction that Councilman Squilla did?

MR. PADILLA: In 2015.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Okay. But was the requirement to be developed?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is it developable?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: It's too small.

MR. DALFO: I mean, it's developable if it's assembled with another...

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Right. Which is what he's trying to do?

MR. DALFO: Right. As it was.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: So we were requiring him to develop a lot that wasn't even buildable.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Right.
MR. PADILLA: That's correct, right.

MR. DALFO: Then I think Mike's motion to get the lot cleaned and maintained is really the best option.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Right. I agree. We need to see a clean lot first. That's -- yeah.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I didn't see what picture you're looking at.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Is it clean? This is what we have.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: This is as of February 25th.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: This is just the other day. This was this past weekend.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All right. So it's clean.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: It's not like that at all.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: That's why we're looking at it going...

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I thought you might have had the same pictures. But that was just the other day, this past weekend.

And like I said, I included other pictures
of what is next door, which is what, typically, 
happens in that area. You can keep them if you 
want.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: So I have a picture of 
the lot and it's totally clean.

Recommendation?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Move to recommend the 
restrictions be released.

MR. KOONCE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you for the 
pictures.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: The next items are 
2638 and 2640 Agate.

MR. O'DWYER: I think it's three 
properties, 2638, 08.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Yeah. We didn't own 
the other one.

Hi. State your name for the record?

MR. DEALY: Brad Dealy. I'm here for
2638, I believe 42, also, but I may be wrong.
I purchased the properties about 18 months ago -- all three of them for $250,000 with the sole mindset to redevelop them.
I had no idea the restrictions were from 1982. I had no idea that there was restrictions. And no total company picked it up until I just went -- I've already started the foundations of the property.
But when I went to get the financing is when I learned of the restrictions on the property.
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: And they both were transferred as rear yards to the applicant who lived on Tulip Street back in 1982.
MR. DALFO: What were the obligations on that?
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Rear yards, just to keep them clean. Can I get a recommendation?
MR. HUNTER: It looked like -- is there fencing in the sidewalk right now for the construction?
MR. DEALY: There may have been, yes, while they were digging foundation.
MR. HUNTER: So if it's in the public right of way, you need to get a sidewalk permit from the Streets Department. That's one issue for that site, so.

And I think before we issue it, I'd like to see them get the necessary permits for it.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: So the recommendation is?

MR. HUNTER: I guess the recommendation would be to issue Certificate of Completion subject to getting the sidewalk closure permit, if needed, from the Streets Department.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Do you know what that is?

MR. DEALY: I do know what it is. It was just very temporary.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Is it no longer there?

The fence is gone?

MR. DEALY: Yes.

MR. O'DWYER: So the fence is no longer there?

MR. DEALY: Yes.

MR. HUNTER: Then I withdraw my motion.

(Duly seconded.)
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor.

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you. 2725 West Stiles Street.

MR. O'DWYER: Wait. Was that -- he withdrew his motion. Did we have a new motion that didn't have that contingency?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Motion was to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: 2725.

MR. CZERNIAK: My name is Jim Czerniak. I'm here for 2725 West Stiles. On the deed, there's an expired reverter that we're trying to get out so we can close as soon as possible.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Motion to approve.

(Duly seconded.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: So you have settlement scheduled?

MR. CZERNIAK: We're trying to. We couldn't until we had this. Is it possible to get anything I could hand to the title so we
can get everything processed?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: I'll speak to my attorney. I can email it to you.

MR. CZERNIAK: That would be great. I'll give you my email address.

Recommendation?

MR. O'DWYER: We moved for --

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: On to the addendum, one item, 5621 Beaumont, we can delete that item. We had that on the agenda, which is on the second page.

2644 North Waterloo Street. There's a balance of $563.15 in taxes.

(Witness approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: State your name for the record, please.

MS. RUIZ: Good morning. My name is --

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Just try to raise your voice a little bit.

MS. RUIZ: My name is Evelyn Ruiz. I'm on
behalf of Gladys Davila on 2644 North Waterloo Street.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. And we have a balance of $563.15 in taxes that needs to be paid at the time of your settlement.

MS. RUIZ: Yes.

MR. O'DWYER: And the lot appears to be a mess.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: You're going to have to have the lot cleaned.

MS. RUIZ: We have on many, many occasions. And we've changed the fencing on many, many occasions. That's why we've chosen -- well, we've not chosen, we've been under court order to sell that property.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Yeah, but you want to have to clean it before we do the release.

MR. O'DWYER: I move that we issue the Certificate of Completion contingent upon the lot being cleaned and all taxes being settled.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?
(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you.

2216 Emerald Street.

(Witness approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: State your name for the record.

MR. BERRIOS: Jose Berrios, realtor from Realty Mark.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Is this conveyed as a side yard?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Yes. You have to remove the truck that's on the lot. It must be removed.

MR. BERRIOS: Yeah. It actually is the owner's truck. He'll take it out.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: He's not allowed to park there. It's not conveyed for parking.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. There's a $2,358.66 tax balance that needs to be paid.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Say that again.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: 2,358.66.

MR. BERRIOS: And that's the reason he's selling the property.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. So they'll pay
MR. BERRIOS: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: So you must remove, the car, the truck.

MR. O'DWYER: And clean the lot.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: And clean.

MR. PADILLA: So move to approve contingent on removal of the existing vehicle and lot and demonstrating -- writing evidence that the lot has been cleaned.

MR. O'DWYER: And taxes.

MR. PADILLA: And taxes in the amount of 2,358.66.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: And any other municipal encumbrances and liens.

MR. BERRIOS: He has it under contract for the purpose of selling it so they can pay those taxes.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: The settlement agent will send us proof of payment of those things.

MR. O'DWYER: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you, sir. 1817
East Albert Street. Can you state your name for the record?

MR. ROUCO: Frank Rouco, I am the sole member of the 1924 East Hagert Street, LLC. And the owner of the property at 1817 East Albert.

I'm requesting that the restrictions be removed that goes back to 2000. I was the fourth owner of that property, and no one had ever picked it up. And I have a contractor ready to develop the land, but they won't move forward without the restrictions being lifted.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. And you're going to develop with the 1815?

MR. ROUCO: Correct. I also acquired 1815. It was a house originally. I had to tear it down, as well, because of drugs going on in there. And that was a mess.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Can I get a recommendation?

MR. O'DWYER: So this was conveyed as a side yard?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Yes, mm-hmm.

MR. O'DWYER: And it looks clean.
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Recommendation, please?

MR. O'DWYER: Is that a giant pile of dirt in the back?

MR. ROUCO: It's just the angle.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Recommendation, please.

MR. PADILLA: Move to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you, sir.

MR. ROUCO: Is there any way I can get a letter on that soon?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay.

MR. ROUCO: How long would that take?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: A day.

MR. ROUCO: So come back here?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: No. I'll email you.

I'm Ms. Jarmon.


Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: You're welcome.
5150 Wakefield Street. This was just added this morning. It's a single-family dwelling. There's a tax balance of $767.09, which is 2019.

(Witness approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Can you state your name for the record?

MS. BEISER: I'm Brenda Beiser. I'm the realtor for Dave McCoy, who is selling the property, which he inherited from his mother. He lives in Cincinnati.

And there's an agreement of sale. And so as soon as the clauses are lifted, he can get the title insurance and deal with closing.

MR. O'DWYER: Is this house habitable?

MS. BEISER: This house is habitable. It needs a little help. I mean, he's put a lot of money into it. And, you know, he put in a heater, central air. And he's been trying to sell it for a long time.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: My inspector is inspecting it today. Online it looks okay from the outside. It was transferred in 1986.

MR. KOONCE: No violations?
CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: I just have that they owe the 2019 tax bill, 767.09.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: It's not due until March 31st.

MR. O'DWYER: I move that we issue the Certificate of Completion contingent upon their --

MR. KOONCE: He's checking to see if there was any liens. No violations.

MR. O'DWYER: I move that we issue the Certificate of Completion.

MR. KOONCE: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: All in favor?

(Aye.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Thank you.

MS. BEISER: Can I send you an email to get a letter for the title company?

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Okay. Last item, 2600 West Girard Avenue.

(Witness approached the podium.)

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Good morning. State your name for the record.
MR. KNECHEL: My name is Ernie Knechel. I'm with ABA Real Estate 2, the owner.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're building by right?

MR. KNECHEL: We're still unsure. We're working with a -- we were asking for a variance. We did get denied. We do have the community's support. And we're kind of going back to see what we can do with the community.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So you're not building by right?

MR. KNECHEL: We're still unsure.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: You're unsure?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: But you submitted an application for a variance?

MR. KNECHEL: Yeah.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: And it was denied?

MR. KNECHEL: It was denied. It will probably be a by right plan.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Have you gone to ZBA yet?

MR. KNECHEL: Yeah. I was there in February, I believe.

MS. JOHNSON: Why was it denied?

MS. CUNNINGHAM: Were you the original recipient?
MR. KNECHEL: Yeah. It was, actually, my boss, but he was sick.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: So for the last five years, you've been hatching a plan on how you're going to develop this?

MR. KNECHEL: Yeah.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: That's a long time.

MR. KNECHEL: It was a very long process working with the architect. He came up with a great plan. Like they mirrored the properties at Girard College. Like architecturally, it looks great, so...

And we were working with the community a long time to create something that was a win, win. We moved the trash inside. We did a setback in the back and lowered -- took off the roof deck and lowered the height of the building.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: So let me stop you. You're asking for an extension of time, but you don't know what you're doing. Why would we give you an extension? So you can think about it?

MR. KNECHEL: I mean, it's a 99 percent
chance we have to build it by right. So that's what it's going to be.

MS. JOHNSON: What was the issue with the community?

MR. KNECHEL: There was no issue. We had their support.

MS. JOHNSON: Why was it denied at the Zoning Board?

MR. KNECHEL: The ZBA denied it.

MR. DALFO: What did you go for ZBA for?

MR. KNECHEL: Our by right is for 16 units. And we went for 20. We just have to lower it one floor.

MR. DALFO: So you would adjust it and build 16 units then by right?

MR. KNECHEL: Yeah. Architecturally, it's the same. It's just one floor less.

MR. O'DWYER: So where are you going to be -- the extension that we could offer is six months. Where do you expect to be six months from now with your by right development?

MR. KNECHEL: In six months, we should be breaking ground. We've been talking with a contractor.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: So you have plans. And you're ready to get your L&I permit?

MR. KNECHEL: We have plans, yes.

MR. PADILLA: So where's the evidence?

MR. KNECHEL: So some of our by right, it was for 16 units. And some of our neighborhood -- to work with the neighbors, they were concerned about parking and just the number of people with 20 units. So we we're going to do 20 units that were all one bedrooms.

But our by right plan has no bedroom count. It's just 16 units that we can build. So we're trying to come up with a mixed use, two bedrooms, do we do all one bedroom again. That's kind of where we're at right now.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're saying 16 units, one bedroom or just --

MR. PADILLA: They don't have a bedroom distribution.

So basically, if you're requesting a time extension, that has to be tied to your developments plans, which we don't have, we're not able to evaluate.
Or we're going to get into this, you know -- this cycle of coming back for another extension.

And after five years waiting, the track record isn't too great on your end.

MR. KNECHEL: We have other buildings that we have built. We're not struggling that way. we don't have financial contingencies.

MR. PADILLA: I understand. But we're talking about this one.

MR. KNECHEL: I do have -- I can send -- we do have a full plan for 16 units by right completed. So I can send that over.

MR. O'DWYER: I mean, we could table this until next month and ask them to come back with more robust plans.

MR. PADILLA: I request we table this item.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: It's not even close. There's no way they can get this done at six months.

MR. PADILLA: I'm just going to warn you, the City may be able to exercise its revisionary right at that point.
MR. KNECHEL: Okay.

MR. O'DWYER: So are we going to table it until next month and ask for some plans before we issue the six month extension?

MR. KOONCE: I don't think -- you can't do it in six months.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: I think we can table it until next month and allow him time to speak to his boss.

MR. KNECHEL: I'll have the owner here.

MR. O'DWYER: And I would definitely bring some plans and have this --

MR. PADILLA: Sources and uses. I mean, what's the development?

MR. O'DWYER: And what the development time line is and make sure this is, in a month, much more baked.

MR. PADILLA: The extension requires a hundred percent completion or that you're in it. You're still in the process of doing it.

MR. O'DWYER: We can keep giving as many extensions as we want.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: As long as he's working on the property.
MR. RODRIGUEZ: I believe if we table it and ask for plans that will make up and sources and uses of funding.

MR. KOONCE: How much is it going to cost you, where are the dollars coming from, and what's your time line.

MR. PADILLA: The time line is crucial, as well, because it goes into your extension.

MR. O'DWYER: Do we have a motion?

MR. PADILLA: We're tabling it.

MS. CUNNINGHAM: In the meantime, I ask that you to continue to send your bi-weekly crews out to go clean the lot, because it looks like it gets...

MR. KNECHEL: Between the trolley stop and the bus stop, it gets trashed so quickly. But we've been doing that. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Angel, you said somebody wanted to speak regarding...

MR. RODRIGUEZ: This property.

MR. ALI: Good morning, my name is Jihad Ali. I'm involved in the community at 26th and Girard. I'm involved with -- there's a woman that lives directly behind that property. And
she had been objecting -- she was one of the
main complainants that took action against
them.

The issue was the trash. There was
nowhere for him to put the trash besides the
amount of units they were going to put. There
was a lot of opposition to that. This was the
second time. So there's a whole lot of stuff
going on about this property.

His boss is an attorney. He very well
knows this whole process. And the fact that
he's not here -- he's building multiple places
in the City.

But this particular place, the issue was
they were trying to go up to exceed the height
limit. The community was upset over that and
those amount of units.

For this to be the second time that he's
been to ZBA and denied -- why are we playing
this game when he could end this? He could
build by right like he said. Let's just end it
and make him go according to the plans. And
the community -- we can all work in place.

Nobody is asking to change the rules. We just
want him to obey the rules. And he's been
there two times.

MR. KOONCE: We already voted.

MR. ALI: I just wanted to make my point.

Thanks for giving me time.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: I'd like to add last
month's agenda to the February the 12th --
minutes. I'm sorry.

MR. O'DWYER: Second.

CHAIRWOMAN JARMON: Meeting is adjourned.

- - - - -

(Whereupon the hearing concluded at 11:11 a.m.)

- - - - -
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