



Board of Zoning Appeals

Kingston Springs, Tennessee

December 6, 2022
Meeting Packet



**Kingston Springs Board of Zoning Appeals
Meeting Agenda
December 6, 2022**

The meeting was called to order by _____ at _____ pm.

1. Roll Call of Voting Members:

Bob Sanders	_____
Ginger Hockenberger	_____
Bridget Wilson	_____
Jane Polansky	_____
Joanna Gupta	_____

2. Non-Voting Staff:

Sharon Armstrong, City Planner	_____
John Lawless, City Manager	_____
Martha Brooke Perry, City Attorney	_____

3. Declaration of Quorum by Chairperson:

4. Motion to approve the September 27, 2022 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting minutes.

5. Motion to approve the December 6, 2022 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting agenda.

6. Community Input and Concerns

7. Old Business

A. None

8. New Business

A. Andy Sullivan - Variance to the side setback of 20' for a concrete parking pad poured without a permit.

B. 269 Harpeth View Trail - Basement finished without permit by previous owner - Appeal to waive the permit fine.

9. Other (For Discussion Only)

10. The meeting was adjourned by _____ at _____ pm.

Bob Sanders
Vice-Chair, Board of Zoning Appeals

Jamie Dupré
City Recorder



**Kingston Springs Board of Zoning Appeals
Meeting Minutes
September 27, 2022**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Sanders at 5:35 pm.

1. Roll Call of Voting Members:

Bob Sanders	Present
Ginger Hockenberger	Absent
Bridget Wilson	Present
Jane Polansky	Present
Joanna Gupta	Present

2. Non-Voting Staff:

Sharon Armstrong, City Planner	Present (via Zoom)
John Lawless, City Manager	Present
Martha Brooke Perry, City Attorney	Absent

3. Declaration of Quorum by Chairperson:

Chair Bob Sanders declared there was a quorum present.

4. Motion to approve the July 20, 2022 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting minutes.

Motion to approve the July 20, 2022 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting minutes made by Jane Polansky, second by Joanna Gupta, and passed unanimously.

5. Motion to approve the September 27, 2022 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting agenda.

Motion to approve the September 27, 2022 Board of Zoning Appeals meeting agenda made by Bob Sanders, second by Jane Polansky, and passed unanimously.

6. Community Input and Concerns

Glenn Remick – 1173 Anna Rebecca Court. Spoke as a town citizen in favor of approving the applicant's request.

7. Old Business

A. None

8. New Business

A. Kingston Springs Board of Zoning Appeals Officer Elections.

Chair Sanders turned the meeting over to City Manager Lawless for election of Board of Zoning Appeals Chair and Lawless opened the floor to nominations. Bob Sanders nominated Jane Polansky to serve as Chair. Lawless asked for additional nominations and no others were presented. Bridget Wilson then made a motion to appoint Jane Polansky as Board of Zoning Appeals Chair. Motion seconded by Joanna Gupta. Vote held with all in favor and motion passed.

City Manager Lawless then turned the meeting over to Chair Polansky for election of Vice-Chair and Secretary.

Chair Polansky then opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair. Bridget Wilson nominated Bob Sanders. Chair Polansky asked for additional nominations but no others were presented. Joanna Gupta made a motion to appoint Bob Sanders as Vice-Chair. Bob Sanders seconded the motion. Vote was held with all in favor and the motion passed.

Chair Polansky then opened the floor for nominations for Secretary. Bob Sanders nominated Bridget Wilson. Chair Polansky asked for additional nominations but no others were presented. Bob Sanders made a motion to appoint Bridget Wilson as Secretary. Joanna Gupta seconded the motion. Vote was held with all in favor and the motion passed.

B. Matt and Kayla Carson, Patterson Dr. Map 96J Grp A Parcel 66. Property divided by deed.

- **Request to establish the parcel as a Lot of Record, Article VII, Section 7.060, Lots of Record.**
- **Variance from the Zoning Ordinance, Article III, Section 3.100, Subpart 3.140.1 (C), Critical Lot Standards.**

City Planner Armstrong discussed the parcel being a lot of record and the variance needed related to the critical lot standards of the Town's Zoning Ordinance. Motion to approve declaring Patterson Dr. Map 96J Grp A Parcel 66 as a lot of record made by Joanna Gupta, second by Bob Sanders, and motion passed unanimously. Motion to grant a variance for Patterson Dr. Map 96J Grp A Parcel 66 on the zoning requirement of critical lot standards of KS Zoning Ordinance, Article III, Section 3.100, Subpart 3.140.1 (C) made by Bob Sanders and seconded by Bridget Wilson. Roll call vote was held with Bob Sanders voting yes, Bridget Wilson voting yes, Jane Polansky voting yes, and Joanna Gupta voting yes. Ginger Hockenberger was absent. Motion passed.

C. Board of Zoning Appeals Training.

City Manager Lawless will email the Board members to schedule a time for training along with the KS Regional Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners.

9. Other (For Discussion Only)

10. The meeting was adjourned by _____ at _____ pm.

Jane Polansky
Chair, Board of Zoning Appeals

Jamie Dupré
City Recorder

B.A.



Town of Kingston Springs
Building and Codes Department
PO Box 256
396 Spring Street
Kingston Springs, TN 37082
615-952-2110

KINGSTON SPRINGS APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

Board of Zoning Appeals, Board of Construction/Sign Appeals

- Board of Zoning Appeals Residential (\$150.00) (34125)
- Board of Zoning Appeals Commercial (\$200.00) (34125)
- Board of Construction Appeals (\$150.00) (34125)*
- Board of Sign Appeals (\$175.00) (34125)

Date of Application: 10-19-2022
 Property Address/Location: 608 Mt Pleasant Rd Kingston Springs, TN 37082
 Property Owner's Name: Amy C. Sullivan
 Property Owner's Address: 608 Mt Pleasant Rd Kingston Springs, TN 37082
 Property Owner's Primary Phone #: 615-378-1052 Secondary #: 615-642-9706 Cell
 Property Owner's Email: KARNUT57@gmail.com

Section for Appeal: _____ Page Number: _____

Description of Appeal Request: _____

Reason: _____

Attachments? Describe: _____

Signature of Applicant: Amy C. Sullivan Date: 10-19-2022

BACK OF THIS FORM IS FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

OFFICE USE ONLY: APPLICANT DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

Staff Review Information: Concrete slab poured without a permit. Slab may be in violation of setback line of 20'.

Mr. Sullivan poured a slab on the side of a detached garage located in the side yard of his parcel without a permit. He called City Hall and asked if he needed a permit in the early morning. Staff assigned to permit review was in training and did not return the call until early afternoon. Mr. Sullivan informed the Planner the slab had already been poured in violation of the Zoning Ordinance requirement for a site plan and permit. Staff recommendation: Denial of variance. Basis of recommendation: KS Zoning Ordinance, Article VIII, Section 8.030, McClurkan v. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS, ETC., 565 SW 2d 495 - Tenn: Court of Appeals, Middle Section 1977 (attached).

The Zoning Ordinance does not allow a variance for a violation of the requirement for a building permit in an action caused by the property owner. Mr. Sullivan caused a slab to be formed and poured without obtaining a permit. 8.030. Building permits. It shall be unlawful to commence the excavation for or the construction of any building or other structure, including accessory structures, to commence the moving, alteration, or repair of any structure, including accessory structures, to use a building or structure, or to change the use of a building or structure, or to commence the filling of land without a permit thereof, issued by the Building Inspector. If said excavation or construction is begun without a proper building permit, the building permit fee shall be double or twice the original cost of the permit if legal compliance has been obtained as is required.

No Building Permit shall be issued by the Building Inspector except in conformity with the provisions of this ordinance, unless there is received a written order from the Board of Zoning Appeals in the form of an administrative review, special exception, or variance as provided for by this ordinance.

In granting a variance, the Board shall ascertain that the following criteria are met:

1. Variances shall be granted only where special circumstances or conditions, fully described in the finding of the Board, do not apply generally in the district.
2. Variances shall not be granted to allow a use otherwise excluded from the particular district in which requested.
3. For reasons fully set forth in the findings of the Board, the aforesaid circumstances or conditions are such that the strict application of the provisions of this ordinance would deprive the applicant of any reasonable use of his land. Mere loss in value shall not justify a variance. There must be a deprivation of beneficial use of land.
4. The granting of any variance shall be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this ordinance and shall not be injurious to the neighborhood, detrimental to the public welfare, or in conflict with the comprehensive plan for development.
5. In reviewing an application for a variance, the burden of showing that the variance should be

Appeal Board Fee: \$ _____

Amount Paid: \$ _____ Date Paid: _____

Receipt Number: _____

Board Performing Review: _____

Date of Review: _____

Approved

Denied

Withdrawn

565 S.W.2d 495 (1977)

Milton McCLURKAN, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS FOR the METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND
DAVIDSON COUNTY, Tennessee, Defendant-Appellee.**

Court of Appeals of Tennessee, Middle Section.

April 1, 1977.

Certiorari Denied June 13, 1977.

496 *496 John L. Chambers, Chambers & Wiseman, Nashville, for plaintiff-appellant.

Robert Rutherford, Metro Dept. of Law, Nashville, for defendant-appellee.

Certiorari Denied by Supreme Court June 13, 1977.

OPINION

DROWOTA, Judge.

This is an appeal by an owner of property in Nashville from a decree of the Chancery Court of Davidson County, which affirmed the denial of appellant's application for a variance by the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals.

The property in question is located at 1713 Beechwood Avenue in an area zoned for one and two family dwellings. It contains a house that is divided into four separate living units, none of which is accessible except by its own outside entrance. The record is unclear as to how long the house has been divided into four apartments, but appellant contends that it has been so structured at least since 1952. In 1973, after having been informed that the residence did not conform to zoning regulations, Mrs. Nora Smith, the previous owner, applied for and was granted a use and occupancy permit to continue its use as a four-family dwelling for so long as she owned and resided on the property. This permit expressly stated that when Mrs. Smith ceased to own and reside on the premises, the property should revert to a "lawful use". The permit was recorded in the office of the Register of Deeds in February of 1974. Appellant purchased the property in September of 1974 and, when notified that he was in violation of zoning regulations, applied to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance, which was denied. He then took his case on certiorari to the Chancery Court, from whose affirmance of the Board he now appeals.

As a preliminary matter, appellee Board of Zoning Appeals has moved to dismiss the appeal for appellant's failure to comply with Rule 12 of this Court, which requires an appellant to file his assignments of error and brief within twenty-five days of the filing of the transcript. Appellant was admittedly six days late in filing his assignments of error and brief in the case at bar. Appellant's counsel, however, avers in reply to appellee's motion that prior to expiration of the twenty-five days he arranged for a short extension with the Clerk of this Court, who informed him that an extension had been granted but evidently failed to make an entry to that effect in the record. Counsel then relied on having this extra time and filed his assignments within what he believed was the extension period, *497 though this was six days after the deadline prescribed by Rule 12. Since appellant filed only a few days late, and since counsel has satisfied us that this was done in good faith for the reason stated above, we overrule appellee's motion to dismiss.

In his first assignment of error, appellant contends that the use and occupancy permit issued by the Board of Zoning Appeals to the previous owner runs with the land and so inures to his benefit and that the condition that the permit should expire when Mrs. Smith ceased to own the property and reside on it is void. Appellant first argues that, as a general proposition, it is the property itself and not the person who owns it that is to be considered by a zoning board in acting on an application for a variance. He then asserts that, since the condition attached to the permit granted Mrs. Smith dealt only with her continued ownership of and residence on the property, the condition is void and appellant is left with an unconditional permit to use the property for a four-family residence. While we are largely in agreement with the premise of this argument, we cannot concur in the result that appellant insists is mandated by it in this case.

The statute authorizing municipal boards of zoning appeals to grant variances allows them to take such action

[w]here, by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of enactment of the zoning regulation, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of such piece of property,

the applicable zoning regulations would impose "peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties ... or undue hardship upon the owner..." Tennessee Code Annotated § 13-707(3). Similarly, § 101.27(b) of the Zoning Ordinance for Metropolitan Nashville empowers the Board to grant variances "to alleviate hardships by virtue of the inability of the landowner to comply strictly with the provisions of this Ordinance by reasons of unique shape, topography, or physical features of the zone lot." These provisions, along with the standards for variances set out in § 102.20 of the Ordinance, clearly contemplate that a variance is not a "personal license given to a landowner," as appellant rightly says. See *Hickerson v. Flannery*, 42 Tenn. App. 329, 302 S.W.2d 508 (1956). But they also contemplate that it is the peculiar circumstances of the *land* that must be the primary consideration, rather than any hardship personal to or created by an owner of it. See 82 Am.Jur.2d, *Zoning and Planning*, §§ 274-76 (1976). While the Board is vested with broad discretion in the variance area, we do not believe that it is authorized to grant a variance when the only hardship to the owner in complying with the zoning regulations is the result of a condition existing not in the land itself but in a structure which was created or altered by an owner of the property in violation of the zoning ordinance. Also, the case for a variance here is made even weaker by a lack of any evidence of hardship other than pecuniary loss, which has been held insufficient by itself to justify a variance. See *Houston v. Memphis and Shelby County Board of Adjustment*, 488 S.W.2d 387 (Tenn. App. 1972). Thus, although we do not have before us the record of the proceedings in which Mrs. Smith was granted her conditional permit to use the premises as a four-family residence, we are forced to conclude from the facts presented that the award of this permit itself, and not merely the personal condition attached to it, was beyond the jurisdiction of the Board under its governing statute and ordinance.

In so concluding, we wish to point out that we do not hold that improvements constructed on the property or even the personal ownership of an applicant may never be considered in deciding whether or not to grant a variance. We do say, however, that both the statute and ordinance controlling here make characteristics of the *land itself* the overriding criteria by which the Board is to decide the issue of hardship to an owner. It may be that in some cases other factors presented by a variance applicant would be closely related to these criteria, and that the Board would be justified in considering them. In the instant case, however, *498 unique features of the land itself were entirely lacking, and any hardship concerned only the condition of the house, which was brought about by an owner of the property in violation of the zoning ordinance, so that the Board exceeded its authority in granting the variance to Mrs. Smith. The first assignment of error is therefore overruled.

Appellant contends in his second assignment of error that the Board's failure to grant him a variance in the present case deprives him of the beneficial use of his property and so constitutes a taking of it without due process of law. Of course it is true that zoning regulations may go so far as to constitute a taking of property, and that in such a case the attempted "regulation" will be held unlawful. *Bayside Warehouse Co. v. City of Memphis*, 63 Tenn. App. 268, 470 S.W.2d 375 (1971). In *Bayside*, the zoning provision was found to deprive the owner of any beneficial use of the property and therefore held invalid as to that property. Far from so penalizing appellant in the instant case, the ordinance to which he is subjected by denial of his request for a variance imposes a simple restriction universally upheld as one within the zoning power: that the premises be used as a residence for no more than two families. This is not such a substantial deprivation of beneficial use of the property as to constitute a taking. Further, any loss to which appellant may be subjected here evidently is directly attributable not to any change in zoning that deprives him of the use of his property but to the erection or alteration of this building for use as a four-family residence by a previous owner in violation of the zoning ordinance. In any case, neither the two-family zoning provision nor the denial of the variance application that subjects appellant to it rises to the level of a taking of property, and the second assignment of error is overruled.

In his third and final assignment of error, appellant maintains that the Board discriminated against him and arbitrarily denied his requested variance. There is no merit in this contention. While appellant argues that others in the neighborhood are allowed "to use their homes as three and four-family dwellings," there is no evidence in the record to support this, and we are therefore unable to consider it. Appellant's claim of discrimination by the Board in awarding a variance to Mrs. Smith while denying one to him is also groundless, for we have already shown that the permit granted Mrs. Smith was beyond the Board's authority and therefore void. Finally, denial of the variance to appellant can hardly be termed arbitrary. On the contrary, just as the Board exceeded its authority in granting a permit to Mrs. Smith on the facts presented here, as explained above, so it would have exceeded its authority had it granted one to appellant for the same reasons. Denial of the

variance to appellant thus was not arbitrary, but was required by the governing statute and ordinance on the facts here presented. The third assignment of error is overruled, and the decree below is affirmed.

Affirmed.

SHRIVER, P.J., and TODD, J., concur.

Save trees - read court opinions online on Google Scholar.



Case #: 200137

Case Date: 04/22/21

Type: Resident/Other Complainant

Violation Address: 608 AND 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd

Description of Possible Violation: junk cars

Re-Inspection Date: 04/29/2021

Complainant Name (If Available): Duane Tabor

Complainant Phone (if Available): 615-310-3158

Complainant E-Mail (If Available):

Status: Court Scheduled

Assigned To: Mike Armstrong

Property

Parcel #	Address	Legal Description	Owner Name	Owner Phone	Zoning
096J A 00300 000	608 MT PLEASANT RD		SULLIVAN ANDY C		

Violations

Date	Violation	Description	Notes	Status
08/10/2021	108.1.4 Unlawful Structure	An unlawful structure is one found in whole or in part to be occupied by more persons than permitted under this code, or was erected, altered or occupied contrary to law.	Construction of a slab without a building permit in violation of Zoning Ordinance Article VIII and potentially in the required 20' setback line.	Open
08/10/2021	302.1 Sanitation	Exterior property and premises shall be maintained in a clean, safe and sanitary condition. The occupant shall keep that part of the exterior property that such occupant	Car parts, inoperable vehicles, and equipment are	Open

occupies or controls in a clean and sanitary condition.

scattered across the yard at 608 and 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd.

Mr. Sullivan placed numerous inoperable vehicles on the property located at 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd. in violation of the court order issued by the circuit court on 19 September 2014. Location of the vehicles is a violation of the zoning ordinance for use within the R-1A district and city code regarding storage of inoperable vehicles.

Except as provided for in other regulations, no inoperative or unlicensed motor vehicle shall be parked, kept or stored on any premises, and no vehicle shall at any time be in a state of major disassembly, disrepair, or in the process of being stripped or dismantled. Painting of vehicles is prohibited unless conducted inside an approved spray booth.

08/10/2021 302.8 Motor vehicles.

Open

Notes

Date	Note	Created By:
2022-10-18	Inspected property and took photos for court. Note continued progress on debris, but it appears that they may be moving debris into the woods behind the 694 address. In court the judge continued the case until the 13 Dec 22 court date. The judge has ruled that the court order that Mr. Sullivan presented allows Mr. Sullivan to continue to his non conforming use on this property. The City Attorney is to write something for the judge for that portion of the charges. The City will have the decision, upon the Judge's signature to appeal the decision or not. The Judge held over the portion of the case with regard to the slab beside the garage encroaching into the setback of the property. The City Manager provided Mr. Sullivan an application to the BZA to request a variance to the setback requirement.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-08-09	Conducted follow-up inspection this date to document the status of the property for court this date. Note that there has been several vehicles moved on the lot and it appears that there are now vehicles that were not there before. I did notice what appears to be surveyor's flags on the property but Mr. Sullivan has not provided a copy of any replat to the City as requested. There continues to be an excessive number of junk vehicles, I counted 63, 8 trailers, and a considerable number of old bikes. I took photos to document the condition of the property this date.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-07-20	Conducted windshield inspection of property. Note several vehicles and equipment appear to have been moved to the rear of the property.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-07-05	Conducted windshield inspection of the property this date. No significant progress made. Junk Vehicles remain on the 604 property as well. Mr. Sullivan has not submitted a new plat to cure the slab being across the property line.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-06-09	Conducted follow-up at this property and 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd to document the status of the property for next week's court appearance. Took photos of the inoperable vehicles to document the appearance of the properties.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-05-19	Conducted windshield inspection of the property. Note that a lot of the vehicles have been moved, but doesn't appear that Mr. Sullivan is in compliance with the court order. It appears that some effort is being made, but not sufficient effort to clear the violations.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-05-06	Received a phone message from Britney of Mr. Sullivan asking that someone from Codes call him. I received a call from Mr. Sullivan asking a question about the setback for his property. I told him that I could not answer his question but that I would ask the Planner to call him when she returned. The Planner returned Mr. Sullivan's call late morning or early afternoon and answered his questions.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-04-12	This case brought to court 12 April 2022. The case was continued to 14 June 2022.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2022-04-12	This case was heard at City Court this date. The case was continued until 14 June 2022.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong

2022-04-08	Called (615) 3781052 Left a message for Mr. Sullivan reminding him of court 12 April 2022 in the Beck Building at 4:30 PM	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-09-30	Sent a text to A.J. Sullivan reminding him that we left the meeting on 21 Sep with an understanding that they would provide us with their remediation plans to again gain compliance with the court order awarded to Mr. Andy Sullivan.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-09-30	Spoke to Andy Sullivan regarding his plan of action to come into compliance. He states he has talked to a surveyor and that he did not know when the surveyor was planning to do the work but that he would contact him again and try to find out. I asked him to put his plan for remediation in writing and get it to us.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-09-23	Met with Mr. Andy Sullivan and his son A.J. Sullivan to discuss the violations existing at 608 and 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd. The Sullivans acknowledged the following: 1. The number of collected cars exceeds those allowed by the court order. 2. The number of collectable cars is limited to 31. All activity associated with the car collection is defined as an accessory use and cannot occur in the front or side yard of the property. 3. The expansion of the collectable cars cannot occur on the adjacent property. 4. The concrete slab poured in the side yard at 608 Mt. Pleasant road encroaches on the adjacent parcel in violation of the KS Zoning Ordinance and must be brought into compliance with a lawfully issued permit. 5. The car collection and activities are not permitted in the R-1A Zoning District. 6. Violation of the court order will result in enforcement action if not addressed. The Sullivans agreed to submit a remediation plan in the very near future.	Sharon Armstrong
2021-09-21	Met with Andy and A.J. Sullivan at Beck Hall in Kingston Springs at 5:00 PM to discuss the violations on their properties at 608 and 604 Mt. Pleasant Road. The City Planner explained all violations to the Sullivans to include their violation of building without a permit across the property line and storage of vehicles. We left the meeting asking the Sullivan's to take the information we had provided and think about it and get back to us with their plan to come into compliance with the KS regulations or the Judge's ruling. They acknowledged that they understood and agreed to get back with us in a few days.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-09-16	Received a call from A. J. Sullivan advising that he would like to reschedule the meeting for Tuesday 21 Sept wise today as his father could not attend today. I told him that was fine and that we would see them on Tuesday.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-09-13	Called Mr. A. J. Sullivan (615) 478-4998 and rescheduled the meeting for 14 Sep to 16 Sep. at 5:00 PM Beck Hall.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-09-01	Called A.J. Sullivan regarding scheduling a meeting he had requested in a previous conversation with me to go over all the violations on his and his father's property and come to a clear understanding of the requirements to remedy the violations. We scheduled the meeting for 5:00PM 14 Sep 2021 at Beck Hall.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-08-14	Received a telephone call from Mr. A. J. Sullivan at 7:49PM. He states that he is the owner of the property at 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd and that all the vehicles on his property were operable vehicles and further stated that any issue at this property with regard to junk cars was adjudicated some years ago and was not a problem. I tried to explain that records indicate his father is the owner of the property; which, when pressed he admitted, and that his father did have several issues on his property and that he had told me when I tried to discuss the issues with him, that he wanted a letter, so I obliged him and sent the letter. Mr. Sullivan then stated that I had trespassed on their property, I explained that I had not and that he was misinformed. Then he told me that he had spoken with a couple of commissioners who told him that their property was grandfathered in and they could have their junk cars. I asked who told him that and he declined to answer. The call was somewhat contentious.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-08-10	Mr. Sullivan expanded the inoperable junk cars to the adjacent lot at 604 Mt. Pleasant Rd. in violation of the court order issued by the Circuit Court in 19 September 2014.	Sharon Armstrong
2021-08-04	Received a call from Mr. Sullivan. When I advised him that the purpose of my visit was to discuss with him the Codes Violations on his property he became angry telling me that he didn't have any and that he had been to court and had won. He stated that Commissioner Remick and Gary Corlew had told him that the City had changed it's laws after his court case. I advised him that it was my understanding that he was in violation of the court's order. He wanted to know why I just walked up on his property without sending him a letter. I explained that I always tried to talk to property owners before initiating a formal letter. He said he didn't like it and then I told him that was fine, that I believed he was in violation of the court order and that I would be happy to send him a letter.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-08-03	Property visit attempting to make contact with Mr. Sullivan. A young lady answered the door and advised that she was Ms. Sullivan and stated that her father was not home. I left my telephone number with her and asked her to ask her father to contact me.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong
2021-07-09	Property Visit 8 July 2021 - Attempted contact at property with the City Planner to work the zoning violations. No one answered the door at the home. City Planner advises that she will have to send a notice of violation to Mr. Sullivan.	Alan (Mike) Armstrong

Uploaded Files

Date	File Name
09/13/2022	12800956-NOTIFICATION OF COURT DATE CHANGE FOR SULLIVAN.pdf
08/09/2022	12497520-608 & 604 MT PLEASANT RD - SULLIVAN PROPERTY PHOTOS 8 AUGUST 2022.pdf
06/14/2022	11979604-608 & 604 MT PLEASANT RD - CONDITION OF PROPERTY 14 JUNE 2022.pdf
04/08/2022	11260225-COURT CITATION 2 MARCH 2022 SULLIVAN.pdf
08/10/2021	9434146-604.MT PLEASANT RD - ADJACENT LOT NOT SUBJECT TO COURT ORDER.JPG
08/10/2021	9434147-608.MT PLEASANT RD - LOT SUBJECT TO COURT ORDER.JPG
08/10/2021	9434148-TN PROPERTY DATA - EXPANSION TO 604 MT PLEASANT RD.pdf
08/10/2021	9433949-KS v Sullivan Filed Order.pdf