

# Akron Documenters

POWERED BY SIGNAL AKRON

## Housing Appeals Board

Documenter name: Bruce Taylor

Agency: None

Date: Feb. 27, 2025

[See more about this meeting at Documenters.org](#)

---

**Notes to reader:** *Unless quotation marks are used, all text is paraphrased. If you believe anything in these notes is inaccurate, please email us at [documenters@signalakron.org](mailto:documenters@signalakron.org) with "Correction Request" in the subject line*

---

### Summary

- The Housing Appeals Board reviewed eight properties at this regular monthly meeting. Of the new cases, four were recommended for demolition and two received extensions of time to comply with repair orders.
- In the two cases where Housing Compliance Division orders were appealed, one appeal was denied and the second withdrawn.
- In two cases, neighbors spoke to the board about the blighting effects that the vacant property had on neighborhood conditions.

### Follow-Up Questions

- Apart from addressing specific complaints about a property (for instance, from neighbors), how does the Housing Compliance Division prioritize the cases that it brings to the board?
- How does the city recoup the costs of demolition if the property owner is deceased?
- If an owner is required to vacate a property, are there other social services that can support them – for instance, to help in locating alternative accommodations?

## Notes

A regular monthly meeting of the City of Akron [Housing Appeals Board](#) was held on Feb. 27 at 9 a.m. in the Council Chambers, 3rd Floor, Municipal Building, 166 South High St..

Five members of the board were present. Six city officials were present, including [Housing Administrator Duane Groeger](#) and Sanitarian Supervisor Jodie Forester, who introduced the individual cases. Eight people were present in the public gallery.

No materials packet was made available to the public, although an agenda did appear on the board website, and a list of street addresses of properties to be discussed at the meeting was published in the Feb. 15 edition of the Akron Beacon Journal.

The minutes of the previous meeting ([Jan. 23](#)) were approved unanimously.

The chair explained that the board considered two types of cases: appeals of repair orders issued by the Housing Compliance Division and cases where the Housing Compliance Division recommends the demolition of a property. Both types of cases were heard at this meeting. Cases where a person had registered to speak to the board concerning the property were heard first. People wishing to speak were sworn in.

A total of eight cases were heard. The table below summarizes the actions taken by the board.

Case Number	Property Address	Neighborhood	Outcome
<b>Cases for which a person registered to speak at the meeting</b>			
#6102	<a href="#">1110 Santee Ave.</a>	East Akron	Extension until April 24
#6131	<a href="#">1164 Derbydale Rd.</a>	Ellet	Extension until March 27
#6133	<a href="#">256 Lloyd St.</a>	Summit Lake	Demolition recommended
#0548	<a href="#">328 Theodore St.</a>	Summit Lake	Appeal denied

#6134	<a href="#">438 McGowan St.</a>	Middlebury	Demolition recommended
<b>Cases for which no person was registered</b>			
#6132	<a href="#">446 Downing Pl.</a>	Middlebury	Demolition recommended
#6135	<a href="#">59 Vesper St.</a>	North Hill	Demolition recommended
#0547	<a href="#">176 Hillman Rd. #3</a>	Ellet	Appeal withdrawn

Case 6102: At the Jan. 23 meeting, the owner received an extension until Feb. 27 to maintain the property and make significant progress on repairs. An inspection on Feb. 25 found that progress had been made, with new windows installed. Permits were issued for porch improvements. A new roof was planned for installation in March.

The property owner said that he was having the title transferred into his name to expedite repairs, which he was doing himself. Weather permitting, the roof would be installed in March and electrical and plumbing work would follow.

It was moved and seconded to allow an extension until the April 24 meeting, by which time the roof should be installed and electrical and plumbing work commenced. In the meantime, the property should be maintained in good order. The motion passed unanimously.

Case 6131: The property is vacant and is not in compliance with city enforcement orders. An exterior inspection identified numerous issues. The Housing Compliance Division recommended demolition of the property.

Property owner Brian Collins said that he did not have the resources to complete the needed repairs. He owns four parcels of land in the area and plans to retain one while selling the others, including the property under review. It was moved and seconded to allow an extension of time until the March 27 meeting to enable the owner to take steps toward selling the property. The motion passed unanimously.

Groeger said that a property owner facing a demolition order could seek a voluntary demolition waiver from the city, reducing the portion of the demolition cost he/she would need to bear.

Case 6133: The property is not in compliance with city enforcement orders, is vacant and vandalized, and the owner is deceased. A neighbor spoke to the board about the lack of

security and poor condition. It was moved and seconded that the property be razed with costs charged to the property owner. The motion passed unanimously.

Case 0548: This case was an appeal of an order issued on Jan. 28 to vacate the property within 10 days and submit by March 24 a report from a licensed structural engineer confirming whether the house is stable. (Soil instability is an issue in this part of the Summit Lake neighborhood.) Property owner Sheila Parker appealed this order but has not taken action toward obtaining an engineer's report, nor has she vacated the house. She spoke to the board and said that personal circumstances, specifically her mother's passing, have made her fall behind on planned repairs.

Both Groeger and Housing Inspector John Goold gave their view that the home was potentially unstable and, as a safety precaution, should be condemned as uninhabitable. If a structural engineer's report on the home was favorable, then the owner could have time to make the needed repairs. In the meantime, both recommended that the Jan. 28 order be enforced and the appeal denied.

It was moved and seconded to deny the homeowner's appeal. The motion passed unanimously.

Case 6134: The property is not in compliance with city enforcement orders, is vacant and fire damaged, and the owner is deceased. A neighbor spoke to the board about the lack of security and poor condition. It was moved and seconded that the property be razed with costs charged to the property owner. The motion passed unanimously.

Cases 6132 and 6135: In both of these cases the property was not in compliance with city enforcement orders, was vacant and vandalized, and the owner was deceased. In each case, it was moved and seconded that the property be razed with costs charged to the property owner. Each motion passed unanimously.

Case 0547: Groeger informed the board that the owners have withdrawn their appeal. As a formality, it was moved and seconded to dismiss the appeal. The motion passed unanimously.

The next meeting of the board is on March 27.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.