ABATEMENT APPEALS BOARD
NOTICE OF MEETING
Wednesday, July 15, 2026 at 9:30 a.m.
Remote Hearing via video and teleconferencing
Watch SF Cable Channel 78/Watch www.sfgovtv.org

Watch: https://bit.ly/4ahIFN6

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 / Access Code: 2664 381 0637

ADOPTED OCTOBER 21, 2026

MINUTES

A. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL.

The meeting of the Abatement Appeals Board for Wednesday, July 15, 2026 was called to order at 9:35 a.m. and roll was taken by Commission Secretary Harris, and a quorum was certified.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:
President Bianca Neumann
Vice-President Williams
Commissioner Alysabeth Alexander-Tut
Commissioner Dan Calamuci
Commissioner Judy Lee
Commissioner Lindsey Maclise, Excused
Commissioner Catherine Meng

Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgment.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD	**DEPARTMENT REPRESENTATIVES**	
Bianca Neumann, President	Matthew Greene, Secretary to the Board	(628) 652-3510
Kavin Williams, Vice-President	Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary	(628) 652-3510
Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, Commissioner		
Dan Calamuci, Commissioner		
Judy Lee, Commissioner		
Lindsey Maclise, Commissioner	Code Enforcement Section	(628) 652-3430
Catherine Meng, Commissioner	Housing Inspection Services	(628) 652-3700
	CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE	
	Jesse Mainardi, Deputy City Attorney	(415) 554-4724

The Abatement Appeals Board acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and Relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: ***(Discussion and Possible Action)***
Discussion and possible action to adopt the minutes for a Regular meeting held on: March 18, 2026 and April 15, 2026.
Public Comment

President Neumann made a motion, seconded by Vice-President Williams to approve the minutes for the Regular meeting of March 18, 2026.

Public Comment: None

The motion carried unanimously.

Vice-President Williams made a motion to continue the minutes for the Regular meeting held on April 15, 2026, which was seconded by President Neumann.

Public Comment: None

The motion carried unanimously.

Secretary Harris stated the order of presentations and time limits, and administered the Oath.

C. NEW APPEALS: Orders of Abatement ***(Discussion and Action)***

1. CASE NO. 6954: 2960 Polk Street - Complaint # 202309727

Owners of Record & Appellant: MISSY CANTOR

ACTION REQUESTED BY APPELLANT: Appellant appeals the February 4, 2025 Order of Abatement and assessment of costs.

a. Presentations by parties.
b. Public comment.
c. Party rebuttals.
d. Commissioner questions.

e. Deliberation and possible action by the Abatement Appeals Board.

* Presentation order may be modified by presiding officer for good cause

Chief Building Inspector of Code Enforcement Mauricio Hernandez presented and discussed the following points:

- 06/21/2023 -Complaint filed regarding work without permit related to the elevator/lift.
- 06/21/2023-Case reviewed and assigned to complaint investigation team and copied to Cal/OSHA Elevator Unit.
- 06/27/2023 -Notice of Violation #202309727 issued.
- 06/27/2023 -Notice of Violation mailed.
- 06/28/2023 -Notice of Violation posted.
- 08/31/2023-Final Warning Letter issued.
- 08/31/2023-Final Warning Letter mailed; case referred to CES.
- 09/01/2023 -Case transferred/referred to Code Enforcement Section.
- 09/06/2023 -Case received in CES.
- 12/12/2024 -Case reviewed and reassigned to Inspector Helminiak.
- 01/03/2025 -Permit research conducted; no permit found to comply with NOV.
- 01/03/2025 -Case referred to Director's Hearing for January 21, 2025.
- 01/10/2025 - Director's Hearing notice posted and photos taken.
- 01/10/2025 - Director's Hearing packet certified mailed to owner on file.
- 01/21/2025 -Director's Hearing held; Hearing Officer approved issuance of Order of Abatement with CES recommendation. Owner/property representative was present at the Director's Hearing.
- 01/21/2025 -Permit research conducted; no permit found to comply.
- 01/22/2025 -Assessment of Costs prepared.
- 02/04/2025 -Order of Abatement created.
- 02/06/2025 -Order of Abatement posted and photos taken.
- 02/06/2025 -Order of Abatement certified mailed to owners on file.
- 02/18/2025 -AAB filing payment processed.
- 03/11/2025-Initial Bill payment received and processed, then later voided due to pending AAB appeal.
- 07/09/2025-AAB request reviewed; case scheduled for August 20, 2025 AAB hearing.
- 07/11/2025 -AAB Notice of Hearing certified mailed to owner on file.
- 07/15/2025 -Case removed from AAB hearing calendar to allow additional time for the responsible party to have a conversation with the Supervisor's Office. A follow-up update on case progress was requested within 90 days.
- 03/11/2026 -Case reviewed and approved to schedule for April 15, 2026 AAB hearing.
- 03/11/2026-Notice of AAB Hearing mailed to appellant and owners on file.
- 03/12/2026 -AAB notice posted and photos taken.

- 03/16/2026-Site visit conducted and photos taken.
- 03/20/2026 -AAB continuance request granted per Deputy Director M. Greene.
- 04/01/2026 -AAB hearing rescheduled to July 15, 2026.
- 04/02/2026 -Notice of Continued Hearing certified and regular mailed to appellant and owners on file.
- Staff recommendation is to uphold the Order of Abatement, including the Assessment of Costs.

Appellant's Representative Attorney David Mangini said one of the owner's would give a brief statement first.

Mr. Iman Binesh, one of the owners of 2960 Polk Street, stated that he was a first generation Iranian American who has spent his career working towards the goal of owning a San Francisco apartment building. He and his partners invested their life savings into purchasing this property with the intention of preserving it as a long term investment for their families and hopefully passing it down to future generations. In deciding to purchase the property in 2024, they relied on OSHA's documentation when the building's elevator had been officially decommissioned. They were also informed by the sellers in 2022, 2 years before they purchased the building, that there were 2 renters complaints regarding the loss of elevator service that were heard by the Renter's Arbitration Board. The Board issued a decision providing those renters substantial rent reductions in perpetuity, which remain in force today. They purchased the property with the reasonable understanding that all elevator issues in the prior years had been resolved. They have operated the building in good faith since purchased and now the NOV if not reversed, would cause their ownership group to reinstall an elevator at an upward cost of $1 million dollars! This would be an extraordinary financial burden that they cannot afford. The practical consequence of the Notice of Violation being upheld is that they will be forced to promptly sell the building at a loss – A building they worked their entire lives to purchase. After paying off the mortgage, it would wipe out their life savings. They respectfully asked the Board to consider the equity of such an onerous burden on them, and thanked the Board for their consideration.

Counsel David Mangini presented the following:

- There was a jurisdictional question of the Notice of Violation (NOV) – Referenced the Amendment to the Housing Code Section 713, Section B that the building falls under. This building did not previously have the requirement.
- NOV issue based on resident complaint 4 years ago.
- Mentioned limited scope regarding transport mechanism.
- Work was stopped and they could not identify if work was needed.
- OSHA has sole jurisdiction over the mechanical components of the elevator.
- He questioned why the NOV was issued, and said DBI has not told the owners information of what was done that warrants an NOV.
- Work was done by Kohn Elevator and did not fall under SF required permit.

- How can you make decisions that NOV was correctly issued if the Board did not know what the facts are.
- City not part of permitting process and no basis for the Board to do anything, but vacate the NOV.

Public Comment:

Mr. James Heron said that he was an Architect and lives at 2960 Polk Street for years. He spoke on what he learned on the elevator codes:

- Problem with different jurisdictions. Referenced plaque in elevator shaft.
- Problem with building is they wanted to remove elevator.
- They did not remove it and that needs a permit.
- 4 years ago, he filed a Housing Inspection Services complaint on elevator, and it got thrown out due to Section 317 code.
- He gave a presentation to BIC previously.
- Old owners got complaint tossed out due to Housing Code. Mentioned it at the Code Advisory Committee (CAC) and got code changed.

Mr. Arnie Lerner discussed the following items:

- He is a Disability Advocate on CAC and practicing Architect for 40 years.
- He replaced an elevator before.
- Exaggeration from owner and attorney something they are trying to get out of it.
- No reason for exemptions.
- BOS voted unanimously to change the Code something should be done.

Staff Rebuttal:

Chief Hernandez commented on the following:

- Owner required to comply with the NOV and get the work done.
- In the exhibits, there is a picture of an empty shaft.
- Whoever opens the door on the top floor may not know there is an empty shaft.
- Staff gave the owner 2 options and they talked to a permit expediter and gave them information on the work that needed to be done.
- Elevator shaft – They have to worry about Fire Code and the Building Code requirements.
- The NOV is due to work without permit. The contractor pulled the permit, but the work was not completed.

Appellant Rebuttal:

Counsel David Mangini discussed the following:

- Offensive of someone who has no knowledge of the elevator that Kohn put in. For someone to say this is an easy project is shocking,
- What work performed needed a permit in San Francisco.

- They complied to the best of their knowledge and gathered information here and there.
- They have a sale non-disclosure agreement with the seller.
- Mr. Hernandez mentioned doors and that people could fall in, but the doors are locked and no one can fall in the elevator shaft.
- Referenced the paper on the wall in the elevator as a permit and said that it isn't and Kohn elevator did not provide the paper.
- This is an OSHA matter, and Kohn elevator is a national company and would not do work without permit.

Members of the Abatement Appeals Board (Bianca Neumann, Kavin Williams, Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, Dan Calamuci, Judy Lee, and Catherine Meng) made comments and asked various questions of DBI staff and the Appellant pertaining to the Appeal.

Commissioner Calamuci made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Alexander-Tut, to uphold the Order of Abatement including the Assessment of Costs.

Secretary Harris Called for a Roll Call Vote:

President Neumann	**Yes**
Vice-President Williams	**Yes**
Commissioner Alexander-Tut	**Yes**
Commissioner Calamuci	**Yes**
Commissioner Lee	**Yes**
Commissioner Maclise	**Excused**
Commissioner Meng	**Yes**

The motion carried unanimously.

2. CASE NO. 6971: 1241 Funston Avenue - Complaint # 202544914

Owners of Record & Appellant: BREHYONNIA REEVES

ACTION REQUESTED BY APPELLANT: Appellant appeals the January 22, 2026 Order of Abatement and assessment of costs.

a. Presentations by parties.
b. Public comment.
c. Party rebuttals.
d. Commissioner questions.
e. Deliberation and possible action by the Abatement Appeals Board.

* Presentation order may be modified by presiding officer for good cause

Senior Housing Inspector Jose Lopez presented and discussed the following points:

- The building at 1241 Funston Avenue has 24 units, and 3 floors of occupancy.
- The building is currently occupied.
- A complaint was received from the occupied apartment building, and there is no resident manager or caretaker on site.
- The caretaker does facility oversight.
- There was a Notice of Violation issued in 2025.

Ms. Brehyonnia Reeves said that she was the Community Manager for Park West and commented on the following:

- They received the NOV, but they made sure that signage is posted at Park West.
- An emergency maintenance line is listed to call if needed or residents can use an app.
- There is also an email and phone number listed.
- At all of their properties, they have an employee that lives on site.
- The Manager has a lease agreement and lives on site and his name is Alan Baltisera who lives at Park West.
- Ms. Reeves said her office is located at Mission Bay and their team answers emails and there is a janitorial service on the premises.
- There are on call maintenance people on site each day.

Public Comment:

Chad said that he is in a wheelchair and where he lives is a handicap accessible site.

- There used to be an office, but now it is filled with junk.
- There is a problem with the phone, email, and text. A blind person cannot do that or use an app.
- When the fire alarm goes off, it locks the elevator. A fireman asked for the lock box with the elevator key and it was not available.
- He has called and asks for something and they respond 3 weeks later.
- Person needs to live there on site. His understanding is everyone is supposed to have a phone number to call on site.
- Brehyonnia Reeves told us all the ways to contact Park West, but when you do so you get a call back says person only talks for 10 minutes.

Eunice Chang mentioned Mr. Hoskins and said she spoke to tenants.

- Elevator broke down 10 times and had to call the Fire department to carry him downstairs.
- At least 20 tenants said they need an in person manager on site.
- Need someone to assist disabled persons.

Staff Rebuttal:

Housing Inspector Donald Osbourne commented on the following:

- The SF Housing Code states a responsible person shall reside on the premises.
- There are 16 apartments and the NOV is because the inspector and I need to see is they can go to the door and say the person is the caretaker.
- Someone named Alan was mentioned earlier and said he lived there. They worked for property management in a different position.
- He asked for the apartment number and the person declined to give the information, so there was no name and number.
- Does not fit CA code and does not meet Housing Code.

Appellant Rebuttal:

Ms. Reeves presented and commented on the following:

- They used to have an onsite staff representative, but now the contact is at Mission Bay.
- They have a remote model and everyone basically is at a hub.
- Park West staff are available and people can reach the team during business hours but off hours it is different.
- They have employees at Park West, but different module set up for emergencies and there is a phone number to call. The call answer rate is 90%.
- She understands the issue is the person's name and number are not listed in the lobby.

Members of the Abatement Appeals Board (Bianca Neumann, Kavin Williams, Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, Dan Calamuci, Judy Lee, and Catherine Meng) made comments and asked various questions of DBI staff and the Appellant pertaining to the Appeal.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Neumann, to uphold the Order of Abatement including the Assessment of Costs.

Secretary Harris Called for a Roll Call Vote:

President Neumann	**Yes**
Vice-President Williams	**Yes**
Commissioner Alexander-Tut	**Yes**
Commissioner Calamuci	**Yes**
Commissioner Lee	**Yes**
Commissioner Maclise	**Excused**
Commissioner Meng	**Yes**

The motion carried unanimously.

D. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public may address the Board on matters that are within the Board's jurisdiction and are not on today's agenda. Speakers shall address their remarks to the Board as a whole and not to individual Board members or Department personnel.
There was no general public comment.

There was no general public comment.

E. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Calamuci made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Alexander-Tut, to adjourn the meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:21 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary