

# Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals Meeting Agenda

April 9, 2026 | Time: 7:00 PM

Zoom Meeting Information:

<https://broward-org.zoomgov.com/j/1600676853>

Meeting ID: 160 067 6853

**I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

**II. ROLL CALL**

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – March 12, 2026, Board Meeting

**V. PUBLIC COMMENT (Except public hearing items on this agenda)**  
Public comments are limited to 3 minutes.

**VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

**1. Certifications – Staff Recommended**

**CITY OF DANIA BEACH**

O'Linn, Dan, Building Official

**CITY OF HOLLYWOOD**

Hagerman, Jeffrey, Electrical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

Martinez, Josue, Fire Inspector

**CITY OF MIRAMAR**

Delatorre, Rafael, Mechanical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

Diaz, Alejandro, Fire Inspector

Elordi, Anthony, Fire Inspector

Estevez, Carlos, Mechanical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

Gonzalez, Yanet, Chief Structural Inspector

**CITY OF PLANTATION**

Claus, David Joseph, Mechanical Plans Examiner (120-Day Temporary)

**CITY OF SUNRISE**

Thomas, Temeka, Fire Plans Examiner

**CITY OF WEST PARK**

Merowitz, Michael, Chief Mechanical Inspector

**COUNTYWIDE**

Diaz, Eliezer, Structural Inspector

**VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

**1. Ad Hoc Committee Report for Appeal #25-02, Xiaohui Guo vs. City of Weston**

- a. Staff Report – John “Jack” Morell
- b. Board Questions
- c. Board Action

2. **Appeal #25-02, Xiaohui Guo seeks to reverse the City of Weston, Permit #B24-01261 Inspection Results Pursuant to Florida Building Code, Section 1512.2.5**
  - a. Staff Report – Dr. Ana C. Barbosa
  - b. Board Questions
  - c. Board Action
3. **Director’s Report**
4. **Attorney’s Report**
5. **Committee Reports**
6. **General Board Member Discussion**
7. **Adjournment**

*If a person desires to appeal any decision with respect to any matter considered at this meeting, such person will need a record of the proceedings and, for this reason, such person may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based (FS Sec. 286.0105).*

*Board Members: If you are unable to attend the meeting, please contact Dr. Barbosa at 954-931-2393 between 6:00 PM and 7:00 PM.*

March 12, 2026  
Board Meeting Minutes

# Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals Meeting Minutes, March 12, 2026

Zoom Meeting Information:

<https://broward-org.zoomgov.com/j/1615556306>

Meeting ID: 161 555 6306

## I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chairman Deveaugh called to order a published virtual meeting of the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals at 7:01 PM.

## II. ROLL CALL

Peter Deveaugh, Chairman	Anthony Salgado
Edward Badiu	Scott Taggart
Gregg D'Attile	David Tringo
Steven M. Feller	Dennis Ulmer
Michael Rada	Derek Wassink

## III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. D'Attile made a motion to approve the agenda, and Mr. Feller seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 12, 2026, Board Meeting

Mr. Feller made a motion, and Dr. Badiu seconded the motion, to approve February 12, 2026, minutes as submitted. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## V. PUBLIC COMMENT (Except public hearing items on this agenda)

Public comments are limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. Tony Palacios, Building Official, City of Tamarac, requested clarification on House Bill 803, specifically contradictory language addressing building permits valued at less than \$7,500 and other language that indicates a local government may require a building permit. He asked if a permit is required. Also, he referred to language for commercial project discounting and questioned if residential projects could also be discounted.

Dr. Ana Barbosa, Administrative Director, advised that a Zoom meeting for building officials is planned for next Tuesday where House Bill 803 among other topics will be discussed.

## VI. CONSENT AGENDA

### 1. Certifications – Staff Recommended

#### **BROWARD SHERIFF'S OFFICE FIRE RESCUE**

Gutman, Nicolas, Fire Inspector

#### **TOWN OF DEERFIELD BEACH**

Szabo, Marius, Chief Mechanical Inspector

#### **CITY OF HOLLYWOOD**

Camera, Michael, Fire Plans Examiner

## **CITY OF LIGHTHOUSE POINT**

Garito, Nicholas, Fire Inspector

## **CITY OF MIRAMAR**

Agostinone, Valentinia, Fire Inspector

Gonzalez, Lucas, Fire Inspector

Nataine, Cindy, Assistant Fire Marshall

Rivera, Ricky, Fire Inspector

Gunn, Thomas, Electrical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

## **COUNTYWIDE**

De Los Santos, Jose, Electrical Plans Examiner

Lozano, Frank, Plumbing Plans Examiner

Oms, Jr., Chester, Structural Inspector

Oms, Jr., Chester, Structural Plans Examiner

Paz, Jose, Structural Inspector

Nathan, Stanley, Michael, Structural Inspector

Mr. Feller made a motion, and Mr. Wassink seconded the motion to approve the certifications as recommended by staff. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## **VII. REGULAR AGENDA**

### **1. Second Reading of the Proposed Revision to the Broward County Amendments to the FBC, Chapter 1, Section 104.3.1 Interim Chief Inspector to Allow the BORA Administrative Director to Grant a One-Time 90-Day Extension to the Interim Chief Inspector Appointment**

#### a. Staff Report

Dr. Ana Barbosa, Administrative Director, introduced the item and noted the first reading took place on February 12.

#### b. Board Questions

#### c. Public Hearing

The floor was opened for a public hearing, but there was no one wishing to speak.

#### d. Board Action

Mr. D'Attile made a motion, and Mr. Feller seconded the motion to approve the item on second reading as presented. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

### **2. Proposed Revision to Administrative Policy #09-01, Voluntary Guidelines for Fee Calculations Related to Building Permits**

#### a. Staff Report – Jack Morell, Chief Structural Code Compliance Officer

Mr. Jack Morell, Chief Structural Code Compliance Officer, advised that this is a housekeeping item. The administrative code requires evaluation of permit fee by the use of R.S. Means. It gives building officials a tool, using R.S. Means, to arrive at a proper permit fee. The Board of Rules and Appeals' fees are based on permit fees.

#### b. Board Questions

In response to questions, Mr. Morell advised that R.S. Means that is contained in Chapter 1 of the Building Code has always been available to building officials. The building official has the discretion to go above the listed amounts.

c. **Board Action**

Mr. Feller made a motion to approve the proposed revision to Administrative Policy #09-01, and Mr. Wassink seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

3. **Director's Report** – none

4. **Attorney's Report**

Mr. Charles Kramer noted an upcoming case in the 17<sup>th</sup> Circuit on March 16, where the Board of Rules and Appeals will request dismissal with prejudice. If not successful, he believed there is a good chance on prevailing.

5. **Committee Reports** - none

6. **General Board Member Discussion**

In response to Chairman Deveaugh, Dr. Barbosa advised that staff is waiting for an approved rendering on the Board's new office.

Concerning Agenda Item 2, Mr. Feller questioned if there is any upper limit above R.S. Means, Mr. Morell advised that there is no upper limit because the averages provided are well studied.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 PM.

# Consent Agenda: Item 1

**CITY OF DANIA BEACH**

O'Linn, Dan, Building Official

**CITY OF HOLLYWOOD**

Hagerman, Jeffrey, Electrical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

Martinez, Josue, Fire Inspector

**CITY OF MIRAMAR**

Delatorre, Rafael, Mechanical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

Diaz, Alejandro, Fire Inspector

Elordi, Anthony, Fire Inspector

Estevez, Carlos, Mechanical Inspector (120-Day Temporary)

Gonzalez, Yanet, Chief Structural Inspector

**CITY OF PLANTATION**

Claus, David Joseph, Mechanical Plans Examiner (120-Day Temporary)

**CITY OF SUNRISE**

Thomas, Temeka, Fire Plans Examiner

**CITY OF WEST PARK**

Merowitz, Michael, Chief Mechanical Inspector

**COUNTYWIDE**

Diaz, Eliezer, Structural Inspector

# Regular Agenda: Item 1



# Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

1 N. University Drive Suite 3500B, Plantation, FL 33324

[broward.org/CodeAppeals](http://broward.org/CodeAppeals) | 954-765-4500 | [rulesboard@broward.org](mailto:rulesboard@broward.org)

---

**TO:** Members of the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

**FROM:** Chief Structural Code Compliance Officer Jack Morell

**DATE:** April 9, 2026

**RE:** Ad Hoc Committee Report for Appeal #25-02, Xiaohui Guo vs. City of Weston

---

## **Recommendation**

The Board of Rules and Appeals Ad Hoc Committee recommends that the Board deny, by vote, Appeal #25-02, Xiaohui Guo vs. City of Weston.

## **Reasons**

On May 8, 2025, the Board of Rules and Appeals heard Appeal #25-02. The Board, by vote, referred the matter to an Ad Hoc Committee for a recommendation.

On May 29, 2025, the Board of Rules and Appeals Ad Hoc Committee convened and heard testimony related to Appeal #25-02, Xiaohui Guo vs. City of Weston. The Committee voted unanimously, 5-0, to recommend denying the appeal.

## **Additional Information**

- Minutes of Ad-Hoc Committee for Appeal #25-02

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Morell".

John "Jack" Morell



Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals  
Ad Hoc Committee for Appeal #25-02  
May 29, 2025, Meeting Minutes

**Call to Order:**

Chair Eduard Badiu called a published meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee concerning Appeal #25-02 to order at 12:05 PM.

The roll was called, and the following members were present:

Eduard C. Badiu, Chair  
Tim Graboski  
John Heller

William Kraemer  
Derek Wassink

Chairman Badiu noted that the purpose of this Ad Hoc Committee meeting was to hear and deliberate Appeal #25-02 (Ms. Xiaohui Guo vs. City of Weston) regarding the homeowner's request for reversal of passed municipal inspections conducted under Permit #B24-01261. He noted that the full Board considered rejecting the appeal, which did not pass. The Board referred the matter to this Ad Hoc Committee.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Doug Clarke, Esq., representing Roofing and Construction Corp., noted that their position statement was provided to Dr. Ana Barbosa, Administrative Director, and members of the Committee. He reviewed the statement's attachments, including that the installation of the underlayment in the valley complied with Valley Option 2 of the Westlake Installation Guide (weaving method). Roofing and Construction Corp. has been in litigation with Ms. Guo since July of 2023. During the project, Ms. Guo was very active in taking pictures, getting on the roof, asking for extras, and attempting to direct how the work should be done. Mr. Wagner, City of Weston Building Inspector, conducted the final inspection by the use of pictures as a direct result of Ms. Guo directing that he not return or she would hold him in trespass. The Committee needs to address which inspections would be reversed, how inspections should be performed on an almost one-year-old roof, and who should pay for the inspections and repair. The relief sought by Ms. Guo is unreasonable. He recommended the denial of Ms. Guo's appeal and to have the inspections stand.

Mr. Reginald Cox, Building Official for the City of Weston, noted that during the full Board's deliberations, they looked at the Owens Corning Technical Bulletin concerning a shingle application, whereas Permit #B24-01261 was for a tile application. He emphasized that the focus should be on Section 1512.2.5 of the Building Code, Workmanship Standards.

Mr. Eugene Copaev indicated he is a local roofer in Hollywood. He indicated that Ms. Guo reached out to him last July. His inspection revealed a leak in her attic from the roof valley. Photos were provided.

Mr. Michael Van Cleve, Esq., indicated that he is the opposing counsel in the litigation mentioned by Mr. Clarke. He noted that Owens Corning has not honored the roof warranty because the underlayment was not installed according to the valley underlayment instructions. The question is whether Weston caught this. The narrow issue is whether the work was done pursuant to the Code. The Board's code compliance officers have determined that there are issues here.

Mr. James Wagner, Structural Inspector for the City of Weston, pointed out that the leak was not discovered until nearly a month after the roof passed inspection. From what he has been able to ascertain, it is not in a valley.

## Staff Report

Mr. Jack Morell, Chief Structural Code Compliance Officer, read Section 1512.2.5 of the Florida Building Code: “All roofing work shall be performed by a qualified contractor licensed to perform roofing in compliance with the tolerances, quality and methods of construction established herein or set forth in the standards adopted by these high-velocity hurricane zone requirements. Roofing assemblies detailed in the product approval shall be installed in strict compliance with the method of application set forth in such product approval or, if not part of the product approval, in compliance with the manufacturer’s published application instruction, or as approved by the building official.” He referred to the Miami-Dade Notice of Acceptance 23-0502, Items 10 and 11, which detail membrane installation. He drew attention to an email from Owens Corning indicating that Owens Corning manufactures the Westlake product. He noted the Westlake Installation Guide for 2-ply with a base sheet as well as a Technical Bulletin from Owens Corning that recommends against weaving of underlayment in the valley (Option 2).

Mr. Morell continued by indicating that Weston’s response indicated their belief that the appeal stems from a lawsuit with the roofing company for nonpayment. Ms. Guo filed a counter suit disputing the roof installation. Ms. Guo filed an appeal in 2024 but waited some eight months to provide data for the appeal. Weston believed that fish mouths in the valleys were corrected following Option 1’s installation instructions. Weston further believed the Owens Corning denial letter was unreliable because it was a one-sided narrative. Weston believed that reversal of the inspection is unreasonable due to the complex nature of a reinspection, re-roofing, and the cost.

Mr. Morell reviewed the position statement from Roofing and Construction Corp. (RCC). RCC contends that the Weston Building Department did exactly what they were supposed to do. RCC provides a ten-year warranty. The fish mouths were corrected, and RCC complied with Option 1 of the installation guide.

Ms. Guo noted that Owens Corning does not recommend weaving of underlayment in the valleys as it could create air pockets. Item 11 of the product approval also does not allow weaving. Westlake recommends weaving only for single ply. Their illustration clearly shows wood decking for single ply. Her roof is two-ply. Photographs presented by Weston show wood decking. Only ten tiles per stack are to be placed on the underlayment. Air pockets appeared in the valleys. Inspector Wagner emailed her, indicating that the contractor should cut open all air pockets and re-seal the underlayment. The photograph she received from Mr. Wagner looks like the Owens Corning example with no weaving. During his deposition, Mr. Wagner denied that he had shown her that picture and denied that he knew the contractor torched the underlayment. On June 21, 2024, he testified that he saw the contractor sealing the air pockets. The contractor took pictures much later to conceal what was done. She sent pictures to Owens Corning, and her warranty was voided. The underlayment was never sealed. Also, more than ten tiles per stack were placed on the underlayment. The contractor testified he never followed Option 1. On the day of the final inspection, she started to film it and was ordered by Mr. Wagner not to do so. Subsequently, Mr. Wagner passed the final inspection using a fraudulent engineering report and tampered photos. Her video shows an air pocket after the inspection was passed. The roofer denied that his business was ever sued for a roofing job. She concluded by emphasizing that her roof is two-ply, not single-ply.

Mr. Patrick Toomey, Jr., Esq., representing James Wagner and CAP Government, noted he served a response to Ms. Guo’s appeal on April 29<sup>th</sup> and technical data from Westlake, distributor of the underlayment used, and the roofer’s judicial statement on May 23<sup>rd</sup>. These materials make it clear that the weaving method used in the valleys complies with the manufacturer’s recommendations and is code compliant. The central point is whether woven valleys complied with applicable product data and were code compliant. The Westlake Technical Bulletin states that woven is an acceptable installation method and does not make any reference to one-ply or two-ply. It is their position that Option 1 is clearly acceptable, and Option 1 includes the woven method. Mr. Wagner has been inspecting roof installations for over thirty-five years. He testified at the May 8<sup>th</sup> hearing that the woven method is acceptable. There is no basis for rescinding the permit approval that was granted almost eleven months ago. He noted that there was an appeal in July of 2024, where Mr. Cox met with Mr. Morell, and the matter died. The second appeal was filed in the middle of heated litigation between Ms. Guo and RCC. The appeal makes no reference to any of the relevant materials in Westlake and does not appear to speak to RCC weaving the valleys. The central allegation debated at the May 8 hearing was apparently not raised by the Appellant and not supported by the Westlake product data. Mr. Wagner was prevented from performing a final

inspection on two occasions. He then passed the final inspection using photographs because he had been denied access to the property. Mr. Wagner also accepted the uplift test results, signed and sealed by a Florida professional engineer. Questions remaining: 1) which inspections are to be reversed and why; 2) what would be the results of a reversal; 3) how re-inspections are to be performed; 4) would inspections be in strategic locations only; 5) who would pay for the re-inspections; 6) who pays for a new roof. He cited the 1991 case law for Longboat Key in support of his position. He urged the appeal be denied.

### **Committee Discussion and Vote**

Chairman Badiu addressed the allegation of a fraudulent engineering report. He drew attention to the clarity that came out at the May 8 hearing. Photographs showed that tiles had been marked "T," which is a common practice to indicate that they were tested. Also, the report was not deemed admissible by the court because the engineer of record was not present at the hearing.

Mr. Kraemer felt there should be consideration given to the legal aspects of reversing the inspections.

Mr. Graboski indicated that the TAS106 testing would have been if the tiles were marked pursuant to the guidelines of that application standard. Another such test could be conducted because it is non-destructive. Chairman Badiu pointed out that this was discussed at the hearing.

Mr. Graboski asked if the roof leak had been resolved. Chairman Badiu was not aware of any evidence of an active leak.

Mr. Wassink asked if the manufacturer provided a full warranty. Chairman Badiu indicated the warranty was only related to the materials, not the installation. Mr. Graboski indicated it is not the practice to provide a full system warranty on residential roofing. The consumer relies on the roofing contractor to stand behind their company's warranty. It is considered a material warranty.

Mr. Clarke indicated a warranty would typically not be issued if there is a remaining balance due. He believed the original contract would provide a ten-year labor and parts warranty.

In response to Mr. Kraemer, Mr. Graboski indicated his standard system is to weave the underlayment on the anchor sheets so there are two plies in the valley. Once the valley flashing goes down, and in the cap sheet, two sheets are woven, so there are effectively five sheets in the valley. He would not see that as causing a leak.

Chairman Badiu had a different opinion from the staff regarding weaving in the valley. He referred to Item 11 of the Notice of Acceptance, which describes the application of the membrane in the valley. His understanding is that it is clearly a woven method. Mr. Graboski pointed out that because it speaks of the center of the valley, it would not be weaving.

The Committee recessed until 1:15 PM.

There was a unanimous decision to recommend to the Board, at their July 10, 2025, meeting, that Appeal #25-02 be rejected. The Committee found no substantial evidence indicating that the inspections conducted and approved by the City of Weston were procedurally flawed or inconsistent with applicable code requirements. Accordingly, the Committee recommends that the Board uphold the validity of the approved inspections and take no further action with respect to Appeal #25-02.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 1:15 PM.

## **Referenced Code Sections**

### **Chapter 1, Broward County Amendments**

**110.5 Inspection requests.** It shall be the duty of the permit holder or their duly authorized agent to notify the Building Official when work is ready for inspection. It shall be the duty of the permit holder to provide access to and means for inspections of such work that are required by this Code. Failure to request such inspections constitutes a violation of this Code. The inspection request shall be made to the Building Department office at least one (1) day prior to the required inspection and shall provide reasonable time for such inspections to be made. Inspections shall be made not later than the following workday after the day of the request for inspection when a request is made prior to noon. Requests for inspections received after noon shall be made not later than the day after the following workday.

---

### **2023 Florida Building Code, Building, Eighth Edition**

#### **Chapter 15 Roof Assemblies and Rooftop Structures**

##### **1512.2.5 Workmanship standards.**

All roofing work shall be performed by a qualified contractor licensed to perform roofing, in compliance with the tolerances, quality and methods of construction established herein or set forth in the standards adopted by these high-velocity hurricane zone requirements. Roofing assemblies detailed in the product approval shall be installed in strict compliance with the method of application set forth in such product approval or, if not part of the product approval, in compliance with manufacturer's published application instructions, or as approved by the building official. (Aesthetic issues not affecting the performance of the roof are not part of this chapter.)

# Item 2



# Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

1 N. University Drive Suite 3500B, Plantation, FL 33324

[broward.org/CodeAppeals](http://broward.org/CodeAppeals) | 954-765-4500 | [rulesboard@broward.org](mailto:rulesboard@broward.org)

---

**TO:** Members of the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

**FROM:** Administrative Director

**DATE:** April 9, 2026

**RE:** Appeal #25-02, Xiaohui Guo seeks to reverse the City of Weston, Permit #B24-01261 Inspection Results Pursuant to Florida Building Code, Section 1512.2.5

---

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals deny, by vote, the appeal submitted by Xiaohui Guo seeking to reverse the inspection results associated with the City of Weston, Permit #B24-01261, pursuant to Florida Building Code, Section 1512.2.5.

## **Reasons**

On May 8, 2025, the Board conducted a hearing on Appeal #25-02. During the hearing, testimony and evidence were presented regarding the appellant's claim that Florida Building Code, Section 1512.2.5, was not properly followed during the installation of the underlayment. Based on this allegation, the appellant requested a reversal of the inspection results.

Following the hearing, the Board directed staff to refer the matter to an Ad Hoc Committee for further review and recommendation. The Committee was tasked with evaluating the technical aspects of the case and addressing any conflicting interpretations and procedural concerns.

The Ad Hoc Committee has since completed its review and provided its recommendation to the Board. The appeal is now returned to the Board for final consideration and action.

## **Additional Information**

- The Board was provided with a USB flash drive containing the Appeal and 1200+ pages of backup.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Barbosa".

Dr. Ana C. Barbosa



# Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

1 N. University Drive Suite 3500B, Plantation, FL 33324

[broward.org/CodeAppeals](http://broward.org/CodeAppeals) | 954-765-4500 | [rulesboard@broward.org](mailto:rulesboard@broward.org)

---

**TO:** Members of the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals

**FROM:** Chief Structural Code Compliance Officer  
Chief Mechanical Code Compliance Officer

**DATE:** May 8, 2025

**RE:** Appeal #25-02 Xiaohui Guo seeks to reverse the City of Weston Permit #B24-01261 Inspection Results Pursuant to Florida Building Code Section 1512.2.5

---

## **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board of Rules and Appeals approve, by vote, the appeal submitted by Xiaohui Guo requesting to reverse the City of Weston Permit #B24-01261 Inspection Results Pursuant to Florida Building Code Section 1512.2.5.

## **Summary of Ms. Guo's Appeal:**

1. Ms. Guo alleges that the Florida Building Code Section 1512.2.5 was not followed when installing the underlayment.
2. Ms. Guo alleges that she reported to Inspector Wagner that the underlayment was delaminated in the valleys.
3. Ms. Guo alleges that the TAS 106 test results are false.
4. Ms. Guo alleges that the contractor, Roofing and Construction Corporation, and the subcontractor installed the underlayment without sealing the laps.
5. Ms. Guo alleges the fish mouths were torched down instead of being repaired according to the manufacturer's instructions.

## **Appellant's Desired Outcome:**

1. To have the inspections reversed.

## **Additional Information:**

- City of Weston Response
- Florida Building Code, Section 1512.2.5
- Miami-Dade Notice of Acceptance 23-052.03
- Westlake Installation Instructions
- Westlake Tile Seal HT installation guide
- Email from Owens Corning, manufacturer of Westlake Tile Seal HT
- Technical Bulletin from Owens Corning dated August 2023

Respectfully Submitted,

Handwritten signature of Jack Morell in black ink.

Jack Morell

Handwritten signature of Rolando Soto in black ink.

Rolando Soto



**Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals**  
 1 N. University Drive Suite, 3500B, Plantation, FL 33324  
[broward.org/CodeAppeals](http://broward.org/CodeAppeals) | 954-765-4500 | [rulesboard@broward.org](mailto:rulesboard@broward.org)

**Appeal Application**

**Appellant Information:**

Name Xiaohui Guo  
 Address 2516 Montclair Circle  
 City Weston State FL  
 Business/Profession \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone 7862818802  
 Email xiaohui\_guo@yahoo.com xiaohui.guo2022@gmail.com

**Project Information:**

Address 2516 Montclair Circle, Weston, FL 33327  
 Type of Construction single house  
 Hight of Building \_\_\_\_\_  
 Square Footage per Floor \_\_\_\_\_  
 Permit Number B24-01261  
 Permit Application Date 03/25/2024  
 Group Occupancy \_\_\_\_\_  
 Number of Stories 1

**Office Use Only**

Date Of Receipt \_\_\_\_\_

Appeal #: \_\_\_\_\_

Hearing Date \_\_\_\_\_

Notice Mailed \_\_\_\_\_

Code In Effect \_\_\_\_\_

Electrical \_\_\_\_\_

Fire Code \_\_\_\_\_

Mechanical \_\_\_\_\_

Plumbing \_\_\_\_\_

Structural \_\_\_\_\_

Alternate Material \_\_\_\_\_

Alternate Method \_\_\_\_\_

I, the undersigned, appeal the decision of the Building/Fire Code Official of James Wagner  
 as it pertains to Chapter 15, Section 1512.2.5 and 110.5, of the (check one):

- South Florida Building Code     Florida Building Code     Florida Fire Prevention Code
- Other FL Stat. 468.621(1)(f) and 468.621(1)(g), as applicable to Broward County. (Attach copy of relevant Code sections).

**Note:** The Board shall base their decision upon the section(s) of the Code you have indicated above. If these are in error, you must re-submit your appeal. The Board is not authorized to grant variances from the Code.

Summary of appeal (attach additional sheets as necessary): "Roofing Component Approval" page 3: "Membrane: ...All end laps and laps without black selvage area shall be sealed under lap using an SBS modified mastic." The roofer did not seal any laps but Mr. James Wagner only required them to conceal the fish mouths along the valleys.  
On February 27, 2025, the manufacturer voided the warranty, stating "...end laps were not sealed with roofing mastic/cement per the installation instructions..."  
The City Inspector also lied under oath at his February 4th, 2025 deposition. For details, please see attached "Summary," "Statement," and Exhibits.  
 Results desired (attach additional sheets as necessary): re-conduct the inspections  
See attached "Conclusion."

**Fee:** Waived

**Note:** Exhibits intended for distribution to the Board supporting the appeal must be submitted with the appeal. All material shall be kept from the appeal hearing. A letter from the Building or Fire Code Official rejecting the applicant's appeal must be included in the appeal packet submitted to the Board of Rules and Appeals.

Appellant Name (Please Print): Xiaohui Guo

Appellant Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

G:\SHARED\Board and Agenda Info\Board Meeting Agendas\2024\2. February 8\Item 1 - Admin. Policy for Appeals\Policy 95-01, Appeal Application (2024).docx