This summary report was prepared by staff to track progress on code compliance issues in the City of Kent. This is the fifth year that these statistics have been analyzed so this report includes a comparison across several years – 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010.

With five years of data we continue to identify common themes that re-appear year after year, e.g., high incidence of overgrown vegetation citations, and it also notes new trends that have emerged, e.g., an increase in sign zoning violations in public right-of-ways.

For the third consecutive year, rental property citations surpassed owner occupied citations for the total number of citations issued – with overgrown vegetation complaints remaining a significant problem for all property owners. This is the second year commercial properties had the most violations for snow removal.

Using this data we hope to be able to continue to introduce new code initiatives.
Code Inspection Results in 2010

Code Violation Distribution by Type

- Overgrown Vegetation: 32.8%
- Zoning Code Violation: 27.1%
- Snow Violations: 11.3%
- Property Maintenance: 10.5%
- Other: 6.3%
- Illegal Use: 5.3%
- Nuisance Material: 3.8%
- Stormwater/Drainage: 1.3%
- Side/Front Yard Parking: 1.0%
- Work Without a Permit: 0.8%

2010 Summary

- 1 out of 3 code complaints in 2010 were in response to overgrown vegetation.
- The top 5 most common complaints made up 88% of all complaints, same as 2009.
- 17 out of 25 of the “other” category were tool rentals.

Total Code Violations by Property Type

Code Violations By Property Type

- Rental: 157
- Owner: 89
- Vacant: 115
- Commercial: 38

2010 Summary

- 39% of all violations occurred at rental properties.
- Rental properties had the highest number of violations for overgrown vegetation than any other category.
- Commercial properties had the highest incidence of snow violations.
Code Inspection Results in 2010

**TOP 20 Streets for Code Violations in 2010**

The following 20 streets are listed in descending order for the most violations in 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STREET</th>
<th># VIOLATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Main</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Water</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Main</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. College</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Mantua</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Summit</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crain</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Elm</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lincoln</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. DePeyster</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Willow</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Streets with multiple violations**

**Street Summary**

- A total of 107 streets had violations in 2010.
- The top 20 streets accounted for 59% of the total violations.
- 38% of the streets had only one violation.
- The map illustrates streets with multiple violations. It's important to remember that the inspection process is mainly complaint based so heavily trafficked streets are likely to have a disproportionately high number of violations called in.

**Property Summary**

- 399 violation notices were issued in 2010.
- 331 different property owners received violation notices.
- 66 properties or 17% of properties (1 out of 6) were repeat offenders in 2010.
- The single owner with the most violations had 7 in the course of the 12 month period.
- Overall 22 owners had violations at multiple properties (6%).
- 10 commercial properties were repeat offenders in 2010.
- 1 out of 4 rental property owners were repeat offenders.

**Percent of Repeat Violations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Owners</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Code Inspection Results 2006 to 2010

**Code Violation Distribution by Type (2006 to 2010)**

Only one of the main violation types have decreased every year:

- 2010 was the second year overgrown vegetation complaints decreased.
- Property maintenance, zoning, and parking violations all increased in 2010.
- Property maintenance violations increased almost 4% in 2010.

**Code Violations by Property Type (2006 to 2010)**

- Total rental violations decreased by 10.
- Total owner violations increased by 22 incidents.
- In 2008, 2009 & 2010 rentals had the highest number of overgrown vegetation violations, in 2006 & 2007 owner occupied was the highest.
- This was the first year the total number of owner occupied violations increased.

**Street Violation Summary (2006 to 2010)**

- 7 out of 20 streets with the highest violations changed from 2009 to 2010.
- All of the top 5 were the same in 2009 and 2010.
- In 2010 the number of streets with violations increased by 17 or 10%.
- 10 streets have remained in the top 20 every year.

**Property Violation Summary (2006 to 2010)**

- Total citations increased by 101 or 25% from 2009 to 2010.
- In 2006 the total number of violations by property owner was 254, then a decrease of 88 owners or 35% in 2007, in 2008 the total number increased by 88 back to 254, in 2009 the total number of property owners was 254 again, and finally in 2010 there was an increase of 77 for a total of 331.
- Repeat offender property owners increased by 35%.
- Vacant properties were the lowest for repeat violations this year.
Code Inspection Duties in Kent

The City's code inspection functions are decentralized with responsibilities spread out among several city departments:

- The Health Department manages the enforcement of the state health code, e.g., food service, swimming pools, licensed boarding houses, trash.
- The Fire Department has a range of building inspection duties related to upholding the state fire code, e.g., electrical, ingress/egress, etc.
- The Police Department handles a number of nuisance activities such as enforcement of the noise ordinance and nuisance parties.
- The Community Development Department performs all inspections related to construction activity, administers the zoning code, and responds to a number of exterior maintenance types of complaints, e.g., tall weeds and grass, graffiti, fencing, etc.

Code Inspection Policy

The City's code inspection efforts are governed by national/state laws and adopted City policy that seeks to protect public health and safety. Where national/state laws establish standards, e.g., building code, fire code, etc., the City ensures private activities comply with those standards through routine permitting, licensing and inspection procedures.

In addition, the City has adopted a range of property requirements that establish local standards for maintenance of private property, e.g., tall weeds and grass, exterior maintenance, etc. These requirements were created as a means to uphold the community's expectations for their investment in their homes, businesses and quality of life enjoyed in the community.

Clean, well-maintained neighborhoods do much more than just make Kent a pleasant place to live. Neighborhoods whose homeowners perform routine, basic maintenance on their structures and yards consistently enjoy lower crime rates and higher property values.

Code Inspection Practices

For those activities that require permits and licenses, the City has procedures in place that govern the necessary application, notification, and inspection of regulated activities.

For the local code matters, the City has historically used a complaint driven practice, whereby inspections are performed only in response to a complaint. This practice was in part due to the lack of staffing available to patrol neighborhoods and seek out violations fairly, but it was also a policy established by City Council in an effort to maintain a more customer-friendly community.

Since the hiring of a full-time Code Enforcement Officer in 2008 the City has been able to take a more pro-active approach to Code matters while maintaining good customer service.