From:	Vaupel, Jessica
То:	Robert Grimaldi; "dan.leonard@am.jll.com"
Cc:	Smith, Katie; VAB; "Cristina Saya"
Subject:	FW: Request for Reconsideration: 2020-00147
Date:	Monday, December 14, 2020 2:58:24 PM
Attachments:	image006.png
	image007.png
	image008.png
	image009.png
	image010.png
	image011.png
	image012.png
	image013.png
	image014.png

Good Afternoon.

Please see the below response from VAB Counsel Thalwitzer regarding the Property Appraiser's Request for Reconsideration concerning petition 2020-00147.

Jessica Vaupel Assistant Manager, Clerk of the Board Department 201 S. Rosalind Avenue, Orlando, FL 32801 Phone 407-836-7302; Fax 407-836-5382 jessica.vaupel@occompt.com



Florida has a very broad public records law. As a result, any written communication created or received by Orange County Comptroller officials and employees will be made available to the public and media, upon request, unless otherwise exempt, pursuant to Florida or Federal law. Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this office. Instead, contact our office by phone or in writing.



PROPERTYFRAUD

Sign up today and protect yourself from Property Fraud!

From: Aaron Thalwitzer <aaron@brevardlegal.com>
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 12:39 PM
To: Vaupel, Jessica <Jessica.Vaupel@occompt.com>
Cc: Smith, Katie <Katie.Smith@occompt.com>; VAB <VAB@occompt.com>
Subject: RE: Request for Reconsideration: 2020-00147

Hi Jessica,

In this substantial completion petition, the subject property was intended to be an assisted living facility ("ALF"). In Florida, an operator of an ALF requires approval from Florida's Agency for Healthcare Administration, Division of Health Care Quality Assurance ("ACHA"). Such approval was not issued until 3/30/2020, well after the 1/1/20 date of assessment. As such, it appears undisputed that the petitioner could not operate an ALF at the subject property on 1/1/20.

The PAO argues that this petition and the underlying factual background, are indistinguishable from a different petition in which the SM found that substantial completion had been reached even though only a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy had been issued. I disagree. In the instant petition, the petitioner cannot use the property for its intended use, as an ALF, without a license which it lacked on 1/1/20. The PAO's argument is essentially that, because the petitioner could make *some* use of the subject property even with the license, it is irrelevant that it could not make its intended use. In other words, the PAO appears to take the position that the SM should find substantial completion because, even without the ACHA license, the subject property could house regular tenants or be used in some other non-ALF way. This argument ignores the definition of "substantially completed" cited in the PAO's request: "the improvement or some self-sufficient unit within it *can be used for the purpose for which it was constructed*" (emphasis supplied) F.S. 192.042(1). Using the subject property other than as an ALF is not using it "for the purpose for which it was constructed".

The PAO also attempts to minimize the importance of the ACHA license to the intended use of the subject property, analogizing it to a case in which a property was found to be substantially complete "even though some minor items might be required to be added." Implicit in this argument is the conclusion that the ACHA license is a "minor item[]" which "might" be required. I disagree with this notion. The ACHA license is not "minor" to the intended use of the subject property, it is critical. It is also not something which "might" be necessary; it is a strict legal requirement which must be satisfied before the subject property may serve as an ALF.

Consequently, I agree with the recommended decision's finding that the subject property had not reached substantial completion on 1/1/20, and accordingly would deny the request for reconsideration.

Thank you,



257 N. Orlando Ave. Cocoa Beach, FL 32931 (321) 799-4777 <u>Aaron@BrevardLegal.com</u> From: Robert Grimaldi <rgrimaldi@ocpafl.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 1:28 PM
To: VAB <<u>VAB@occompt.com</u>>
Cc: aaron@brevardlegal.com; 'dan.leonard@am.jll.com' <<u>dan.leonard@am.jll.com</u>>; Smith, Katie
<<u>Katie.Smith@occompt.com</u>>; Vaupel, Jessica <<u>Jessica.Vaupel@occompt.com</u>>; Starr Brookins
<<u>sbrookins@ocpafl.org</u>>; Cristina Saya <<u>msaya@ocpafl.org</u>>; Camille Smith <<u>csmith@ocpafl.org</u>>;

James M. Kleitz <<u>jkleitz@ocpafl.org</u>>; Ana M. Arroyo <<u>aarroyo@ocpafl.org</u>>; Tatsiana Sokalava <<u>tsokalava@ocpafl.org</u>>

Subject: Request for Reconsideration: 2020-00147

Good afternoon,

Please see the attached correspondence.

Thank you,

Robert Grimaldi, Esq. Legal Advisor Representing Rick Singh, CFA | Orange County Property Appraiser 200 S. Orange Ave | Suite 1700 | Orlando, FL 32801 407.836.5030 work| 407.836.5051 fax rgrimaldi@ocpafl.org| www.ocpafl.org





This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual or entity named. This message may be an attorney-client communication, and as such is privileged and confidential. If you are not the named addressee in this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution, copying, forwarding of this e-mail is prohibited and to do so might constitute a violation of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. section 2510-2521. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail is prohibited and to do so might constitute a violation of the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. section 2510-2521. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. In the event this communication contains a discussion of any U.S. federal or other tax-related matters, and unless specifically stated otherwise, this discussion is preliminary in nature and is subject to further factual development and technical analysis. Unless specifically stated otherwise, no part of this communication constitutes a formal legal conclusion or opinion of any kind.