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INTRODUCTION

Along with the many good qualities our Louisiana towns and parishes share, we also have in common many of the same nuisances. LMA kindly emailed our questions about nuisances to all Louisiana communities so we could bring you the latest tools to address your top 5 problems.

The title of this discussion is “The Troublesome Top 5 Nuisances of Louisiana Communities and your Legal Arsenal for Solving Them.” The nuisances targeted are based on your votes geographically spread across the State, as shown on the map below.
Generally, litter is defined as all waste materials except for hazardous waste. 
La. R.S.30:2522(4)

Your Legal Arsenal

Litter is regulated by state statute, and may also be regulated by local ordinance.

State Statute: La R.S. 30:2521 - 2548
Legislative Update on Addressing Litter Nuisance

There is a new anti-litter law [amends and reenacts La. R.S. 30:2531(A)(2) and (B)(2), La. R.S. 30:2531.1 (D)(1),(2), and (3)], effective August 1, 2015), which doubles fines for litter violations and applies increases to the retirement system of the law enforcement agency issuing the citation.

This change in both fine increase and allocation is seemingly beneficial for local government, as incentive to cut down on litter increases in the hands of those enforcing it. Local and state officers who issue littering citations are then likely to have incentive to issue them more frequently, as half of the total fine will be diverted to the state retirement system, benefitting whichever law enforcement agency issued the citation. The other half of the fine (the previous fine level) will continue to be split between law enforcement agencies (often district attorney and state district court offices) and the Keep Louisiana Beautiful Fund.
A breakdown of the newly doubled monetary fines and the three types are as follows:

- **Simple littering**, the lowest offense, is the disposal of litter on public or private property not owned by the offender or on waters of the state. This type of litter occurs, for example, when a load is not secured well, and an ice bag flies out from the open back of a truck.
  
  Civil penalty and cost. Its fine is now $150 (increased from $75) for the first offense and $1,000 for the second and subsequent offenses.

- **Intentional littering** occurs when, for instance, one tosses a beverage can out the window.
  
  Criminal penalty and cost. New citations are $500 for the first offense, $1,000 for the second offense, and $2,500 for the third or subsequent offenses.

- **Gross littering** is household garbage and the intentional disposal of large items (such as abandoned boats, for example).
  
  Newly doubled fines are $2,000 for a first offense, up to $5,000 for a second offense and up to $10,000 for a third and subsequent offense.

**Litter vs. Junk**

Both litter and junk occur within public places, but the difference between the two is that litter involves property not owned by the offender, while junk is often on property that is owned by the offender.

**Local Ordinance:**

Nothing prevents local governments from adopting local ordinances aimed at litter control and reduction.

If local ordinances are adopted that provide civil fines for littering, they potentially may be adjudicated in code enforcement court, which will be discussed in the next nuisance section.
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4. ABANDONED VEHICLES AND JUNK
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ABANDONED VEHICLES

Your Legal Arsenal

Abandoned vehicles on public and private property

State Statute:

La. R.S. 33:471 et seq.

“Abandoned motor vehicle” = vehicles on public property, highways or streets, or vehicles of others on private property without consent of property owner.

- Motor vehicle that is inoperable and left unattended on public property, or
- On shoulder or right of way of interstate or 4-lane highway, for more than 24 hours, or
- Has remained illegally on public property, for more than 24 hours.
- Or a motor vehicle that has remained on private property, without the consent of the owner or person in control of the property, for more than 3 days.

Local ordinance:

Apparently necessary to extend reach of abandoned vehicle prohibition to municipal streets.

Required Notice:

Law enforcement officer must post notice on windshield of vehicle that must be removed within 24 hours or be towed to municipal storage.

Once towed, municipality must within 10 days send registered or certified letter, return receipt requested, to owner of the vehicle and any person or firm known to be holder of mortgage on the vehicle. Second letter required at end of three months.

Notices state that vehicle shall be sold at public auction to highest bidder unless owner claims the vehicle and pays the municipality “all costs and charges imposed by the municipality” for the removal and detention of the vehicle.
Legal Strategy

Towing to municipal storage (but maximum statutory towing and storage charge of $30!)

If left unclaimed for three months or more, then considered abandoned to municipality and, after appraisal and notice in official journal, may be sold at public auction. Funds received must be set aside in case owner or lienholders of the vehicle appear within one year of the sale (when they are entitled to claim vehicle and entitled to amount received for the vehicle at auction, less pro rata share of costs and expenses of sale as well as charges and costs for removal and storage of the vehicle.)

However, the tow truck operator who takes possession of the vehicle for the municipality stores and may dispose of the vehicle under the Louisiana Towing and Storage Act (La. R.S. 32:1711 et seq), which applies if the vehicle is worth less than $500 and allows the towing and storage business to crush or dismantle the vehicle after inspection and notice.

JUNK VEHICLES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY, STREETS, OR SIDEWALKS

State Statute:

La. R.S. 33:4876

“Junk vehicle” = motor vehicle which is totally inoperable, left unattended on any occupied lot, street, or sidewalk, and is so damaged or dismantled as to be a total loss (cost to repair exceeds junk value under a national appraisal book).

Some municipalities make it clear by ordinance that a vehicle must be in running condition with a current license plate and inspection sticker in order to remain in open storage, otherwise must be in an completely enclosed building (fixed structure, permanent roof, solid exterior walls).

Local Ordinance:

Necessary to implement.

Required Notice:

“10 Day Notice” placed on the vehicle (pasted on windshield). Or written notice given to owner, if known. Or it may be preferable to provide notice both ways to prove satisfaction of due process.
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Legal Strategy

After required notice, if no action taken by owner and no effort made to appeal to municipal authorities, the vehicle is considered public property and may be disposed of by the municipality “as the governing authority may designate.” (Towing and storage by a towing company selected by the municipality may be preferable method, given the mechanism already in place for abandoned vehicles.)

JUNK

State Statute:

La. R.S. 33:4876

“Junk” = discarded or abandoned major appliances, such as refrigerators, freezers, ranges or machinery, or other metal, tin, or other discarded items on any vacant or occupied lot, street or sidewalk.

Local ordinance:

Necessary to implement.

Required notice:

To owner of the lot upon which the junk is located.

Legal Strategy

Removal by municipality, with cost of removal (statutory maximum: $200) constituting a special lien collectible as a special assessment.

Alternatively, any vacant lot, or any portion of occupied lot, used for storage or junk, may be required to be surrounded or enclosed by a board fence.

Property Standards Ordinance

Constitution and State Statute:

La. Const. Art. 1, Sec. 4, guarantees the right of private property but specifically subjects it to the “reasonable exercise of the police power.” The police power authorizes local governmental regulation of general health, safety, and welfare. City of New Orleans v. Board of Directors of the Louisiana State Museum, 98-1170 (La. 3/2/99), 739 So.2d 748.
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A Lawrason Act municipality is authorized “to exercise any power and perform any function necessary, requisite, or proper for the management of its affairs not denied by law.” La. R.S. 33:361.A.

Local ordinance:

Necessary, with option to adopt International Property Maintenance Code. (Although advisable to review the International Property Maintenance Code for any sections that the municipality may wish to exclude, adopting remainder.)

Required Notice:

Inspection, notice or citation. Right of appeal, which may be to the Board of Aldermen or City Council.

Legal Strategy

Typically, an Order that the nuisance created by the storage of junk be removed or corrected within a specified period of time. Otherwise, the municipality may remove the junk with municipal resources or by a private contractor retained by the municipality, with the cost being the responsibility of the owner.

The municipality shall have a lien and privilege for the cost of removal of the junk.

Civil or criminal fines also may be provided.

CODE ENFORCEMENT COURT OPTION

Violations of municipal codes prohibiting storage of junk, abandoned property (La. R.S. 33:4720.59(D)(2)), blighted property (La. R.S. 33:1374(B)(1)), housing codes, or ordinances addressing public health, housing, fire code, or environmental concerns may carry civil fines adopted by the municipality.

These civil fines for such code violations may, at the option of a municipality, be adjudicated through the establishment of an administrative hearing procedure under La. R.S. 13:2575. This administrative forum is known by various names, such as Environmental Court (Monroe’s in 2007), Litter Court (Baton Rouge, since 2008), and Code Enforcement Court.
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A hearing officer is appointed (who may be the municipality’s attorney), who may be empowered to, upon at least 15 day notice of a hearing:

- Administer oaths in the administrative hearing,
- Issue orders compelling attendance of witnesses and production of documents
- Levy fines, fees, penalties, and hearing costs (the maximum of which shall not exceed those established for parish or municipal courts)
- Order violators to correct violations within a stipulated time
- Take “necessary and lawful measures to effect correction of the violation if the violator fails to do so” by the deadline established
- Record orders, judgments, notices of judgment, or liens in the mortgage records. The lien and privilege secures all fines, costs, and penalties assessed, which are included in the next annual ad valorem tax bill and, if unpaid, subject to tax sale as blighted or public nuisance property. The lien and privilege has the effect of a judicial mortgage against the immovable property, and may be enforced by filing in district court for a writ under Code of Civil Procedure Art. 2253.

The hearing officer’s order may be appealed to district court. Filing of the appeal does not stay the enforcement and collection of a judgment by the hearing officer unless the person filing the appeal furnishes security prior to the filing of the appeal with the municipality in an amount to be fixed by the hearing officer as sufficient to assure satisfaction of the hearing officer’s order to correct the violation.

The Code Enforcement Court procedure avoids criminal prosecution for non-criminal violators and often has been found through experience to offer a useful forum for agreement on a reasonable plan for correction of the code violation.
3. ROAMING DOGS

How are Roaming Dogs Defined?

Roaming Dogs are unaccompanied dogs running at large, or any place other than the premises of the owner. La. R.S. 3:2773

Your Legal Arsenal

Dogs running at large are prohibited by State statute (La. R.S. 3:2771). Also, local authorities are given the right to regulate dogs running at large through adoption of animal control ordinances (La. R.S. 3:2731).
State Statutes:


Dogs are personal property of the citizens who own them. *(La. R.S. 3:2773(A))*

Unaccompanied dogs running at large - any place other than the premises of the owner - may be seized by any citizen and shall be seized by a local or statewide law enforcement officer. *(La. R.S. 3:2773(B))*

“If the dog is wearing a collar bearing a tag showing the name and address of its owner, it shall be impounded and the citizen or officer so seizing and impounding the dog shall immediately thereafter by written notice notify the owner of the dog, at the address disclosed by the tag on the dog’s collar, that the dog has been seized and impounded by him, and unless the owner or keeper of the dog shall, within seven days from the receipt of the notice, claim the dog and pay the citizen or officer a fee of one dollar for seizing and a fee of twenty-five cents for each day it is impounded, it shall be disposed of in a humane manner.” *(La. R.S. 3:2773(B))*

Any dangerous or vicious dog may be killed by any citizen or officer, who shall not be liable for damages or to prosecution by reason of killing any dangerous or vicious dog. *(La. R.S. 3:2773(D))*

Whether or not a dog is “vicious” or “dangerous” is a factual determination which must be determined on a case-by-case basis, and the test is whether a reasonable person under similar circumstances would have concluded that the dog was dangerous pursuant to statute providing that any citizen or officer may kill any dangerous or vicious dog, and no citizen or officer shall be liable for damages or to prosecution by reason of killing any dangerous or vicious dog. *Hebert v. Broussard*, 886 So.2d 666 (La. App. 3 Cir. 11/10/04).

Local Regulation of Roaming Dogs

Parishes and municipalities may adopt ordinances regulating dogs running at large, and they may regulate or prohibit vicious or dangerous dogs. Parishes and municipalities may also limit the enforcement of said ordinances or the imposition of fees and fines thereunder. In addition, such ordinances may provide for the utilization of the proceeds of dog and cat license fees and fines for the operation of its animal control program or for the effective enforcement of its animal control ordinances. *(La. R.S. 3:2731)*
Municipalities or parishes may set fees and fines in amounts sufficient for the operation of its animal control program or for the effective enforcement of its animal control ordinances. **La. R.S. 3:2778**

A municipality may be able to work successfully with its Animal Control Division, to which citizen complaints are driven.

Inside municipalities (vs. outside in parishes), there is a greater need for control of the nuisance. However, recently, there has been an effort in certain parishes (such as DeSoto Parish) to institute a unified animal control ordinance in which municipalities may opt in and agree to pay fees to the police jury for any pickup of roaming dogs. Additionally, some Parishes work cooperatively with their municipalities that have animal control services or shelters.

In the absence of the adoption of such animal control ordinances, the parish or local governing authority shall rely on the provisions of **La. R.S. 3:2773. (La. R.S. 3:2778)**

In smaller communities, an animal control program may not exist or exist with minimal resources. For enforcement in these municipalities, a law enforcement agency and perhaps a reliable veterinarian may be able to help with the worst problems.

**Understanding Enforcement Issues**

A problem from the statutory authorization to local government for regulation of roaming dogs is that the State placed an unfunded mandate on each Parish (**La. R.S. 3:2774**) for enforcement, and most Parishes simply do not enforce it. Instead, many Parishes ask their Sheriff’s Office to handle any outrageous violations, such as vicious dogs that have attacked a person, or suspected rabid animals.

Unfortunately, no easy or free solution to the problem exists. Some volunteer animal welfare agencies and no-kill shelter groups, like PAWS, try to help with the problem. They usually hit a hurdle, however, when they ask local government agencies to fund their (expensive!) operations. The well-intentioned volunteer agencies must be careful, however, not to house such a large number of dogs in a neighborhood as to risk becoming a nuisance and a zoning violation.
Looking Ahead: Emerging Animal Issues in Municipalities

- Prohibition of hybrid wild/domestic animals – wolf/dog hybrids in particular.

- Backyard chicken and rabbit raising in town – very popular sustainable practice now. Some communities have adapted their zoning regulations to allow this under specified sanitary conditions; however, most subdivision covenants still prohibit it.

- Limitation on number of animals at residences (in most covenants, but towns don’t enforce them).

- Feeding of feral animals, thereby increasing the population.

- Housing of wild animals, such as monkeys and big cats
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2. DILAPIDATED STRUCTURES
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A NUISANCE NATIONALLY, NOT JUST IN LOUISIANA

Dilapidated structures and abandoned buildings are a nuisance headache across the United States. Major case studies have been undertaken by groups such as the International City/County Management Association showing that despite aggressive efforts in many large communities, nagging problems persist.

All local government officials in Louisiana want a safer, cleaner community for citizens. Public safety is on everyone’s mind, and under the widely discussed “Broken Windows Theory” of property standards maintenance, neglected properties – if left dilapidated – can lead to spreading problems. As one of the co-authors of the Broken Windows Theory, Professor George Kelling of Rutgers put it, “Taking care of broken windows reduces crime, taking care of crime reduces broken windows.” He adds that a neighborhood with broken windows is vulnerable, because it looks like no one cares.

Louisiana municipalities addressing this widespread nuisance face some special challenges, despite best intentions. Louisiana’s poverty rate is #49 in the country based on household income (ahead of Mississippi, and paired with Texas, Alabama, and New Mexico). This translates into a challenge of financial capacity both of many citizens who have difficulty maintaining their own structures, and tight public finances that limit local governments in taking remedial action.

The goal, therefore, is efficiency in correcting the nuisance of dilapidated structures.

EFFICIENCY IN PROPERTY MAINTENANCE ENFORCEMENT

Dilapidated and dangerous structures in Louisiana can – through criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding (Code Enforcement Court) - be ordered repaired or condemned and demolished. But someone has to pay for it. This requires action either through governmental effort and expense, or mandated private remediation.

Which option – criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding through a Code Enforcement Court works best?

First, you need a strong municipal property maintenance code. The International Property Maintenance Code is available for adoption, although you should review those sections you might wish to delete.
Second, an initial investigation is required of the capacity and potential willingness of the owner of the dilapidated structure to take private action. There is a difference between a property owner who can but won’t make repairs, and a citizen who cannot and does not make repairs.

But even a potentially willing owner is unlikely to act without the push of a well-organized municipal enforcement effort that meets due process requirements. For a recent federal decision discussing due process requirements for demolition of a dilapidated structure, see *Yang v. City of Wyoming*, No. 14-1846, 2015 WL 4174760 (6th Cir. 07/13/15) (“notice reasonably calculated, under all the circumstances, to apprise interested parties of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to present their objections”).

**YOUR LEGAL ARSENAL**

**State Statute**


Additionally, municipalities may adopt the administrative procedure for addressing blighted property and dilapidated structures by a municipal Code Enforcement Court under *La. R.S. 13:2575 (B)(1).*

**Local Ordinance**

Required for adoption of a local Property Maintenance Code, with potential fines, under *La. R.S. 33:1236.28 or La. R.S. 13:2575 (B) (1).*

Local enforcement is self-operative under the enabling provisions of *La. R.S. 33:4761 et seq.* for condemnation and demolition or removal.

**LEGAL STRATEGY**

Under the self-operative provisions of *La. R.S. 33:4761 et seq.*, before a municipality may condemn a structure, there must be a report recommending the demolition or removal by an authorized municipal official, followed by a show cause hearing. In the case of “grave public emergency” where the condition of the building could cause “possible immediate loss or damage to person or property” the municipality may condemn the building on 24-hour notice to the owner or an attorney appointed to represent an absentee owner. Additionally, any notice served must be filed with the recorded or mortgages.
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Under local ordinances adopted, which must provide for adequate due process notices and the opportunity for hearings, municipalities may provide for securing, condemning and demolishing any building or structure which is considered to “endanger the public welfare or safety.” This means as to “cause harm to the physical well-being of members of the public” or “which may facilitate or encourage criminal activity within such structure.” La. R.S. 33:1236.28.A.(3)(b).

Criminal fines are possible under local ordinance, but experience has shown that while these may be a deterrent, courts are hesitant to impose such fines if the unwilling property owner promises action.

Likewise, civil proceedings are possible, typically in the parish district court. However, the same sympathy often is shown by judges as in criminal proceedings, and the proceedings can take a very long time.

Therefore, the recommended strategy is through the creation by the municipality of an administrative Code Enforcement Court under La. R.S. 13:2575(B)(1). Experience has shown this to be relatively quick in comparison with either criminal or civil proceedings in district court, and, since it remains under the control of the municipality, efficient in its coordination of municipal personnel addressing the problem.

Enforcement though Liens

A monetary sum becomes due to the municipality through enforcement of property maintenance codes, or an orders to demolish and remove a dilapidated structure. This arises from a fine or the cost of the municipality’s own actions in securing (typically boarding up) or demolishing and removing the dilapidated structure.

This sum is enforced through recordation of a lien in favor of the municipality in the mortgage records. The lien amount includes costs of locating the property owner, notification to the owner, recordation of the lien, and enforcement and collection of the lien. Ordinances may provide for interest on the costs incurred at the rate of judicial interest provided in state statute. (La. R.S. 9:3500(B)(1)).

The privilege and lien primes all other liens or privileges filed after the notice is recorded, and may be enforced through judicial foreclosure.

Tax Sales and Adjudication
Code enforcement does not result in transfer of ownership unless the fines and costs of remedial action are not paid by the owner and the government enforces the lien by foreclosure.

Ownership of dilapidated structures can and often do come to municipalities through failure of the property owner to pay property taxes, resulting in a tax sale. Under La. Constitutional Amendment 10, which passed in November, 2014, the redemption period for blighted and abandoned property sold at tax sale has been reduced from 3 years to 18 months. This reduction in time at least reduces the period of tax sale ownership “limbo” which often provides headaches for municipalities seeking correction of property maintenance problems.

If the property being sold at tax sale receives no buyer, however, ownership reverts to the taxing entity, often the municipality, through adjudication. Adjudicated properties create inventory and maintenance headaches for the municipal owner.

If there is no market demand for the dilapidated properties, especially those which become adjudicated to a local government, creative solutions must be sought. In Louisiana, this has included Choice Neighborhood Planning or Implementation Grants: City of Shreveport, Planning Grant of $250,000 for Fiscal Year 2010; Baton Rouge, Planning Grant of $500,000 for Fiscal Year 2013; and New Orleans, Implementation Grant of $30.5 million for Fiscal Year 2011.

Land banking, adoption of a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay Ordinance, or creation of a Redevelopment District also offer creative possibilities for redevelopment of neighborhoods containing dilapidated and abandoned structures, but these deserve their own lengthier seminar presentations.
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1. BLIGHTED PROPERTY & YARDS
A. What is Blighted Property?

Blighted Property refers to an area that was developed at some point but currently suffers from physical deficiencies. (American Planning Association)

It can mean land that is in a dilapidated, unsafe, and unsightly condition.

Other definitions of blighted property include the words uninhabitable and abandoned, or property that presents an imminent danger to other people or property.

B. How Can I Get Rid of Blighted Property in My Community?

Most cases are complaint driven.

You should be aware of the local resources available to you. Your local code may have a general nuisance or health ordinance covering a broad range of nuisances, like weeds, overgrown lots, trash or rubbish on lots.

If there is no general nuisance ordinance, there may be something in another place, such as:

- Zoning code or ordinance – general health, safety and welfare; junkyards
- Fire prevention ordinance – may assist in controlling accumulations of trash
- Mosquito and pest control ordinance – may assist in controlling trash and open, abandoned receptacles
- Streets and/or drainage ordinance – may have regulations prohibiting the placement of debris in ditches or property

State statute(s):

There are several statutes on blight scattered across the Louisiana Revised Statutes, many of which are municipality-specific.

Generally – La. R.S. 33:4770.12

[text of statute on following page]
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Local ordinance:

Necessary to implement.

Required notice:

To the owner of the lot that is “blighted”; or to the owner of the lot to which the “blight” abuts

Legal Strategy:

Removal by municipality, with cost of removal constituting a lien on the property

Code enforcement court – see pages 8-9

Text of Louisiana Revised Statute 33:4770.12

Grass and weed cutting; abutting owner’s liability; notice; waiver of notice

A. The governing authority may enact ordinances requiring that property be maintained in a safe and sanitary condition, including ordinances providing for the cutting, destruction, or removal of noxious weeds or grass or other deleterious, unhealthful, or noxious matters on any sidewalks or banquettes and on any lot, place, or area within the city. The charges, costs, and expenses incurred by the city in enforcing such ordinances, shall, to the extent of the actual cost thereof be a charge, cost, or expense of the property abutting the sidewalk or banquette or of the lot, place, or area, and the owner thereof.

B. If an owner of property fails to cut, destroy, or remove such grass or other matter from his property or from any abutting sidewalk or banquette, the city shall notify the property owner of its intent to perform such work after ten days and to charge the property owner for the work. Such notice shall be given by registered mail, addressed in accordance with the tax rolls of the city, or served on the property owner, by domiciliary or personal service, by a representative of the city.

C. The city may undertake the cutting, destruction, or removal of noxious weeds or grass or other deleterious, unhealthful, or noxious matters on any property within its jurisdiction on a monthly basis without the notice required in Subsection B of this Section if the property owner liable has been notified pursuant to said Subsection at any time during the immediately
preceding twelve months and has failed to do the work himself after opportunity to do so. However, prior to undertaking such work, the city shall file and record an affidavit, signed by the mayor or his designee, at the administrative office. Such affidavit shall include the following:

(1) A description of the property sufficient to reasonably identify it.

(2) A photograph of the property sufficient to reasonably identify its unsafe or unsanitary conditions and to justify the necessity for cutting, destroying, or removing weeds, grass, or other noxious matters.

(3) A statement that the property owner liable has within the past twelve months failed to do such work after notification and opportunity to do so pursuant to Subsection B of this Section.

D. Once the city has undertaken such actions, pursuant to Subsection A of this Section, it shall have the bill for the work delivered by registered mail, addressed in accordance with the tax rolls of the municipality, or served on the property owner, by domiciliary or personal service, by a representative of the city.

E. Upon failure of the property owner to pay the charges within thirty days of receipt of the bill, the city may file a certified copy of said charges with the recorder of mortgages, and the same, when so filed and recorded, shall operate as a lien and privilege in favor of the city against the property on which the work was done or against the property abutting the sidewalk or banquette on which the work was done. The lien and privilege granted under this Subsection shall have the same ranking as an ad valorem tax lien on immovable property as provided in R.S. 9:4821(1).


(emphasis added).
CONCLUSION

There would be little or no disagreement that municipal nuisances, if left unaddressed, can erode a sense of community, risk public safety, and inhibit future growth.

Therefore, looking at the Troublesome Top 5 Nuisances of Louisiana Communities, it is recommended that municipalities:

- Encourage stepped-up enforcement of anti-littering efforts under the newly increased fines under State law.

- Adopt local ordinances to control junk, and at least, stop the open storage of vehicles.

- Explore cooperation with parish government to adopt animal control ordinances and provide necessary enforcement personnel.

- Adopt a property maintenance code.

- Implement a system for required yard maintenance, enforced through liens if the municipality must step in.

- Adopt an administrative Code Enforcement Court as an efficient and achievable method of solving nuisance problems.
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