



# City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.  
Saint Paul, MN 55102

## Minutes - Final

### Legislative Hearings

**Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer**  
**Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator**  
**Joanna Zimny, Executive Assistant**  
**legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us**  
**651-266-8585**

---

Tuesday, September 23, 2025

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

---

#### 9:00 a.m. Hearings

##### Special Tax Assessments - Forestry

- 1      **RLH TA 25-388**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 650  
SIMS AVENUE (File No. 2507T, Assessment No. 259010)

**Sponsors:**      Yang

*Refer back to LH January 20th, 2026 at 9 am. Forestry staff to take after photo and look at any past communication records with PO.*

*Mai Yang & Phong Vang, owners, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Yang: my husband is the one who did the work. I'm going to have him on the speaker with us too.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Adam Strehlow: the original abatement order was issued July 2022 between that time and January 2025 we had a staff change and it was noticed this original case was never closed. Therefore we decided March 18, 2025 we would close the old entry and order a new abatement for the trimming work on a large cottonwood overhanging the adjacent property. Inspection done May 13, 2025 and Huge Tree Service did the work May 30th. Final inspection was done June 20, 2025 and invoice was sent.*

*Moermond: I'm assuming what we're looking at are branches overhanging the neighbor's lot that were considered dangerous?*

*Strehlow: correct.*

*Vang: there's a large cottonwood int eh back of my lot and when I got the notice to trim it, we went out and took care of it. That was August or September 2024 we had a couple trees serviced. They said that after they looked that particular area requirement to remove is in our lot, not over the neighbor's side of the property. At the same time they said it wasn't a particularly dangerous tree because they are familiar with the tree and they asked us why the City is particular about this tree because most of the other trees have the same issues. That's why we called the City back and mentioned that to*

*the inspector.*

*Yang: we left a Voicemail and didn't get a call back so we assumed things were fine. Then we got another notice this year so we called out another tree service. They came out and said they didn't know why the City was after us when the whole neighborhood was like that. Maybe because it was a vacant lot. There were some trees over the lines so I called Xcel April 23. He called me back too saying they'd go see what needs to be trimmed. That was it. Then in June my husband went out and he cleared out the area and the dead trees on the side of the neighbors. All the trees and brush under the cotton wood. Then we got this invoice. We didn't see any differences of anything cut.*

*Moermond: were you there AFTER the contractor? They went out June 20th? You shouldn't have seen anything growing over the neighbors after that. August or September 2024 you said you had a service look at it. A fresh letter went out in March 2025, 8 months later. You talked about the old letter, which was sent in 2022. Maybe had some ongoing conversation with forestry? But that old letter got closed out and reissued in March of this year. It was a new deal. It sounds like you had a new contractor out after that March letter and he said "I don't see anything wrong" but the City did. You mentioned the other houses have similar issues, I don't know what the situation is with them. I can tell you that the City is normally out responding to complaints. Likely there was a complaint on your property about these branches, and the City agreed they were dangerous. The tree company you hired may have given different information. Mr. Strehlow, how does that communication go back and forth?*

*Strehlow: the original letter goes out and there's a compliance date in the letter, approximately 30 years from the issuance date. Forestry contact information is present. It contains our customer service email and forestry specific phone number. There is a chance that number may have been down during the security breach—*

*Moermond: but that wasn't until August 2025, past this time in March.*

*Strehlow: yes, thank you. This was earlier in the summer. I don't have record of direct contact with these property owner's. If calls like these come into the CSR department they do get routed directly to me.*

*Moermond: if the call came in during April of 2025, would you have access to the records now due to the system?*

*Strehlow: it is possible. I do have communication with the contractor in the file. Within access to AMANDA though, I don't have a definitive answer.*

*Vang: are you from the City, Ms. Moermond?*

*Moermond: I'm the hearing officer for the City Council.*

*Vang: are you a neutral 3rd party?*

*Moermond: I'm in the legislative branch. The work was done by the Executive branch.*

*Vang: my question is are you a neutral third party or do you work for the City?*

*Moermond: both. I don't work for the mayor. The Council can reverse whatever the mayor does since it results in an assessment. It is a neutral assessment of your situation. I follow the rules in the City Charter about assessments, and those rules*

apply regardless.

Vang: I understand, thank you. Your tree service guy and the City code enforcement it seems like that particular lot has been a focus for the City. That's an empty lot. I have a lot of problems with the neighbors throwing trash and branches. I've been cleaning it for all these years and it seems like every time your worker goes out they focus on our lot. We are there most every month dealing with the trash and yard. There's a lot of trash and branches everywhere but we are particularly in the cross-eye of the City. I am just concerned that as this continues from what I see so far, if we request that Hugo tree service did the job we just want to see what is the before and after pictures. What did they actually do with those branches? When I went out there wasn't even a flake of wood chips anywhere if they said they cut down the tree. I took a look at the photos you sent me and focus had no change. I can send you the picture, that's why we aren't sure they cut a branch off. I'm not sure if when your inspector went out if he is familiar with the lot border. My lot sits a foot or two from the neighbor, so the whole area there isn't the neighbor's. It is mine.

Moermond: I can take those issues one by one. The first thing you mentioned is you feel like you are getting a lot of orders about lot maintenance. You have problems with trash and dumping. I can tell you that when complaints come in they go to an area called Code enforcement and that inspector goes out to see if there's a founded issue. Based on that they will write orders or state it is unfounded. If there are items there, they would write those orders. If a complaint comes in about a tree like this, a dangerous tree, Code wouldn't make the decision at all. It goes straight to Forestry, because they're the tree experts. They make the decision about whether or not it is a dangerous tree. You have different people looking at that. It could be the neighbors are not only putting things on your lot, or you are being complained about by your neighbors. If they're looking and seeing it is vacant, they only come once a month, there's always stuff on it. It may be targeted, but it isn't the City doing the targeting; it is the City responding to each complaint. Each thing is investigating as its on issue. I know that can be frustrating. I do have the before photo you have. I don't have an after photo. It isn't something the City requires, but it is obvious even at this point which branches were trimmed.

I suspect your visit in June was AFTER the contractor went, so the branch wasn't there anymore. I think both things are true. Hugo removed it but also you didn't see it. I'd like to put a pause on our conversation because there are two things I'd like to get for us to review. One is we could use a forester going by and taking a photo of the tree where the branch was removed. Second is past communication records. The problem is the computer system with those was proactively taken down by the City during the cyber attack. I think we should give a look at those things. You say there were calls and we should be able to confirm that. I'm hearing from Mr. Strehlow they don't have it back yet. October 8 is your Council Public Hearing and won't have it resolved then, so I'd like to push this out and have another conversation January 20th, 2026. We can send an email confirming that.

Vang: thank you for that. It is just that if Hugo went out there should be a before and after. They send you an invoice and they should have to represent to show what actually happened. That is particularly questionable. If you are able to go back to your records and retrieve the communication with Code Enforcement because we seem to be a particular target for Code enforcement every month. The City keeps targeting us to raise their revenue it seems like, even though we take care of the issues. Maybe the neighbor or---

*Moermond: I understand. I also have to say sir, you have to take care of your property. If the inspector gets a complaint they have to go look at it. If you go more frequently and take care of things then it is gone before the inspector visits. I'll get this additional information to you. The nice thing with trees it is obvious where something was cut down.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/8/2025**

**2 RLH TA 25-387**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 115 WINONA STREET EAST. (File No. 2507T, Assessment No. 259010)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Approve and make payable over 10 years.*

*Richard & Patricia Preston, owners, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor Adam Strehlow: this was originally opened in 2023 and the previous forester, Mr. Mueller moved on, and going through records I noticed it was still an open case. I opened a new file March 18, 2025. I did an initial compliance inspection May 13, 2025 and it was given to Hugo Tree Care for abatement June 4, 2025.*

*Richard Preston: I have had MS since 2001 and put on disability in 2008. I'm just looking for some time. I've had four surgeries in the last 8 months. My wife is on disability too. I just need time to accumulate some income to pay this off. We are already dealing with hardships.*

*Moermond: you have a couple of options; one is disability deferment up to 10 years. You can definitely pay it earlier, but that wouldn't put you on the hook until then. Another option is making payments over the next 10 years. An amount due every year, but it would slow it down. Interest does accumulate on these. If left unpaid the first payment would be on the 2026 property taxes. That also gives you more time. It is really about how you want to posture yourself on this. Giving you 10 years to pay it would give you what you are looking for but if you aren't going to be living there for more than 10 years at this point, you wouldn't have to deal with it until point of sale.*

*Richard Preston: let's make it payable over 10 years. It can be paid early?*

*Moermond: yes. The Council will look at this October 8, you'll get an invoice after that. You can pay it, part of it, or let it ride. Whatever is left goes on your 2026 property taxes.*

*[Patricia Preston joins call]*

*Patricia Preston: I don't want anything approved until I know what is going on. I don't normally due calls in the morning due to headaches. I just wake up. What is going on here?*

*[Moermond explains the two payment options again]*

*Moermond: sounds like you two need to confer about that?*

*Patricia Preston: we do, but I can't discuss things in the morning like this. It isn't good for me to do this and get into a migraine. I just suffer with this. The options are 10 years and 10 years disability? I'm not sure if the 10 year thing is paying off when you sell.*

*Moermond: it would be due in 10 years, but if you sell before then it would be due at point of sale. That's a personal situation and decision. It can be paid early. The other option is payments every year over 10 years.*

*Richard Preston: and it can still be paid off early?*

*Moermond: absolutely.*

*Patricia Preston: how much is that?*

*Moermond: it is about \$450 a year, the total assessment is \$4,039. It does accumulate interest in both cases.*

*Patricia Preston: what is the interest rate?*

*Moermond: I don't have it in front of me, it will be on the back of the notice you got about today's hearing.*

*Patricia Preston: I didn't read it. I deal with migraines. It wasn't something we should have had to deal with. It was by the sidewalk. It was just scrub trees. It wasn't something anyone planted.*

*Moermond: you are responsible for your own lot.*

*Patricia Preston: trees aren't born to get diseases. It is just unfortunate these diseases are going around. I don't want to stay on the phone too long, but disability deferment is what now?*

*Moermond: if you fill out the paperwork and its approved it doesn't have to be paid for 10 years. It does have interest but you don't have payments between now and then. If you are selling in the next 10 years you don't have to deal with it until point of sale, which is sometimes a nice option. The payment plan is payments over 10 years. The other is no payments for 10 years. In both cases you can pay it off early.*

*Patricia Preston: and the third thing is it is due in 10 years and if you sell you pay it then? You pay the \$4,000 plus interest? What is due in 10 years?*

*Moermond: it would be the amount plus interest, yes. So if you sell in 5 years, its 5 years of interest.*

*Patricia Preston: well, what is the interest for Pete's sake?*

*Moermond: for Pete's sake it is on the back of your notice for this hearing. It changes with the market. It was mailed to you.*

*Richard Preston: I think it was around 5%.*

*Patricia Preston: it is hard to believe trees can cause so much grief, and we have too many on our lot. I can't think about it any more now. Can we have your number if we*

*need to call you back?*

*Moermond: Mr. Preston has it, he's spoken to Mai Vang a couple of times already. She can handle whatever your decision is. We need to know by the next 10 days. Staff looked it up and sees 5.9% for storm sewer but we don't have a rate for tree removal.*

*Patricia Preston: what are you talking about storm sewer?*

*Moermond: it is one of the things assessed to your taxes, but its likely ballpark of what you have.*

*Patricia Preston: we have to get back to who in 10 days?*

*Richard Preston: Mai Vang*

*Moermond: Mai Vang.*

*Patricia Preston: do you know who to get back to Rich?*

*Richard Preston: yes.*

*Moermond: we'll wait to hear from you, and if you have gotten that disability payment in we'll go with that, otherwise we'll go with 10 years.*

*Patricia Preston: Rich can't even do paperwork; he can't even write. With the headaches I get, I just can't deal with all that ridiculous garbage for some stupid trees.*

*Moermond: you two talk and figure out the path forward you want, and we're happy to work with you.*

*Patricia Preston: thank you.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/8/2025**

## **10:00 a.m. Hearings**

### **Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS**

- 3      RLH AR 25-92**      Ratifying the assessment for Rubbish and Garbage Clean Up services during June 11 to July 11, 2025. (File No. J2601R, Assessment No. 268601)

**Sponsors:**      Noecker

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/7/2026**

- 4      RLH AR 25-93**      Ratifying the assessment for Tall Grass and Weed Removal services during June 12 to 24, 2025. (File No. J2601TW, Assessment No. 268701)

**Sponsors:**      Noecker

**Referred to the City Council due back on 1/7/2026**

**11:00 a.m. Hearings****Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders**

- 5      [RLH SAO 25-53](#)      Appeal of Paul Warner to a Summary and Vehicle Abatement Orders at 42 BAKER STREET WEST. (September 30, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

**Sponsors:**              Noecker

*Layover to LH September 30, 2025 at 11 am (unable to reach property rep).*

*Compliance date October 3, 2025 if unable to conduct hearing. CPH October 1, 2025.*

*Tried calling 11:49 am: mailbox full, unable to leave message.*

*Moermond: no ability to leave a Voicemail at the number provided. I'll lay this over 1 week and at the same time send it to Council for October 1. Recommend compliance date of October 3 if unable to reach September 30th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/1/2025**

**Correction Orders**

- 6      [RLH CO 25-9](#)      Appeal of Parker Hoen to a Correction Notice at 1635 MONTREAL AVENUE. (Refer back to October 14, 2024 Legislative Hearing)

**Sponsors:**              Jost

*Refer back to LH October 14, 2025 at 11 am for further discussion.*

*Parker Hoen, owner, appeared*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: a correction notice was issued August 15 regarding drainage of gutters into City right-of-way and to remove the underground PVC to Sims and discharge to front or rear yard, not property boundaries. Compliance date of August 25 and issued by Inspector Kedrowski.*

*Moermond: your appeal says you are disputing interpretation of cited code.*

*Hoen: my concern was that in the code Cited which was 34.08(2) and it just reads provide proper drainage from house away from foundation house.*

*Moermond: I think we're talking about encroachment into right-of-way. We have 34 being quoted here, Ms. Martin, which does give specifics but I think it should be citing the right-of-way code.*

*Hoen: that was the only thing I could find, municipal code says roof drains shouldn't drain onto public sidewalk, and it can to street or lawn. That is specifically. On to vs. to or towards. Where my fence and wall is is 2 feet back into my property line. My property goes another 2 feet from where the water egresses. I didn't find any code forbidding that action. Based on the measurements I have, it is six feet run to the*

*sidewalk from where it outlets, and 2 feet to the right-of-way. I know the right-of-way is 11.5 feet around the sidewalk. I located both property pins, it actually has moved a couple of inches towards my neighbor, it still is relatively in the middle of the easement. In my conversations with Mr. Kedrowski he wasn't able to cite any codes specifying the towards language or the minimum from draining towards an easement.*

*Moermond: Ms. Martin, any comments at this point?*

*Martin: I think the concern more is because of how it comes out under the wall the water will go onto the sidewalk, freeze, and create a hazard.*

*Moermond: I tend to agree. Your property is inclusive of the public right-of-way, so you pay taxes for that portion which is your side of the sidewalk to the alley if present. Likely some utility easement. The Actual right-of-way is the sidewalk through the center of the street. When the City is looking at the discharge feet from the sidewalk, it doesn't depend so much as whether it goes onto the sidewalk or not regardless of where it disperses. If it is discharging and going into the right-of-way it is different than dispersing into the lawn.*

*I hear you say the outlet is six feet in?*

*Hoen: it has done a good job absorbing into the lawn. At the time of the complaint from Public Works that excavation had moved the hillside much closer to my property line and that wasn't replanted for six weeks following the sidewalk being laid and paved. It has been backfilled and planted since then, and I haven't noticed any significant runoff or undo water hitting the sidewalk. Nothing from my property going onto the sidewalk.*

*Moermond: do you happen o know from Mr. Kedrowski any observations?*

*Martin: the observation was from Public Works.*

*Moermond: I have some photos. Did Public Works give you right-of-way code they cited or did Mr. Kedrowski just go to chapter 34?*

*Martin: 34.*

*Moermond: a fresh order with the correct code citation would be helpful. We may end up in the same location we are now. Chapter 34 doesn't seem to work exactly like Code Enforcement intended it to do. Granting the appeal doesn't mean the situation is resolved.*

*Hoen: you can see in the photos that there's no vegetation and it has since been backfilled. It has since has vegetation and clover and wildflowers to absorb some of that water outlet runoff.*

*Moermond: you think you're in compliance regardless?*

*Hoen: I have water discharging on the opposite side of the wall, but not into the public right-of-way.*

*Martin: I'd like to do 2 things: talk to Public Works about what they saw and also give it some time to wait for a rainstorm and then go out and see if there's any drainage.*



*Moermond: it is September, so we have a good six weeks to deal with any dirt issues. Let's get fresh orders if needed. Let's talk about this again on October 14th. We can hear from Public Works. I'm inclined to grant the appeal as written under chapter 34, but doesn't solve the issue under the right-of-way code.*

*Hoen: I've been trying to find the codes that pertain to this.*

*Moermond: I'm in restrictions on use of sidewalks and streets. Title 12 of the code, generally.*

*Hoen: there is some frustration on my part trying to talk to Mr. Kedrowski about the appropriate code. I took PTO and paid for parking to do this, and it easily could have been a phone call. I left Voicemails for both Mr. Kedrowski and Ms. Martin.*

*Moermond: and I'm encouraging you to give some grace. They've been using handwritten orders, at least ¾ of their time is being used rebuilding their system. They've been buried. Their stuff still isn't up and running.*

*Martin: we didn't have phones for 4 weeks.*

*Hoen: I did speak to Mr. Kedrowski. He did return my initial voicemail.*

*Moermond: and we gave some grace hearing this now because you had other obligations, so we're hearing it today. We can do your next hearing by phone as well, but I understand the frustration. You aren't the first person on your side of things to express that.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 9/24/2025**

## **1:30 p.m. Hearings**

### **Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy**

- 7      RLH VO 25-12      Appeal of Lita Fierro to a Correction Notice-Reinspection  
Complaint-Condemed at 927 DESOTO STREET. (Refer to September  
23, 2025 Legislative Hearing)**

**Sponsors:**      Kim

*Grant the appeal as property is now owner-occupied (balance of orders to be transferred to Code Enforcement).*

*Lita Fierro, owner and occupant, appeared  
Tasha Fierro, daughter of owner, appeared  
Alida Weidensee, SMRLS, appeared*

*Moermond: looks like we have probate handled.*

*Weidensee: house is in the name of the four siblings. Slight wrinkle in that one of the siblings recently passed away. I think his share goes to his son. That's another probate issue, but I don't think it should affect anything here. Lita is on the title and she lives there.*

*Moermond: that makes it owner-occupied in my view. We can put this to bed at this*

point. We were looking for the plan to complete the work on the house. Supervisor Shaff can talk about next steps and we'll try to answer any questions you may have.

Shaff: Fire Safety and Inspections only works with non-owner occupied buildings, so we transfer to Code Enforcement to work with owner-occupied so any remaining items on the house and yard would be transferred to them.

Moermond: the worst things were taken care of before. Some of the larger-ticket items that weren't as critical life-safety issues were pending. You were going to talk to the tribe and they needed it in your name, which you got done. That should help in terms of finding financing. Have you talked to anyone about that?

Lita Fierro: I talked to the tribe, but the lady I talked to left. So then I talked to someone else and they were kind of like, well, we'll have to go through it all over again. I have to start all over again and I was like, can't you get my files from where I left off with Loretta. She said she did stuff different than we normally do, it changed. I didn't understand that. Now I'm in the process of trying to get it done and they're giving me a really hard time. They don't want to help me.

Tasha Fierro: they're more willing to help people actually on the reservation, rather than them coming up here to fix things. It may be an option, but probably discussing more.

Moermond: Ms. Shaff, please pass onto Code Enforcement that they are actively working with the tribe to get financing to complete the items. You do have to circle back, but I'm so happy you got this through probate.

Weidensee: I haven't been through this before, so will we get new orders from Code?

Moermond: they will talk internally and maybe schedule an inspection, but you'd get new correspondence on all of that. You got all the critical items done.

Lita Fierro: the water department was down and redid a bunch of new pipes. I can't walk down there but my brother before he died said it looked really nice down there.

Moermond: my recommendation has been forthcoming. I'll amend to grant the appeal as the property is now owner occupied.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/8/2025**

**8 RLH VO 25-18**

Appeal of Stephen Martin, Tenant, to a Fire Inspection Report at 1771 REANEY AVENUE, APARTMENT 4 (carriage house).

Sponsors: Johnson

Grant to November 1, 2025 for compliance or property must be vacated.

Steve Martin, tenant, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Shaff: this is a multi unit property with one being the carriage house, the main building is multi-unit. We've had quite a long process concerning the front retaining wall, rear staircase, lighting in the back in this hearing room and given compliance dates. Inspector Harrington was out there and has orders dated September 4 revoking the Fire Certificate of Occupancy for long-term noncompliance with the orders and

*deadlines given by Council with vacate or compliance date of October 1. Appellant is looking for more time to find a new place for him and his family, it sounds like.*

*Martin: this was out of the blue and none of the issues pertain to my unit, but the landlord's noncompliance means he is just going to sell in the future. I don't see him getting into compliance at all. We are in the process of applying for different units and waiting to hear back and waiting to find something. I know there's a long line for some of them. Just need another month just in case.*

*Moermond: that sounds reasonable. I'm inclined to give you to November 1. Does that help?*

*Martin: that's perfect.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/8/2025**

## 2:00 p.m. Hearings

### Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 9      [RLH FCO 25-54](#)      Appeal of Pat Ware to a Fire Inspection Report at 673 CHARLES AVENUE.
- Sponsors:**      Bowie
- Layover to LH November 4, 2025 at 2 pm.*
- Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 11/4/2025**
- 10      **RLH FCO 25-55**      Appeal of Francis J Hickey to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1407 PROSPERITY AVENUE.
- Sponsors:**      Yang
- Deny the appeal as conditions existed at the time orders were written, noting the property is now in compliance.*
- Francis Hickey, owner, appeared via phone*
- [Moermond gives background of appeals process]*
- Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: our Dept received a complaint about potholes in the driveway. August 19 inspector Harrington went and observed there are 4 properties sharing this same access, one being 1407 prosperity. He wrote orders about the shared lot, took photos, needs to be repaired or replaced with an approved dustless surface. Orders went to all 4 properties for compliance. The photos and survey Mr. Hickey submitted, it is hard to tell where is what and it is only his property when overhead views from our system shows that area with the potholes is accessed by all the properties. They may have varying interests but share access.*
- Hickey: I gave you a survey that shows my property and there are no holes in mine at all. I also had the guy who did the parking lot before I paid them that there was no holes in my lot at all. There is no association agreement. I have had to clean up for these other people—every year I haul away---can you believe---5 gallon buckets and*

*empty tar bags in the pickup truck, full every year. This year twice. None of the holes are in my property. I resurface my lot every year with seal coating. I have a letter from my renter showing that. He's lived there 12 years and I've done it every year. To send me a letter for what these other people have done just isn't right at all.*

*Moermond: it looks to me like there was an area, a strip, maybe 10 feet wide?*

*Hickey: I didn't resurface that this year, but there are no holes. It has hole patch from previous years. There's usually so many holes on the other side that if I resurface they won't have a place to drive and complain about the dust, so I just fill the pot holes in my 10 feet. It was smooth and nicely filled. The people are all driving on my side and not on the other side at all. I supply a driveway for everyone and I complain to the owners and the people that come—I was going to have mine possibly totally redone this year, and I had one guy who was going to put new pavement in my side. He said my side was heaven compared to these other people's. Absolutely no holes on my side at all, inside of that survey. I do have that survey, it is a bit old but it is a written survey. Mine was done by a legitimate survey company.*

*Moermond: I do I believe I see potholes in the pavement associated with your property. So, I have a different view of the photos than you do. I see potholes in a lot of places. You have them too. I appreciate you did some blacktop along the garages there, but there are more problems. It sounds like you have issues with the neighbors and how to manage that shared access and parking and that complicates things. I only have the order on the potholes in front of me, I can't step into your relationship with the surrounding landlords. Ms. Shaff, orders were written to the landlords?*

*Shaff: yes, all 4 properties received letters.*

*Moermond: I don't have appeals from anyone else, but has there been any action from them?*

*Shaff: it sounds like they are, yes, willing to get it done. It would be nice if all 4 properties worked together.*

*Hickey: the lot has been totally repaved. The thing that I was appealing was the simple fact that I got a letter and I shouldn't have been sent one. Mine is smoother than some City streets. My entire lot inside this survey had no holes. It was smooth and clean. I don't know what else to say.*

*Shaff: Mr. Hickey, you're saying all four parcels have the work done?*

*Hickey: yes, that is true.*

*Shaff: great, thank you.*

*Hickey: I am glad you sent the letter to them too because they knew they were in trouble. I wouldn't sign until the guy signed on my survey there were no holes on my parcel.*

*Moermond: if we look at the driveway apron it looks like 50% yours. They fall on both sides of the center-line, but it sounds like it has been addressed regardless. My recommendation to the Council will be to deny your appeal noting that the property is now in compliance. There are no ongoing issues as far as the City is concerned.*

*Hickey: what do I have to do to appeal again?*

*Moermond: we'll send you a letter later this week and you would need to appear in person at the Council meeting or send a letter and it will be put in front of the Council as part of the record. Either one of those. They may have a different opinion.*

*Hickey: I also want to say at this point I called your supervisor on numerous occasions. No calls were ever returned. The only call returned was today. By I think "Mariah", whoever sent an email yesterday. I even called yesterday. They said the 22nd in this email. I'm concerned about the supervisor not calling about Mr. Harrington. This isn't fair. You're supporting Inspector Harrington's unfair decision. I will appeal again, whatever it costs me I'm going to pay.*

*Moermond: and the Council's focus will be on what you're specifically asking for. October 8 will be your Council Public Hearing.*

*Hickey: I'll be able to make that.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/8/2025**