



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
Jean Birkholz, Hearing Secretary
Mary Erickson, Hearing Secretary
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8560

Tuesday, August 2, 2011

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

Rescheduled J1112P, CPH 8/3

- 1 [RLH TA 11-194](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1112P, Assessment No. 118079 at 1137 GRAND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thune

Delete the assessment. Graffiti waiver received.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/3/2011

Rescheduled J1113A, CPH 8/3

- 2 [RLH TA 11-198](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118077 at 475 SAINT CLAIR AVENUE. (To be laid over to October 5, 2011 public hearing.)

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [475 St. Clair Ave. Summary Abatement](#)

Approve the assessment.

RE: 475 St. Clair (9 apartments)

Joyce Pforr, sister of owner, David Ripplinger and Jane Ripplinger, daughter of owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement issued Mar 28, 2011 with compliance date of Mar 31; re-checked Mar 31, 2011

- Work was completed Apr 4, 2011 for a cost of \$359 plus \$140 service charge for a total of \$499

- Orders sent to David Ripplinger, 2710 Kentucky Ave N, Crystal, MN and Pat

Lenahan, P O Box 385817, Bloomington, MN

- hauler service was a result of having only 2 containers on site; currently, they have 4
- 14 more weeks of service are pending

Ms. Pforr:

- property purchased in 2008 by her brother
- have been no issues until 2010 when a lot of dumping began to occur
- problem tenants have been given notice (they moved in Aug 2010); other moved in Oct & Nov, 2010
- Renters' Warehouse approved those tenants (screen and recommend tenants)
- drug task force is involved
- another tenant will be moving out the end of Sep, 2011
- are working with the neighborhood watch
- her brother, David, is an independent contractor and has been unemployed most of 2009; just started working 2010 in Chicago
- he comes one every 2 weeks; has a bookkeeper who was receiving these Notices but just filing them away
- he has spoken to her and Jane about the problems with the apartments and the bookkeeper
- currently, 2010 taxes are not paid nor are any of the 2011 taxes
- suffering a financial hardship but slowly digging out with David working
- she and Jane go to apartments to clean up once a week
- has a painter hired to paint outside trim, etc.
- are not denying these complaints
- just asking for leniency
- will be doing some planting and are working hard to improve things
- have the garbage situation under control; have 4 containers
- Renters' Warehouse will be replaced

Ms. Moermond:

- viewed video showing clean-up
- notification was sent to the proper parties although the bookkeeper put Notices into a file
- daughter sent Notice to Renters' Warehouse (faxed over twice) who said they'd take care of it
- the City did the clean-up; the charges are legitimate
- will recommend the City Council approve this assessment
- Renters' Warehouse dropped the ball

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/3/2011

Rescheduled J1110G, CPH 8/3

- 3** [RLH TA 11-199](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1110G, Assessment No.118078 at 475 SAINT CLAIR AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [475 St Clair Ave. Hauler.DOC](#)
 [475 St Clair Ave.Statement to Council.8-3-11.pdf](#)

Approve the assessment.

475 St. Clair (9 apartment units)

Joyce Pforr, sister of owner, David Ripplinger and Jane Ripplinger, daughter of owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Trash Hauling Service for \$200 plus service charge of \$140 for a total of \$340
- dropped off 2 containers plus 1 week service
- Orders sent Apr 18 with compliance of Apr 22; re-checked on Apr 22
- dropped off containers Apr 27, 2011

Ms. Pforr:

- property purchased in 2008 by her brother
- have been no issues until 2010 when a lot of dumping began to occur
- problem tenants have been given notice (they moved in Aug 2010); other moved in Oct & Nov, 2010
- Renters' Warehouse approved those tenants (screen and recommend tenants)
- drug task force is involved
- another tenant will be moving out the end of Sep, 2011
- are working with the neighborhood watch
- her brother, David, is an independent contractor and has been unemployed most of 2009; just started working 2010 in Chicago
- he comes once every 2 weeks; has a bookkeeper who was receiving these Notices but just filing them away
- he has spoken to her and Jane about the problems with the apartments and the bookkeeper
- currently, 2010 taxes are not paid nor are any of the 2011 taxes
- suffering a financial hardship but slowly digging out with David working
- she and Jane go to apartments to clean up once a week
- has a painter hired to paint outside trim, etc.
- are not denying these complaints
- just asking for leniency
- will be doing some planting and are working hard to improve things
- have the garbage situation under control; have 4 containers
- Renters' Warehouse will be replaced

Ms. Moermond:

- viewed video showing clean-up
- notification was sent to the proper parties although the bookkeeper put Notices into a file
- daughter sent Notice to Renters' Warehouse (faxed over twice) who said they'd take care of it
- the City did the clean-up; the charges are legitimate
- will recommend the City Council approve this assessment

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/3/2011

Laid Over Items, CPH 8/17

- 4 [RLH AR 11-42](#) Ratifying Collection of Vacant Building Fees from February 2011 at 331 AURORA AVENUE (File No. VB1108A, Assessment No. 118089). (Public hearing continued from June 1, 2011)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 5 [RLH TA 11-62](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1108, Assessment No. 118050 at 331 AURORA AVENUE. (Public hearing continued from June 1)

Sponsors: Carter III

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 6 [RLH AR 11-44](#) Ratifying Collection of Vacant Building fees from February 2011 at 559 MCKNIGHT ROAD SOUTH. (File No. VB1108C, Assessment No. 118091) <Layover from 06/01/2011>

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 559 McKnight Road S (single family)

Leonard Anderson, owner; attorney; Morris Hammons, friend; Carol Berg, friend; Troy Lind, friend; appeared

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- Vacant Building fee of \$1,100 plus a service charge of \$135 for a total of \$1,235
- VB file opened Dec 13, 2010 as a Category 2
- 2-story split level single family home vacant and secured by normal means

Inspector Smith's notes:

- per Xcel Energy: no gas, no electric usage in over a year
- minimal water usage over the past 3 months per St. Paul Regional Water
- neighbors have informed me that the property owner has not lived at the property for several years
- interior of the house is very cluttered; has a collapsed ceiling on the west side of the main floor and the refrigerator is open
- exterior of the building is unpainted wood surface, deteriorated soffits and fascia, deteriorated water damaged wood on the deck
- multiple code deficiencies per Cat 2 status
- Jan 4, 2011 - Mr. Anderson failed to appear at LH today; questions validity of categorizing his property as a Cat 2 VB; due to this inaction, his appeal was denied by the Hearing Officer and his property is now a Cat 2 Registered VB
- Mr. Yannarely thinks that this discussion is saying that Mr. Anderson has been living in a Cat 2 VB for the last 6 months

Ms. Moermond:

- this appeal was originally filed and there was a request to lay it over based on pending litigation with the City
- City Council has referred this back to LH

Attorney:

- we are looking for a declaration that this is not an unoccupied building

- Mr. Anderson will testify that he's lived there, continues to live there, receives mail there, pays water bills there, etc.
- a number of witnesses will testify that they've visited Mr. Anderson there
- entered photographs of the interior of the building clearly indicating that it's occupied
- entered a signed petition with 30 names on it indicating that the neighbors clearly think it's an occupied building; not vacant

Ms. Moermond:

- scanned photos and signed petition

Morris Hammons:

- have been over to Lenny's house at 559 McKnight Rd a number of times; helped him work on things back of his house
- has been in his house socially, sat on his couch and back deck; was over there last night talked about some beans
- has been there a lot over over the past 2-3 years; has known him for longer than that
- bought the barrels that he kept the sand in from him (he supplies barrels for MN State Fair)
- they confer on many things
- identified a photo taken last night of him, his girl friend, Troy Lind and his girl friend, his son, Matthew, sitting in Lenny's house with the lights on sitting on the big chair and sofa

Carol Berg:

- lives on Avon Drive in Woodbury
- has been acquainted with Lenny for 25 years
- has visited him at 559 McKnight Rd many times over the past 25 years
- Lenny has occupied the house at 559 McKnight Rd
- has stayed overnight there numerous times
- has used the bathroom; taken a bath there; cooked dinner there; washed dishes there; cleaned the yard; planted flowers; done everything there for 25 yrs
- identified a photo of her standing on the stairs that goes upstairs to the bedroom at 559 McKnight Rd S (taken in the last couple of weeks)
- identified another photo of her with flowers planted next to driveway and back yard (has been that way for a long time) and her yard is restricted at her townhouse in Woodbury; she tends those flowers almost every day
- we're a committed couple; we go back and forth; we spend time at both places
- last fall the property was abated; their snow plow was taken by the City along with the salt/sand for the driveway so, they had to hire someone this year to plow the driveway; they're on limited means: Leonard's on Social Security so, they couldn't plow the driveway every time the snow fell; it's the City's fault that their driveway wasn't plowed every time it snowed; they had a Court Order approving the snow plow which was sitting on the property and now, it's gone (lots of extenuating circumstances in this matter)
- identified a photo of her taken Nov 19, 2010 with her vehicle parked at 559 McKnight Rd
- identified a photo taken Dec 15, 2010 at 559 McKnight Rd when they had to hire someone to plow the driveway
- the house has a wood stove that is used in the winter (the area is small and the stove heats very well); both use bottled water to drink

Troy Lind:

- visited Mr. Anderson at his house at 559 McKnight Rd yesterday; was on the deck
- there's no rotting boards on the deck
- the house looks very lived in

- didn't see any sagging ceilings or water damage or anything like that
- saw the small wood stove can heat the small house adequately

Mr. Anderson:

- entered a letter - they tried to make an appointment with Ms. Seeley
- lives at 559 S McKnight Rd and has lived there since 1978
- lived there in Dec 2010, as well
- has never abandoned the premises
- 1995 - he was in the hospital for about 10 days in cardiac intensive care at Regions Hospital
- occasionally, he'll go visit his aunt for a few days
- in 1995, a former inspector Charles Boutell made some of the same comments about the property, specifically that he saw rotten concrete and rotten windows
- he has Andersen Windows, which have a lifetime guarantee; exterior of the house is cedar natural finish, which is impervious to decay and has a minimum life expectancy of about 50 yrs; it's rustic
- he called Andersen Windows telling them that someone was slandering Andersen Windows (they said they would refute what the City is saying about the windows)
- he hired an independent architect, Mr. Waltersdork, who came out along with Mr. Ken King, who brought a video camera (other witnesses were there, also)
- they asked Mr. Boutell to walk around the house and show where the rotten windows were and the rotten concrete (Mr. Boutell said, "Well, maybe I'm at the wrong address. Well, maybe I made a mistake. Maybe, I got the property mixed up with another property.")
- Mr. Anderson was a contractor for the better part of his life and knows construction inside out
- he has owned the property at 559 S McKnight Rd and the tax records will clearly show that the City sent the wrong tax bill to his address
- his property is 2.3 acres; the City has the tax records for 555 S McKnight Rd mixed up with his records
- when the smoke cleared from Mr. Boutell's false statements, he ended up without a job because he also made other false statements
- these matters went to Judge Louise Bjorkman
- he has an Order signed by Judge Bjorkman, also signed by Larry Zangs in Zoning
- he sent letters to 10 law firms in Saint Paul to get legal representation; letters of decline came back because of conflict of interest (the City had used these law firms to take care of their own legal matters)
- he packaged up these letters of decline and sent them to Judge Bjorkman, who said that he had done a diligent search to get legal representation and under these circumstances, she would provide him with a free attorney at the City's expense. That attorney's opening statement with Judge Bjorkman was, "How much time do you want to spend beating up this sick old man?" She said, "No more time." The attorney made the motion to dismiss the matter and Judge Bjorkman did dismiss the matter. She added that if he pay a \$25 fine, she would sign an Order to protect him from further harassment by the City. On that Order (entered and scanned), it says that he can have 3 boats, a snow plow, fire wood, an RV, a trailer on an approved site, approved by Larry Zangs in Zoning. The City came out and forgot about the protection he had received. Judge Bjorkman had dismissed all of the City's false, bogus claims against him, entirely. Now, the City is starting the same harassment. He filed a letter Nov 19, to DSI about the problems he was having - being harassed by City inspectors - they had been on his property 33 times. The City never responded to his complaint about the conduct of their inspectors. They further harassed him because he had 3 bldg permits issued to him for a storage bldg on the back of his property. When he called for an inspection, he was told by Mr. Nelson that he had been instructed by his superiors to not do a final inspection at Mr. Anderson's property.

- wonders how he can get anything done when the City refuses to inspect his property for an accessory bldg
- re-applied for a bldg permit because the first one had expired
- the City told him that he needed to have his plans signed by a registered engineer
- he came down to the City with his plans signed by 2 registered engineers
- those plans have been in the City dept since Nov 19, 2010 and he never got an answer about the bldg permit
- claims that the City is making about his property are 110% false
- according to fine print in the code, if you have a Vacant Building, you can't get a bldg permit (this is retaliation)

Ms. Moermond:

- will review materials entered today
- will determine a recommendation by the end of business tomorrow, Aug 3, 2011

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 7 [RLH TA 11-60](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1108, Assessment No. 118050 at 559 MCKNIGHT ROAD SOUTH. (To be referred back to Legislative Hearing on June 21, 2011 and City Council Public Hearing on October 5, 2011)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [559 McKnight Rd S.Petition.12-21-10.pdf](#)
[559 McKnight Rd S.Exhibit 2.8-3-11.pdf](#)
[559 McKnight Rd S.Exhibit 3.8-3-11.pdf](#)
[559 McKnight Rd S.Exhibit 4.8-3-11.pdf](#)
[559 McKnight Rd S.Exhibit 5.8-3-11.pdf](#)
[559 McKnight Rd S.Exhibit 6.8-3-11.pdf](#)
[559 McKnight Rd S.Anderson Ltr.11-22-10.pdf](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 559 McKnight Road S (single family)

Leonard Anderson, owner; attorney; Morris Hammons, friend; Carol Berg, friend; Troy Lind, friend; appeared

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- Vacant Building fee of \$1,100 plus a service charge of \$135 for a total of \$1,235
- VB file opened Dec 13, 2010 as a Category 2
- 2-story split level single family home vacant and secured by normal means

Inspector Smith's notes:

- per Xcel Energy: no gas, no electric usage in over a year
- minimal water usage over the past 3 months per St. Paul Regional Water
- neighbors have informed me that the property owner has not lived at the property for several years
- interior of the house is very cluttered; has a collapsed ceiling on the west side of the main floor and the refrigerator is open
- exterior of the building is unpainted wood surface, deteriorated soffits and fascia, deteriorated water damaged wood on the deck
- multiple code deficiencies per Cat 2 status
- Jan 4, 2011 - Mr. Anderson failed to appear at LH today; questions validity of categorizing his property as a Cat 2 VB; due to this inaction, his appeal was denied by the Hearing Officer and his property is now a Cat 2 Registered VB

- Mr. Yannarely thinks that this discussion is saying that Mr. Anderson has been living in a Cat 2 VB for the last 6 months

Ms. Moermond:

- this appeal was originally filed and there was a request to lay it over based on pending litigation with the City
- City Council has referred this back to LH

Attorney:

- we are looking for a declaration that this is not an unoccupied building
- Mr. Anderson will testify that he's lived there, continues to live there, receives mail there, pays water bills there, etc.
- a number of witnesses will testify that they've visited Mr. Anderson there
- entered photographs of the interior of the building clearly indicating that it's occupied
- entered a signed petition with 30 names on it indicating that the neighbors clearly think it's an occupied building; not vacant

Ms. Moermond:

- scanned photos and signed petition

Morris Hammons:

- have been over to Lenny's house at 559 McKnight Rd a number of times; helped him work on things back of his house
- has been in his house socially, sat on his couch and back deck; was over there last night talked about some beans
- has been there a lot over over the past 2-3 years; has known him for longer than that
- bought the barrels that he kept the sand in from him (he supplies barrels for MN State Fair)
- they confer on many things
- identified a photo taken last night of him, his girl friend, Troy Lind and his girl friend, his son, Matthew, sitting in Lenny's house with the lights on sitting on the big chair and sofa

Carol Berg:

- lives on Avon Drive in Woodbury
- has been acquainted with Lenny for 25 years
- has visited him at 559 McKnight Rd many times over the past 25 years
- Lenny has occupied the house at 559 McKnight Rd
- has stayed overnight there numerous times
- has used the bathroom; taken a bath there; cooked dinner there; washed dishes there; cleaned the yard; planted flowers; done everything there for 25 yrs
- identified a photo of her standing on the stairs that goes upstairs to the bedroom at 559 McKnight Rd S (taken in the last couple of weeks)
- identified another photo of her with flowers planted next to driveway and back yard (has been that way for a long time) and her yard is restricted at her townhouse in Woodbury; she tends those flowers almost every day
- we're a committed couple; we go back and forth; we spend time at both places
- last fall the property was abated; their snow plow was taken by the City along with the salt/sand for the driveway so, they had to hire someone this year to plow the driveway; they're on limited means: Leonard's on Social Security so, they couldn't plow the driveway every time the snow fell; it's the City's fault that their driveway wasn't plowed every time it snowed; they had a Court Order approving the snow plow which was sitting on the property and now, it's gone (lots of extenuating circumstances in this matter)
- identified a photo of her taken Nov 19, 2010 with her vehicle parked at 559

McKnight Rd

- identified a photo taken Dec 15, 2010 at 559 McKnight Rd when they had to hire someone to plow the driveway
- the house has a wood stove that is used in the winter (the area is small and the stove heats very well); both use bottled water to drink

Troy Lind:

- visited Mr. Anderson at his house at 559 McKnight Rd yesterday; was on the deck
- there's no rotting boards on the deck
- the house looks very lived in
- didn't see any sagging ceilings or water damage or anything like that
- saw the small wood stove can heat the small house adequately

Mr. Anderson:

- entered a letter - they tried to make an appointment with Ms. Seeley
- lives at 559 S McKnight Rd and has lived there since 1978
- lived there in Dec 2010, as well
- has never abandoned the premises
- 1995 - he was in the hospital for about 10 days in cardiac intensive care at Regions Hospital
- occasionally, he'll go visit his aunt for a few days
- in 1995, a former inspector Charles Boutell made some of the same comments about the property, specifically that he saw rotten concrete and rotten windows
- he has Andersen Windows, which have a lifetime guarantee; exterior of the house is cedar natural finish, which is impervious to decay and has a minimum life expectancy of about 50 yrs; it's rustic
- he called Andersen Windows telling them that someone was slandering Andersen Windows (they said they would refute what the City is saying about the windows)
- he hired an independent architect, Mr. Waltersdork, who came out along with Mr. Ken King, who brought a video camera (other witnesses were there, also)
- they asked Mr. Boutell to walk around the house and show where the rotten windows were and the rotten concrete (Mr. Boutell said, "Well, maybe I'm at the wrong address. Well, maybe I made a mistake. Maybe, I got the property mixed up with another property.")
- Mr. Anderson was a contractor for the better part of his life and knows construction inside out
- he has owned the property at 559 S McKnight Rd and the tax records will clearly show that the City sent the wrong tax bill to his address
- his property is 2.3 acres; the City has the tax records for 555 S McKnight Rd mixed up with his records
- when the smoke cleared from Mr. Boutell's false statements, he ended up without a job because he also made other false statements
- these matters went to Judge Louise Bjorkman
- he has an Order signed by Judge Bjorkman, also signed by Larry Zangs in Zoning
- he sent letters to 10 law firms in Saint Paul to get legal representation; letters of decline came back because of conflict of interest (the City had used these law firms to take care of their own legal matters)
- he packaged up these letters of decline and sent them to Judge Bjorkman, who said that he had done a diligent search to get legal representation and under these circumstances, she would provide him with a free attorney at the City's expense. That attorney's opening statement with Judge Bjorkman was, "How much time do you want to spend beating up this sick old man?" She said, "No more time." The attorney made the motion to dismiss the matter and Judge Bjorkman did dismiss the matter. She added that if he pay a \$25 fine, she would sign an Order to protect him from further harassment by the City. On that Order (entered and scanned), it says that he can have 3 boats, a snow plow, fire wood, an RV, a trailer on an approved

site, approved by Larry Zangs in Zoning. The City came out and forgot about the protection he had received. Judge Bjorkman had dismissed all of the City's false, bogus claims against him, entirely. Now, the City is starting the same harassment. He filed a letter Nov 19, to DSI about the problems he was having - being harassed by City inspectors - they had been on his property 33 times. The City never responded to his complaint about the conduct of their inspectors. They further harassed him because he had 3 bldg permits issued to him for a storage bldg on the back of his property. When he called for an inspection, he was told by Mr. Nelson that he had been instructed by his superiors to not do a final inspection at Mr. Anderson's property.

- wonders how he can get anything done when the City refuses to inspect his property for an accessory bldg
- re-applied for a bldg permit because the first one had expired
- the City told him that he needed to have his plans signed by a registered engineer
- he came down to the City with his plans signed by 2 registered engineers
- those plans have been in the City dept since Nov 19, 2010 and he never got an answer about the bldg permit
- claims that the City is making about his property are 110% false
- according to fine print in the code, if you have a Vacant Building, you can't get a bldg permit (this is retaliation)

Ms. Moermond:

- will review materials entered today
- will determine a recommendation by the end of business tomorrow, Aug 3, 2011

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 8 [RLH AR 11-58](#) Ratifying Property Clean Up service on February 03 & 14, 2011 at 672 MAGNOLIA AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1111A1, Assessment No. 118108) [Laid over from July 06, 2011 for separate consideration to Legislative Hearing August 02, 2011 and City Council Public Hearing August 17, 2011]

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 9 [RLH AR 11-60](#) Ratifying Excessive Inspection service billed February 09, 2011 at 326 ONEIDA STREET. (File No. J1107E1, Assessment No. 118115) [Laid over from July 06, 2011 for separate consideration to Legislative Hearing August 02, 2011 and City Council Public Hearing August 17, 2011]

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: Assessment Roll

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/16/2011

- 10 [RLH TA 11-228](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1107E, Assessment No. 118115 at 326 ONEIDA STREET.

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: 326 Oneida St.EC Ltr.2-10-11.pdf
326 Oneida St.Snow Letter 2-2-11.pdf
326 Oneida St.Work Order 2-8-11.pdf

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/16/2011

- 11 [RLH AR 11-49](#) Ratifying Demolition services during April 2011 at 557 ELFELT STREET.
(File No. J1112C, Assessment No. 118071)

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

J1110B, CPH 8/17

- 12 [RLH AR 11-81](#) Ratifying Boarding and Securing Services in April 2011 (File No. J1110B,
Assessment No. 118085)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 13 [RLH TA 11-246](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.
J1110B, Assessment No. 118085 at 920 FOREST STREET.

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [920 Forest.J1110B.pdf](#)
[920 Forest.Respo 4-22-11.pdf](#)
[920 Forest St.Invoice](#)

Approve the assessment.

RE: 920 Forest St (single family)

Yong Yia Vue, property manager, appeared.

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- boarding took place Apr 22, 2011 at a cost of \$161.95 total (\$21.95 to board- rest fee)

- Apr 14, 2011, Inspector Nelmark inspected the vacant property

- issued a Summary Abatement on a broken window on side door; compliance date Apr 21, 2011

- sent to Yong Yia Vue, 957 Reaney Ave and A Home 4U, 4467 Fawn Ridge Trail, Eagan; and Occupant

- Apr 21, 2011 - re-checked and found noncompliant; a Work Order was issued on the side door

Mr. Vue:

- property had been vacant for a long time
- they bought it from a local realtor
- received the letter to correct but it was the last day of the Notice to take care of it
- next morning, he called inspector and asked him for an extension so he could take care of it
- inspector said he would extend it if he would get there before the work crew that day
- went to the property after conversation with inspector and looked around all over and he didn't see anything done to it.
- just saw the single broken window on door had been boarded

Ms. Moermond:

- notice was originally mailed on a Thu, Apr 14, 2011
- the work was supposed to have been done the following Thu, Apr 21, 2011
- bldg was found open to entry
- appellant was sent Notice and had 7 days to comply
- will recommend approval of the assessment

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 14 [RLH TA 11-234](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1110B, Assessment No. 118085 at 702 PREBLE STREET.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/16/2011

- 15 [RLH TA 11-230](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1110B, Assessment No. 118085 at 929 WILSON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Delete the assessment. New owner did not receive notice.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

J1113P, CPH 8/17

- 16 [RLH AR 11-54](#) Ratifying Graffiti Removal Services from April 28 to May 24, 2011 (File No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 17 [RLH TA 11-208](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 275 BATES AVENUE. (To be laid over to October 5, 2011 public hearing.)

Sponsors: Lantry

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 18 [RLH TA 11-207](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 279 BATES AVENUE. (To be laid over to October 5, 2011 public hearing.)

Sponsors: Lantry

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 19 [RLH TA 11-214](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 393 DUNLAP STREET NORTH.

Sponsors: Carter III

Delete the assessment. Wrong address, abatement done at 410 Griggs Street North.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 20 [RLH TA 11-213](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 280 FORBES AVENUE. (To be laid over to October 5, 2011 public hearing.)

Sponsors: Thune

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 21 [RLH TA 11-212](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 477 LAUREL AVENUE, UNIT E5.

Sponsors: Carter III

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 22 [RLH TA 11-211](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 477 LAUREL AVENUE, UNIT E1. (To be laid over to October 5, 2011 public hearing.)

Sponsors: Carter III

Delete the assessment. Waiver received.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 23 [RLH TA 11-239](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 477 LAUREL AVENUE, UNIT E3.
Sponsors: Carter III
Delete the assessment. Waiver received.
Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011
- 24 [RLH TA 11-219](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 774 SELBY AVENUE.
Sponsors: Carter III
Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.
Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011
- 25 [RLH TA 11-264](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1113P, Assessment No. 118088 at 1161 SELBY AVENUE.
Sponsors: Carter III
Delete the assessment as a waiver is on file.
Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

J1114A, CPH 8/17

- 26 [RLH AR 11-79](#) Ratifying Property Cleanup Services from May 02 to May 31, 2011 (File No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086)
Sponsors: Lantry
Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)
Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011
- 27 [RLH TA 11-205](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1980 ASHLAND AVENUE.
Sponsors: Stark
Attachments: [1980 Ashland Ave. Sa.DOC](#)
 [1980 Ashland Ave.Photos.5-5-11.pdf](#)
 [1980 Ashland St.Property Owner Ltr 7-27-11.pdf](#)
No one appeared. Approve the assessment.
Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011
- 28 [RLH TA 11-191](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 687 BLAIR AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: [687 Blair Ave. photo.DOC](#)
[687 Blair Ave. SA.DOC](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 687 Blair Ave

Lee Thao and Mai Vang, owners, appeared. (Mai Vang interpreted)

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- *Summary Abatement for failure to maintain exterior property*
- *inspector's notes: including a box spring by garage, metal cans, scrap wood, misc. refuse in rear yard*
- *Orders issued Apr 19, 2011; compliance date Apr 28; re-checked May 2, 2011*
- *work done May 2, 2011 for a cost of \$298 plus service charge of \$140 for a total \$438*
- *Orders sent to Lee Thao / Mai Vang, 687 Blair Ave*
- *no returned mail; no history on the property*

Ms. Vang and Mr. Thao:

- *never received Notice*
- *owned property since 1995*
- *not aware of box spring near garage*
- *garage blocked that trash from the house (they hadn't gone around to see that it was there)*
- *don't know who might have put that trash there*
- *their children interpret letters for them*

Ms. Moermond:

- *showed appellants the photographs*
- *will recommend deletion of this assessment*
- *appellants were unable to see the box spring, etc., from the house and there may have been some language difficulties*

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 29 [RLH TA 11-229](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 703 CASE AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [703 Case Ave. SA.DOC](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 30 [RLH TA 11-195](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1336 DAYTON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: [1336 Dayton Ave TGW letter 5.19.11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 31 [RLH TA 11-193](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 2106 DAYTON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Attachments: [2106 Dayton Ave. Sa.DOC](#)
 [2106 Dayton Ave.Photos 5-5-11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 32 [RLH TA 11-192](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1092 EDGERTON STREET.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [1092 Edgerton St.Summary Abatement.DOC](#)

Rescheduled.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/16/2011

- 33 [RLH TA 11-188](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 717 FRY STREET/1642 MINNEHAHA AVE WEST.

Sponsors: Stark

Attachments: [1642 Minnehaha Ave W.Summary Abatement.4-20-11](#)
 [1642 Minnehaha Ave W.Photos 5-3-11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 34 [RLH TA 11-218](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1848 and 1850 HYACINTH AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [1848 Hyacinth Ave E. SA.DOC](#)
 [1850 Hyacinth Ave E.Garbage Bill Reciept.7-29-11.pdf](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 1848 / 1850 Hyacinth Ave E (duplex)

Kira Johnson, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement for failure to maintain exterior property
- Orders mailed May 4, 2011; compliance date May 10; re-checked May 10, 2011
- work done May 12, 2011 for a cost \$316 plus a service charge of \$140 for a total of \$456
- Orders sent to Kira Johnson, 11133 97th Pl N, Maple Grove; Occupant; and Kira Johnson, 855 Hague Ave, St. Paul
- mail was returned for 855 Hague Ave on May 12, 2011
- City cleaned the property on Jul 1, 2011 - assessment forthcoming
- inspector Mitch's notes: garbage and rubbish; trash container overflowing; trash on the ground; clean all areas around container and all trash blowing into the alley
- currently, there are 2 assessments for \$890 pending (another assessment coming for \$438, according to Inspector Essling)
- SA issued Jul 1 (compliance Jul 12) sent to Hague and Maple Grove addresses (underlined: household items in back by alley; rubbish)
- WO issued Jul 14 and work was done for that (box spring; tire; boxes around the garage)

Ms. Johnson:

- entered documents
- has a neighbor who constantly calls on her property since she has been owner
- has been in contact with the inspector on a regular basis and given him her cell phone number for when these issues come up
- received Notice and contacted Mr. Reardon to let him know that she received Notice but that the trash had been suspended because she had overlooked a bill in Apr 2011 and she was re-instating it immediately (May 5, 2011) and they went out and cleared the trash - and hauling was resumed
- she contacted the tenants about the Order; she didn't go out there, personally
- she spoke with inspector who said that was fine
- there has been no other assessments on the property in the 4 years she has owned it (no other issues with the trash)
- the property has been sold; closing Aug 19, 2011
- she has trash pick-up at the property on Mondays this whole time
- has no recollection of receiving the Jul Notice (she hasn't seen anything since May, 2011)
- she thought she was here for only the May charge
- is unaware of the coming assessment of \$438 for work done Jul 14 (she has had trash service this whole time)

Ms. Moermond:

- viewed video (she saw overflowing containers)
- Ms. Johnson is not here on the Jul charge; only on the May
- looks as though there's inadequate garbage service for the property
- there should be additional barrels or additional pick-up days for this address
- will recommend this assessment be deleted
- it is likely that the garbage the Orders were originally issued on was abated and then you got the problem again and they abated that second problem

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

35 [RLH TA 11-237](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 253 IVY AVENUE WEST.

Sponsors: Helgen

Attachments: [253 Ivy Ave W, Summary abatement.5.3.11.DOC](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 253 Ivy Ave W (single family)

David Thornton, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement Orders issued May 3, 2011; compliance date May 9, 2011; re-checked May 13
- work done May 16, 2011 for a total of \$158 plus service charge of \$140 for a total \$298
- Order sent to David and Patricia Thornton, 253 Ivy Ave W
- remove a Christmas tree on the blvd
- no returned mail
- no history on the property

Mr. Thornton:

- a missionary family out of state when this occurred
- he received the notice after the work had already been done
- house sitter was paying utilities and making sure property was secure
- this friend didn't notify him about things that were a little irregular
- thought his trash hauler would take care of it but he didn't
- after the snow melted, the caretaker failed to notify him
- he forwarded the mail to them 3 weeks later
- asking for a pardon or leniency

Ms. Moermond:

- seems to be an honest mistake
- will recommend deletion
- owned the home for 13 years

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 36 [RLH TA 11-216](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 666 JESSAMINE AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [666 Jessamine Ave E. SA.DOC](#)
 [666 Jessamine Ave E. Photos.DOC](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 37 [RLH TA 11-197](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 358 MAGNOLIA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Helgen

Attachments: [358 Magnolia Ave E.SA.DOC](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 38 [RLH TA 11-236](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.

J1114A, Assessment No.118086 at 925 MAGNOLIA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/16/2011

- 39 [RLH TA 11-204](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1676 MARSHALL AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Attachments: [1676 Marshall Ave SA 4.21.11.DOC](#)
[1676 Marshall Ave.Photos.4-21-11.pdf](#)
[1676 Marshall Ave.Photos.5-2-11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 40 [RLH TA 11-206](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No.118086 at 2078 MOHAWK AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [2078 Mohawk Ave. grass letters.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 41 [RLH TA 11-202](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1263 RICE STREET.

Sponsors: Helgen

Attachments: [1263 Rice St. grass letters.pdf](#)

Approve the assessment.

RE: 1263 Rice St (duplex)

Michael Birrenbach, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- tall grass and weeds Order sent May 17, 2011; compliance date May 20; re-checked May 23, 2011*
- work done May 25, 2011 for a cost of \$160 plus a service charge of \$140 for a total \$300*
- letter sent to Michael Birrenbach, 1263 Rice St, St. Paul; Jeff Pauls, 1866 Chelton Ave W, St. Paul; Amber Brown, 1263 Rice St; and Occupant*
- no returned mail*
- grass was over 12" high and should never have reached that height*
- was a shoddy job*

Mr. Birrenbach:

- didn't receive Notice*

- the most shoddy grass cutting job he has ever seen
- entered photos
- City ran over trash and left it there; there are 14" weeds leftover; there are stripes left in the lawn where they just didn't mow; in the backyard, they walked around with a weed-whacker and waved it around and walked back out and they are charging \$300 for this
- it's absolutely absurd; the lawn looked worse after it was mowed than before
- the people who did this work should be fired or sued; no person should get paid for doing that kind of work
- he feels that the nuisance was not abated
- 2 of the owners lived in Singapore at that time (doesn't know whether they have received any letters)

Ms. Moermond:

- viewed video, which showed tall grass and weeds and a very poorly done job; the City is not incumbent to do a beautiful job
- viewed Mr. Birrenbach's photos
- suggested that he email those photos to her
- will recommend the Council approve this assessment
- can go to City Council Public Hearing Aug 17, 2011

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 42 [RLH TA 11-189](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1330 SEVENTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [1330 7th st E.grass letters.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 43 [RLH TA 11-215](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 1891 SEVENTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [1891 Seventh St E.Work Order.5-19-11.pdf](#)
 [1891 Seventh St E.Summary Abatement.5-13-11.pdf](#)
 [1891 Seventh St E.Photos.5-13-11.pdf](#)

Reduce the assessment from \$448 to \$348

RE: 1891 Seventh St E (apartments 10-19 units)

Robert King, Twin Empire Investments, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- *Summary Abatement Order issued May 13, 2011 with a compliance date of May 17; re-checked May 17, 2011*
- *work was done May 19, 2011 for a cost of \$308 plus a service charge of \$140 for a total \$448*
- *sent to Twin Empire Investments LLC, 3168 Berwick Knoll, Minneapolis*
- *no returned mail*
- *3 Excessive Consumptions are forthcoming*

- another Work Order coming for Jul 2, 2011 (work done Jul 8, 2011) for \$436
- 5 search warrants done

Mr. King:

- a tenant moved out and left a lot of furniture behind
- the landlord 2 doors down told him that if he called the City of Saint Paul, they would come out and pick it up
- in Minneapolis, the City does pick up
- he has hired people in the past to pick up furniture that's left behind (\$50 - \$75)
- he called the City of Saint Paul and they said they would come to pick it up but there was no conversation about charging him a fee
- he was totally shocked when he received the bill
- also, a lot of dumping takes place there, especially from the guy behind the bldg and the apartment bldg next door
- these charges are out-of-line

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend that the Council reduce the assessment by \$100
- will be at the City Council Public Hearing Aug 17, 2011

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 44 [RLH TA 11-249](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 663 THIRD STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Rescheduled to August 16.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/17/2011

- 45 [RLH TA 11-235](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 875 THIRD STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 46 [RLH TA 11-232](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 2090 WELLESLEY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Harris

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 47 [RLH TA 11-196](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No. 118086 at 974 WOODBRIDGE STREET.

Sponsors: Helgen

Attachments: [974 Woodbridge St TGW letter 5.23.11.pdf](#)

Approve the assessment.

RE: 974 Woodbridge St (single family)

Yee Vang, owner, appeared with her daughter. (Mai Vang interpreted)

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- tall grass and weeds letter went out May 23, 2011; compliance date May 26; re-checked May 26, 2011
- work done May 26, 2011 for a cost of \$174 plus a service charge of \$160 for a total \$314
- Orders sent to Yee Vang, 1108 Wilson Ave; Occupant
- City had billed them in Oct 2010 (grass)

Ms. Vang:

- said that she paid \$314 Feb or Mar, 2011
- she had not been living there then and isn't living there now
- property is still under her and her husband's name
- wasn't aware that she still needs to maintain the property

daughter:

- left a message (couldn't get a hold of the inspector) that her mom no longer lived at this address
- this house is in foreclosure
- she moved when they were informed of the sheriff's sale, which took place Jul 15, 2010

Ms. Moermond:

- Ms. Vang won't be paying taxes on this place in the future
- this assessment will be put on the property taxes and go with the property (new owner)
- Ms. Vang will not get the bill if she doesn't redeem the mortgage
- will recommend approval of the assessment

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 48 [RLH TA 11-233](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1114A, Assessment No.118086 at 1209 WOODBRIDGE STREET

Sponsors: Helgen

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

J1111G, CPH 8/17

- 49 [RLH AR 11-80](#) Ratifying Trash Hauling Services from May 04 to May 25, 2011 (File No. J1111G, Assessment No. 118087)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

50 [RLH TA 11-200](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1111G, Assessment No. 118087 at 475 SAINT CLAIR AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [475 St Clair Ave.Hauler.DOC](#)
[475 St. Clair Ave.Pforr Letter.8-17-11.pdf](#)

Approve the assessment.

RE: 475 St. Clair (9 apartments)

Joyce Pforr, sister of owner, David Ripplinger and Jane Ripplinger, daughter of owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Trash Hauling Service for \$400 plus service charge of \$25 for a total of \$425
- provided for weeks beginning: May 4; May 11; May 18; and May 25, 2011
- 8 more weeks of trash removal forthcoming

Ms. Pforr:

- property purchased in 2008 by her brother
- have been no issues until 2010 when a lot of dumping began to occur
- problem tenants have been given notice (they moved in Aug 2010); others moved in Oct & Nov, 2010
- Renters' Warehouse approved those tenants (screened and recommended tenants)
- drug task force in involved
- another tenant will be moving out the end of Sep, 2011
- are working with the neighborhood watch
- her brother, David, is an independent contractor and has been unemployed most of 2009; just started working 2010 in Chicago
- he comes one every 2 weeks; has a bookkeeper who was receiving these Notices but just filing them away
- he has spoken to her and Jane about the problems with the apartments and the bookkeeper
- currently, 2010 taxes are not paid nor are any of the 2011 taxes
- suffering a financial hardship but slowly digging out with David working
- she and Jane go to apartments to clean up once a week
- has a painter hired to paint outside trim, etc.
- are not denying these complaints; just asking for leniency
- will be doing some planting and are working hard to improve things
- have the garbage situation under control; have 4 containers
- Renters' Warehouse will be replaced

Ms. Moermond:

- viewed video showing clean-up
- notification was sent to the proper parties although the bookkeeper put Notices into a file
- daughter sent Notice to Renters' Warehouse (faxed over twice) who said they'd take care of it
- the City did the clean-up; the charges are legitimate
- will recommend the City Council approve this assessment

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

51 [RLH TA 11-201](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.

J1111G, Assessment No. 118087 at 612 COOK AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [612 cook ave e. hauler.DOC](#)
[612 Cook.Appeal Attachment.8-2-11.pdf](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 612 Cook Ave E (Single family)

Eugene Copeland, Liberty Resources Corp, appeared.

Mr. Copeland:

- submitted documents to scan

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- failure to provide trash service*
- Orders for trash hauler service were sent Apr 21, 2011 to obtain trash service; compliance date Apr 26, 2011; re-checked Apr 26, 2011*
- a trash container was put out at a cost of \$250 (start-up fee and 4 wks service) plus a service charge of \$140 for a total \$390*
- Orders sent to Liberty Resources Corp, 612 Cook Ave E, St. Paul; Occupant; and Eugene Copeland at 612 Cook Ave E*
- no returned mail*
- open file on-going there*
- approximately 8 more weeks of trash hauling service assessments*

Mr. Copeland:

- documents entered indicate his understanding that there was no need for an assessment because there was no violation of City code*
- has in place over a number of years, an agreement with his neighbor to the east at 616 Cook for shared trash service*
- he does put his trash into her container*
- complaints were that he did not have trash service because there was no visible trash container on his property*
- has lived at this property since 1992 and has not ever had a code violation*
- has tried to explain this to the City (they didn't know about "shared trash service")*
- contacted Ann Hunt, Mayor's Office, who verified that he could have a shared service according to City policy (she met with DSI)*
- took 11 weeks to get final correspondence from the City (Jul 12, 2011)*
- last Fri, the container was picked-up*
- additionally, no one ever asked him whether or not he had service*
- a comment on the City's site said that he had garbage next to his garage (he doesn't even have a garage)*
- there was never any garbage to pick up all this time*
- there was no need for any of this*
- the system wasn't listening at all and had already decided that he had missed a deadline*
- Eureka promotes shared service on it's website*
- this assessment should be deleted*

Ms. Moermond:

- asked for copies of inspector's emails*
- will recommend deletion of this assessment and all subsequent assessments related to this*
- Mr. Copeland made a good faith effort to address the situation*

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

J1103V, CPH 8/17

- 52 [RLH AR 11-52](#) Ratifying Towing of Abandoned Vehicle services in February and March 2011(File No. J1103V, Assessment No. 118081)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 53 [RLH TA 11-217](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1103V, Assessment No. 118081 at 1028 AURORA AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: [1028 Aurora Ave. Police work order.DOC](#)
 [1028 Aurora Ave. vehicle abatement.DOC](#)
 [1028 Aurora Ave.Photos.3-14-11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

CRT1106, CPH 8/17

- 54 [RLH AR 11-50](#) Ratifying Collection of Certificate of Occupancy Fees from April 2011 (File No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076)

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [Assessment Roll](#)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 55 [RLH TA 11-270](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 470 EDMUND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: [470 Edmund Ave.First Invoice.pdf](#)
 [470 Edmund Ave.Final Notice.pdf](#)

Reduce the assessment from \$535 to \$300

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 56 [RLH TA 11-268](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.

CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 1666 JESSAMINE AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [1666 Jessamine Ave E.CRT1106.pdf](#)

Recommend for deletion, bills sent to prior owner.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 57 [RLH TA 11-269](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 1283 LAUREL AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: [1283 Laurel Ave.CRT1106.pdf](#)

Delete the assessment because Fire Certificate of Occupancy was done early.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 58 [RLH TA 11-227](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 1244 MATILDA STREET.

Sponsors: Helgen

Attachments: [1244 Matilda St.First Notice.pdf](#)
[1244 Matilda St.Final Notice.pdf](#)

Reduce the assessment from \$390 to \$200

RE: 1244 Matilda St (single family)

Zhi Kai Yu, owner, appeared (had Chinese interpreter)

Fire Inspector Westenhofer:

- *Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection*
- *cost \$255 plus service charge of \$135 for a total of \$390*
- *Orders sent Dec 29, 2010; Jan 31, 2011; Feb 18, 2011 and Mar 8, 2011*
- *Invoices sent Mar 9, 201 and Apr 8, 2011*
- *mail was sent to Zhi Kai Yu, 699 Virginia St, St. Paul*
- *end result is that he does have a Fire Certificate of Occupancy*

Mr. Yu:

- *doesn't know what the fee is for*
- *doesn't know why the City didn't notify him*
- *has a friend take care of all his paperwork and letters sent to him and his properties;*
- Mr. Yu thought he had cleaned-up his property well - he didn't know that inspections took place inside the building*
- *has 2 rental properties; asked if those could be combined together in 1 file (was told that each property must remain separate)*
- *would like waiver or discount*

Ms. Moermond:

- *explained that the fee was approving this building as a rental property, which is higher than normal because there are also fees associated with no one showing up*

for inspection dates and for multiple re-inspections to get items corrected

- Mr. Yu was sent notification
- Mr. Yu will need to become aware of what is included in letters sent from the City; these letters did say that the bldg would be inspected inside
- will recommend that the assessment be reduced from \$390 to \$200
- will not look at decreasing further assessments
- Mr. Yu is completely responsible for making sure that notifications from the City are read and handled in a timely fashion

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

59 [RLH TA 11-223](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 633 PALACE AVENUE

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [633 Palace Ave.Invoice.pdf](#)
 [633 Palace Ave.Final Invoice.pdf](#)
 [633 Palace Ave.Staeheli Ltr.8-17-11..pdf](#)

Approve the assessment.

RE: 633 Palace Ave (duplex)

Ron Staeheli, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector Westenhofer:

- duplex Fire Certificate of Occupancy cost \$256 plus service charge of \$135 for a total \$391
(one re-inspection fee of \$56)
- Orders sent Jul 24, 2009; Apr 4, 2010; Jun 24, 2010; Oct 22, 2010; Dec 2, 2010 Dec 23, 2010 and Jan 18, 2011
- Billing sent Feb 2, 2011; Mar 4, 2011
- sent to Ronald Staeheli, 4300 Blackhawk Rd, Eagan

Mr. Staeheli:

- the C of O fee is not assessable because it's a license fee and it's not in association with any particular maintenance code issue; it's assessed whether there's is or isn't a maintenance code issue
- 429 the law that allows for special assessments only allows for special assessment in association directly with a housing code violation
- the 2 re-inspections fees weren't re-inspections; they kept scheduling because he is aggressive in exercising his appeal rights
- entered the bill he received showing 2 re-inspections
- there were no re-inspections on the dates indicated; the inspector kept scheduling dates awaiting an answer from the City Council on his appeals

Ms. Moermond:

- the decision on the original appeal was decided before these re-inspections took place
- Mr. Staeheli had a later appeal on a 2nd inspection but this is about the previous cycle
- state law allows Certificate of Occupancy fees to be assessed and it does so explicitly
- will recommend that the Council approve this assessment
- see you at City Council Public Hearing Aug 17, 2011
- scanned the bill

Fire Inspector Shaff:

- searching the records for proof of re-inspections
- found dates: Jul 23, 2009; Jun 24, 2010; Dec 21, 2010; Dec 23, 2010; Jan 31, 2011

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 60 [RLH TA 11-225](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 560 RANDOLPH AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [560 Randolph Ave.First Invoice.pdf](#)
 [560 Randolph Ave.Final Invoice.pdf](#)

Reduce assessment from \$315.00 to \$180.00

RE: 560 Randolph Ave (light manufacturing)

James Walsh, owner, and Patrick Kelly, attorney, appeared.

Fire Certificate of Occupancy fee

Mr. Kelly:

- Mr. Walsh purchased property; he is owner and Chairman of the Board of The Finn Company, established in 1898, roofers
- trying to clear up a number of issues
- compliments to the Fire Inspectors
- the C of O fee of \$180 and a service charge of \$135
- they are getting Notices from the City of Saint Paul directed to The Finn Company at 626 Armstrong
- Mr. Walsh didn't receive a copy
- this was addressed to J. James Walsh, trustee / Rose M Walsh, trustee at 1895 Eagle Ridge Dr, Mendota Heights
- they have no objection to the fee
- asking to consider a waiver of the service charge
- prior owner was M and J (trying to clear up)
- Fire C of O contact should be The Finn Company, 626 Armstrong, Saint Paul 55102

Mr. Walsh:

- did not receive copies of the Notices until the final letter
- it was sent to the former owner

Inspector Westenhofer:

- Initial inspection letter was sent to M and J Companies, Bog Hagen, 6278 Otter Lake Rd, White Bear Lake (address from Fire C of O file)
- inspector approved the file with no corrections
- 1st invoice sent to M and J Company LLC, 6278 Otter Lake Rd, White Bear Lake Jan 31, 2011
- final bill sent Mar 2, 2011 to M and J Company LLC, 6278 Otter Lake Rd, White Bear Lake

Ms. Moermond:

- asked to see the tax letter sent to Mr. Walsh
- J. James Walsh, trustee / Rose M Walsh, trustee, 1895 Eagle Ridge Dr, Mendota Heights received the tax letter

- will recommend that the service charge of \$135 be deleted from the assessment and ask that Fire change the address for contact

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 61 [RLH TA 11-222](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1106, Assessment No. 118076 at 201 SNELLING AVENUE NORTH.

Sponsors: Stark

Attachments: [201 Snelling Ave N First.doc.pdf](#)
 [201 Snelling Ave N Final.doc.pdf](#)

Delete the assessment.

RE: 201 Snelling Ave N (commercial)

AL Nadimi, Snelling Auto Sales, appeared.

Fire Inspector Westenhofer:

- *Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection cost \$180 with a service charge \$135 for a total \$315*
- *Orders sent Dec 27, 2010*
- *Invoices sent Jan 24, 2011; Feb 23, 2011*
- *sent to responsible party at 201 Snelling Ave N, St. Paul*

Mr. Nadimi:

- *is not appealing the \$180*
- *the mail was not coming to him at 12910 54th Ave N, Plymouth MN*
- *mail was only going to the tenant at the property at 201 Snelling Ave*
- *sent in the payment and was told that they couldn't accept it because it was late*

Fire Inspector Shaff:

- *when the first bill goes out, you have 30 days to pay it*
- *when the second bill goes out, you have 15 days to pay it*
- *then, it's turned over to Real Estate*

Ms. Moermond:

- *asked that Fire add Mr. Nadimi's name to the list of responsible parties; tax payer should receive notice*
- *will recommend deletion*

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

- 62 [RLH VO 11-52](#) Appeal of Brenda Wright to a Condemnation and Order to Vacate at 295 STINSON STREET.

Sponsors: Helgen

Attachments: [295 Stinson.appeal.7-27-11.pdf](#)
[295 Stinson St.Photos.7-15-11.pdf](#)
[295 Stinson St.Photos.7-25-11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Deny the appeal. (Lisa Martin)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 63 [RLH VO 11-50](#) Appeal of Tamaye Ceannaideach to a Notice of Condemnation as Unfit for Human Habitation and Order to Vacate; Correction Order; and Summary Abatement Order at 718 WATSON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thune

Attachments: [718 Watson.appeal.7-26-11.pdf](#)
[718 Watson.Photos.7-25-11.pdf](#)

No one appeared. Deny the appeal. (Ed Smith)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Window Variances: Hearing Required

- 64 [RLH FOW 11-107](#) Appeal of Joe McKasy to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 2170 PALACE AVENUE.

Sponsors: Harris

Attachments: 2170 Palace.appeal.7-14-11.pdf

Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in the lower unit west and east bedrooms; grant a 3.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the upper unit west bedroom; and deny a variance on the egress window in the upper unit north bedroom and grant 90 days for compliance. The re-inspection date has been changed. Appellant needs to contact inspector for new date. (Inspector Rick Gavin)

RE: 1270 Palace Ave (duplex)

Joe McKasy, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection
- 4 bedrooms windows replaced without permits and not inspected: 1) 23h x 24w; 2) 23h x 23w; 3) 20.5h x 24w; 4) 15h x 24 w
- the 15h x 21w is concerning

Mr. McKasy:

- he is asking for a variance on all the windows
- windows are all new, replaced within the last 3-4 years by Gladstone; they passed inspection last year
- entered photos; will email them to Ms. Moermond

- there are no fire issues with the windows
- said he weighs 235 lbs and could get out of the 15h x 21w within 5 seconds
- usually the room with the smaller window is used as a baby's room and they take the door off on the inside anyway (within 4 feet of the entry door, there's another window which would meet code)

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend a variance on each window except the 15h x 21w and grant 90 days to come into compliance
- 2 concerns: 1) there's a shortfall of 9 inches in height and 21 inches is not a compensating width to address the shortfall in height; 2) she has never gone below 16 inches in recommending a variance
- the Council may consider it favorably (public hearing Sep 7, 2011)
- gave Mr. McKasy Christine Boulware's (HPC) number (for advice on how to maintain architectural integrity) #266-6715
- she will check with the building official on this window

Mr. Urmann:

- all egress window work needs to be done under permit by a licensed contractor

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

65 **RLH VO 11-42** Appeal of Aaron Durkop, on behalf of K.C. Rabobank, to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 604 HOLLY AVENUE

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: 604 Holly.appeal.7-7-11.pdf
 604 Holly Ave.Photos.6-15-11.pdf
 604 Holly Ave.Photos.4-7-11.pdf

Ms. Moermond recommended the following:

- re: parking lot - she will allow one more attempt at repair but only under permit by Sep 16, 2011). If the building inspector signs off under permit, it's good. If the inspector does not sign off on it, a full replacement will be required by Oct 31, 2011.
- re: stairs - she will allow repair or replacements of front and back stairs by a licensed mason under permit by Sep 16, 2011. If the building inspector doesn't sign off on it, a full replacement will be required by Oct 31, 2011.
- re: tuckpointing - condition of the foundation elements and the exterior walls is bad; they clearly need tuckpointing by Sep 16, 2011

RE: 604 Holly Ave (apartments, 9 units)

Aaron Durkop, appeared on behalf of K C Rabobank LLC

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- he was the inspector on this property; it's an on-going issue since the first set of Orders were sent under a referral in Jun 2010
- appellant attempted a repair to the front and back steps which he allowed them to do last fall (he said he would re-check it in spring
- many photos in the file from this spring's inspection
- 4 photos from the last inspection cycle shows that the existing repair is starting to fail again
- it should now, be a replacement, not a repair

- re: parking lot - it's asphalt with several defects; code requires it to be free from defects and areas that may hold water; photos show holes in the asphalt parking lot that retain stagnant water. Appellant tried to repair that, as well, using some cold mix and sealcoat (photos) - sealcoating around a vehicle. That is not a code compliant repair.

- Mr. Urmann cannot accept either repair job because of non compliance; and because of the length of time it has taken just to get them to do something, it became necessary to Revoke the Certificate of Occupancy

- mail was returned; Mr. Urmann emailed on Jul 5, 2011

Mr. Durkop:

- also has photos which he will email to Ms. Moermond

- not appealing the Work Orders, completely, just appealing the excessive Work Orders

- Mr. Urmann wants entire parking lot repaved and he won't accept any repairs (excessive)

- there are areas in the parking lot that are deficient; there are low spots; it is not completely even; was there today after the rain and there is only one little puddle (photos)

- the parking lot is one continuous piece of asphalt, no dirt lot

- asking that repairs are allowed; we could do more repairs

- the Sealcoating around a vehicle was because the tenant had been gone for a very long time

- Mr. Urmann wants the entire set of steps removed and replaced

- Mr. Urmann never indicated in his letters to us that an assessment was to be done by a licensed contractor; his comment to them was that it needed to be replaced, regardless

Mr. Urmann:

- he had allowed them to attempt repairs and they are woefully inadequate

- Sealcoat is not a code compliant fix

- he is not saying that he wants the steps totally removed; he wants a licensed mason to make the assessment of the stairs (whether to repair or to replace by that licensed mason under permit)

Ms. Moermond:

- viewed all photos

- re: parking lot - Ms. Moermond will allow one more attempt at repair but only under permit by Sep 16, 2011). If the building inspector signs off under permit, it's good. If the inspector does not sign off on it, a full replacement will be required by Oct 31, 2011.

- re: stairs - Ms. Moermond will allow repair or replacements of front and back stairs by a licensed mason under permit by Sep 16, 2011. If the building inspector doesn't sign off on it, a full replacement will be required by Oct 31, 2011.

- re: tuckpointing - condition of the foundation elements and the exterior walls is bad; they clearly need tuckpointing by Sep 16, 2011

- non-compliance could result in revoking the Certificate of Occupancy or a Criminal Citation

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

66 **RLH FCO**
11-236

Appeal of Jon Edstrom to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Approval With Corrections at 160 LEXINGTON PARKWAY NORTH.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: 160 Lexington.appeal.7-8-11.pdf

Deny the appeal and grant an extension for one year on the driveway. (Mitchell Imbertson)

RE: 160 Lexington Pkwy (duplex)

Jon Edstrom, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- exterior gravel area alongside of the bldg was required to be removed and ballards were to be installed so that vehicle protection was there for the gas meters (photos in file)*
- checked with Zoning and found that there was also an Order during Code Compliance for a Vacant Building that would also require this area to be removed but it never was so, the parking area visible in the photos is a non-compliant parking area*
- entered photos taken yesterday*

Mr. Edstrom:

- the Code Compliance inspection was done just over a year ago and everything was fine*
- would like to continue using it for the parking area because it is much safer for the tenants to be able to turn around and drive out moving forward onto Lexington rather than having to back out*
- there is bituminous under the surface and runs all the way to the building*
- he has put in protection for the gas meter*

Ms. Moermond:

- read email into record from Mary Montgomery in Zoning to Mitch Imbertson: "The owner came in Monday. He does need to pave the driveway because it was on the original Abatement Building Code Compliance Report. I gave him a plat copy so he could draw up the driveway plan and bring them back to me for approval. He wanted to know why it was approved before and now, it's not. I told him the gravel was there when it was a Vacant Building; the inspector simply missed that it had not been paved." A document was also attached to photos.*
- the driveway's in pretty bad shape*
- Zoning is asserting that the driveway should have been called in the first place; it's not a cheap thing to fix*
- do some patching on the existing driveway*
- will recommend a 1 year extension to get the driveway plan approved and installed*

Mr. Urmann:

- re: ballards - the mechanical code and Xcel require specific parking protection (posts have to be a certain size; they have to be sunk into the ground a certain depth; and they have to be filled with cement) - has to be done in an area of parking or within 10 feet of a parking area; this needs to be taken care of correctly, ASAP (could be a life safety issue even if the gas meter was merely tapped)*
- the code specifically says that if the gas meter is 10 feet away from an area that's used for parking or you couldn't drive there and the Class 5 is removed from there, the ballards would not be required, giving there would be curbing and a distinct separation between the driveway and where the gas meters are.*

Mr. Edstrom:

- asked why the ballard / gas meter issue hasn't been addressed by the City before if it's a life safety issue*
- is sure that the parking area is 10 feet away from the gas meters*

Ms. Moermond:

- looked for the Code Compliance Report done in 2008-09 but didn't find it
- is not thrilled with the railroad ties as a solution; need curbing of cement and be permanent
- there must be a significant separation between parking area and gas meters

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

67 **RLH FCO
11-269**

Appeal of James Baker to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 369 LAUREL AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: 369 Laurel.appeal.8-2-11.pdf
 369 Laurel.Photos.pdf

Deny the appeal on the egress windows in the garden level bedrooms; Appellant must install two-steps (7 inches in depth by 11 inches high) the full width of the windows to address the sill height issue. (Mitch Imbertson)

RE: 369 Laurel Ave (apartments 20-49 units)

James Baker, Lor West Apartments LP, appeared.

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- unit B2 - double hung 15h x 27w (sill height 60 inches)
- 20h x 43 w (limited by the storm)
- B3 - awning type 16 x 40 w (sill height 68 inches)
- no permanent steps under windows

Mr. Baker:

- are looking for a variance
- there were permanent steps screwed into the wall which the tenants removed (we put them back in)
- re: awning type window - Inspector Imbertson's concern was that there was not something that held the window open independent of a chain or a clip (we installed something to fix that)
- Christine Boulware (HPCC) came out to go tour the bldg with them - she did address some of the concerns about the storm windows - she had some concerns about removing the storms because they are part of the character of the bldg
- he took photos showing that there is not much wiggle room to change these windows; they are just above the foundation
- have gone back to lubricate the tracks
- the awning window needs to be replaced
- can go to the City Council Public Hearing Sep 7, 2011

Ms. Moermond:

- need to have a better photo with measuring tape
- if the windows can be opened up to 16 inches, it will go a long way (if they open up to 16 in, she will grant a variance)
- need to the steps present and permanently affixed (2 standard steps full width of the window)

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

- 68 [RLH FCO
11-261](#) Appeal of Mark Kneer and Dan Gelb on behalf of Quality Residences, LLC, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 983 MARYLAND AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Bostrom
- Attachments:** [983 Maryland.appeal.7-18-11.pdf](#)
- Ms. Moermond stated that the appeal form indicates the window measurements; however, the orders indicate one window will not open and the other is blocked. So, no variance can be recommended until inspector actually measures it.*
- On August 10, Ms. Vang spoke to Inspector Cassidy and he stated that the 2nd floor south bedroom window is abated and the east bedroom would not open. I asked that he get measurements. Laid over to August 16 to get measurements.*
- Referred to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/9/2011**
- 69 [RLH FCO
11-243](#) Appeal of Dave Chmiel, WIEL LLC, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1082 SIXTH STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Attachments:** 1082 Sixth Street E.Appeal.7-13-11
- Deny the appeal on the basement, bedroom and tv room ceiling height issue.*
- RE: 1082 Sixth St (single family)*
- Dave Chmiel, Wiel LLC, appeared.*
- Fire Inspector Urmann:*
- measurements in the TV room in basement - ceiling height over entire area is 6' 1"
 - the bedroom in basement had been Condemned because it didn't have an egress window; it had no window at all
- Mr. Chmiel:*
- appealing for TV room
 - the tenants were told to remove the bed from the other room
 - he is 6' 2" and can stand up straight in the TV room and still has a couple inches to get to the ceiling
 - house built in 1917 (he can't raise the ceiling)
 - tenants would like to use one room as a TV room (12' x 10")
 - house has 2 bedrooms on main floor
- Ms. Moermond:*
- will recommend the appeal be denied
 - it's 11 inches short of the requirement
 - the Council may see things differently (CCPH Sep 7, 2011)
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011**
- 70 [RLH FCO
11-259](#) Appeal of Dao D Phan to a Correction Order at 151 PAGE STREET WEST.
- Sponsors:** Thune

Attachments: 151 Page.appeal.7-19-11.pdf
151 Page St.INSPSOL-502625-ABC.pdf
151 Page St.Costandine Photo Evaluation.pdf
151 Page St.Constandine Indoor Air Quality Report.pdf
151 Page St W.PHA Emails.6-9-11.pdf
151 Page St W.Photos.8-2-11.pdf

Deny the appeal for Items 1 (foundation) and 2 (panel board access). Property owner must provide access for tenant to gain access to electrical room and must find a way to seal the crawl space/foundation. (Inspector Sean Westenhofer)

RE: 151 Page St W (duplex)

Sylvie Phan, owner, and Debra Costendyne, tenant, appeared.

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection*
- first issue: this is an efficiency apt and the electrical panel for this unit is not accessible to the tenant (the National Electrical Code requires that a sub-panel be placed within the unit/building that is accessible to the tenant.) Currently, the tenant needs to go through another tenant's space, which is not occupied but to which they do not have access.*
- building has only a crawl space - no full basement*
- second issue: quite a bit of water has been coming through the foundation which has caused mold in the building; inspector has asked that the sump pump be installed by a contractor (one had been installed without permit or license to do electrical work). Plumbing work does not require a permit; however, the installation of the sump pump is required to be done with a permit*
- dampness in the crawl space is causing a mold issue in the crawl space and is infiltrating into the living space*

Ms. Phan:

- she spoke with inspector about the windows that allow access to the crawl space (have been there since she bought the property)*
- this inspector was brought in by her before she purchased the house*
- this duplex is built in the lowest spot of the area, water seeps to the lowest point*
- the crawl space has a sump pump and a fan which circulates air down there*
- the water is actually seeping through the ground, not the foundation access points*
- the only outstanding thing is the circuit breaker access - when she bought the building, she thought it was OK because there was a Certificate of Occupancy on that property; it's been OK for the past 2 1/2 yrs; if it was OK then, why does she need to fix it now; if the tenant needs access, there are ways to grant her access - it's not difficult*
- mold issues: these are very new to her; she was just informed yesterday; she had been out of town. She has instructed her tenants to call her with issues and work with her before they inform other alternatives*

Ms. Costendyne:

- has occupied the efficiency apt since May 7, 2011 (was 50-60 degrees in apt then)*
- didn't know that there was a water problem until the floor started to buckle Jun 1 or 2, 2011; she called Ms. Phan right away and told her that there was water or moisture in the basement owner asked, "What basement?" She has had a hard time getting an answer from her about why it has been so cold in the apt; why the floor started to buckle (put in the last week of Apr 2011). She mopped and the floors wouldn't dry.*

She suspected there was a problem but didn't know what it was. Owner's dad came over Fri and took a look; he took the screens off and said there wasn't a problem but she saw some type of reflection when she looked in. When he left, she she took a camera and she stuck her hand down there; there was probably about 2 feet of standing water that had probably been there for some time. They put a fan on a little pontoon type platform in the crawl space. The fan is attached to an outlet (inspector said it was very dangerous)

- entered photos before and after the sump pump was put in (was put in on the 7th)
- crawl space floor goes into a V
- that fan is attached to her breaker box (to which she doesn't have access; has been forbidden from going into that room)
- she has been very straight forward with the owner
- a few days after the sump pump was put in, the owner sent her an email telling her she could leave; she's not a very friendly owner; she's been asked to leave the premises 4 times; owner is very hostile and it's difficult living there.
- when she asked the owner to just open up a door so that she could access her breaker box, she asked, "Are you going to pay for it?"
- her electricity bill has gone up twice
- the previous tenants told her that they had to use space heaters to keep the apt heated
- the owner blames her talking to the Fire and Safety Dept but it wasn't her, it was Jordan Hucklebe, Public Housing
- submitted emails from owner blaming her and Jordan
- owner has not notified her when she comes over (disregards the 24 hour notice)
- on the 1st, after owner had asked her to leave again, the hot water was turned up to scalding (has video of temp. at 220 degrees)
- the water continues to pump out every half hour; so, it's not dry down there; it took days to pump all that water out to begin with
- can no longer close her bedroom door because of warpage in the floor

Ms. Moermond:

- scanned emails, photos, etc.
- informed Ms. Phan that this hearing just looks at the bldg conditions themselves, not tenant-landlord issues

Ms. Phan:

- in her lease contract, she always asks her tenants to communicate with her by email about issues
- the only time the tenant told her about moisture in the room was Jun 2, the Thu before she left town
- the sump pump happens to be plugged into the electrical box of the one bedroom unit and the garage door opener is plugged into the 4-bedroom unit's elect box
- the sump pump failed sometime after tenant moved in; she hadn't noticed any moisture as they were preparing the unit for rental right before this tenant moved in; she fixed it as soon as it failed; it pumped continuously for several hours
- Section 8 came in to inspect the property and cleared it for the tenant to move in
- she knows the crawl space was dry because the previous tenant had plumbing issues and if the crawl space had been wet, she would have known.
- City of Saint Paul inspector came out without her knowledge
- tenants should communicate with her about issues before going to higher authorities because it costs time and time is money and money is taxpayers' money
- she offered her tenant the opportunity to break a lease without a fee (tenant called that harassment)
- she feels as though she's being harassed; there's one thing after another; nothing is ever enough
- crawl space is completely dry now

Mr. Urmann:

- from viewing the photos, the crawl space appears to be as the inspector described; he said there was water in the crawl that there was an issue with the sump pump (one had been installed without benefit of a permit or a licensed contractor to do that electrical work)
- other issue of the electrical panel: it's very clear that the tenant does not have access to their own electrical panel as required by the code
- what may required at Ms. Phan's home is not what is required at a place that's not owner-occupied
- the crawl space/foundation may entail encapsulating/sealing that space; the sump pump should be able to keep that space dry; it needs to be taken care of
- a moisture seal is needed and a contractor needs to make that determination

Ms. Moermond:

- asked Ms. Phan is a licensed contractor / electrician had been hired to install the sump pump to which Ms. Phan replied, "No. Rarely does it fail, but you don't need an electrician to replace the sump pump."
- unfortunately, the Order here doesn't say that the work has to be done under permit (to which Mr. Urmann replied, "That's because it was already done at the time of the inspection.")
- this should dry out; thinks the owner needs to do some sealing and repair
- legally, the owner needs to provide access to the panel board box in the electrical room (the electrical code is quite clear on that)
- City Council may grant a variance on that on Sep 7, 2011
- will grant an extension of 90 days to take care of both items
 - electrical code says tenant must have access to their panel box
 - crawl space / foundation must be free from water / moisture because of mold issue

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

71 [RLH FCO
11-241](#)

Appeal of Song Lor to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 1044 FOURTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [1044 4th.appeal.7-12-11.pdf](#)

Hearing date was changed to August 9.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/9/2011

72 **RLH FCO
11-251**

Appeal of Daniel J. Ruza to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 1842 ARLINGTON AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: 1842 Arlington.appeal.7-18-11.pdf

Deny the appeal and grant 90 days for compliance on the entire list except the roof which is granted until July 30, 2012. (Inspector James Thomas)

RE: 1842 Arlington (single family)

Daniel Ruza, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- suggested appellant go through each individually

Mr. Ruza:

- timing is his biggest issue along with the number of visits by the inspector*
- this was originally scheduled for inspection Jul 2, 2011*
- without notice, the inspector came to the property 3 weeks earlier (don't know the reason why)*
- he also appeared on Jul 2, 2011 and Mr. Ruza was awaiting the report*
- he fore warned the tenant that he had problems with this inspector before, so the tenant thought he got along well with this inspector and sat with pen and paper waiting to write down what the inspector told him needed fixing*
- when the inspection was over, he told his tenant nothing*
- the tenant told him that he would never allow this inspector into the bldg again*
- inspector was very curt with the tenant and wouldn't tell him anything and made a number of comments about Mr. Ruza*
- inspector told his tenant that Mr. Ruza had threatened him in an email and that he had reported Mr. Ruza to the Police (none of which is true, of course)*
- inspector sent the Notice to Mr. Ruza's home certified mail for another re-inspection on Jul 2, 2011 (wife said she got a little pink slip from the mail service saying they had attempted to deliver certified mail from the City)*
- inspector showed up on Jul 2, Mr. Ruza wasn't there so, he came to another property that Mr. Ruza was working on and said that no one had been at the inspection (Mr. Ruza told him, "That's because you didn't notify us." He said, "Yes, I sent a letter certified mail." (3 witnesses heard him say that)*
- complained to inspector's supervisor - she questioned inspector and told Mr. Ruza that he said that he had never said that.*
- this notice, dated Jul 13, 2011, was received 2 weeks ago*
- he told inspector that he had appealed it; inspector said that he was inspecting anyway*
- problem: inspector could have, conceivably been there 5 times*
- first time inspector comes, it's \$200; each time the inspector comes again, it's another \$100*
- last year he was so naive, he thought he was going to get some kind of extra credit for having the inspector come back to check his progress (he found out that was the wrong thing to do)*
- he could be sending him a bill for \$500 of \$600 and he's had this notice only 2 weeks; he wants to make sure that he's not going to get that bill*
- he is working on this and he doesn't want the inspector to come back until he's done*
- wishes the inspector would point out exactly what you are to do, instead of listing a lot of things on one item leaving you to guess what you are supposed to do*
- seems as though they put you in a position of entrapment*
- the program is supposed to be a safety program but it seems more like a "set-up" to collect fees*
- thinks the inspector should tell him what's wrong when he's there*
- things people should get more time*
- is appealing, basically, the foundation doesn't look very good but it looks exactly like it did 30 yrs ago when he bought the property and it hasn't changed
(he called the bldg inspector, Dave Nelson, who told him that if he goes in and disturbs the foundation, now, he needs to be up to Minnesota code) and he doesn't want to do it*
- would need to ask his tenant to leave while it's being repaired because of the bathroom (he's not going to do that)*
- if he has to repair the foundation, he will need at least a year*
- everyone in that area has a water problem (Lake Phalen lake bed area)*

- inspector thinks the roof should be done but it doesn't leak, it just doesn't look very good; when he bought the house, the roof leaked and he had a guy come in to fix it but water got in there and the joists got warped and over the years, they've deteriorated; agrees the roof needs to be fixed
- still unemployed; don't have the money
- this is not an investment property; he doesn't get rent from his tenant - he is more of a caretaker; he bought this property as an investment 30 yrs ago but it became more of a nuisance than anything, so he allowed this person to live in this house
- there is no water going into the basement

Mr. Urmann:

- checking out the bill
- so far, there's the initial fee and no re-inspections
- spoke with inspector re: exterior paint issues (he said there were some areas of peeling paint that need to be addressed; no photos)
- re: roof - needs to be free from defects
- re: foundation - described as deteriorating to the point that it's letting water and mud into the basement that needs to be cleaned after a large rainfall; the structural integrity of the foundation is becoming a concern
- photos in file

Ms. Moermond:

- asked if the appellant had a permit pulled on something else in order to get advice from Dave Nelson (Mr. Ruza had a permit pulled for roof and siding at 1623 McAfee where a conversation took place about the foundation at 1842 Arlington)
- list doesn't seem too hard to get done
- will recommend granting a 90-day extension for getting the entire list fixed except for the roof, which can go to Jul 30, 2012
- if the appellant tries to pull a permit on the foundation and they tell him that he needs to do a lot more, she is willing to look at it again; but so far, the appellant has gotten information from an inspector at another site (get different information before Sep 7, 2011 and she will be willing to change her recommendation for the City Council) Ms. Moermond needs to know what the considerations are as the appellant tries to pull a permit.
- set up for City Council Public Hearing Sep 7, 2011

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 73 [RLH VBR 11-54](#) Appeal of Zac Tchu Meng Yang to a Vacant Building Registration Renewal Notice at 981 EARL STREET.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [981 Earl.appeal.7-14-11.pdf](#)

Appeal withdrawn by Department. Issue resolved per Supervisor Rich Singerhouse.

Withdrawn

- 74 [RLH VBR 11-51](#) Appeal of John Zydowsky to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 822 EDMUND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Attachments: 822 Edmund.appeal.7-8-11.pdf
822 Edmund Ave.Fire C of O Revocation.6-16-11.pdf

Ms. Moermond recommends waiving the vacant building fee for 90 days. Appellant needs to get Certificate of Occupancy within 45 days. If not done, Appellant will need to obtain a code compliance inspection; repair the driveway. (Inspector Dennis Senty)

RE: 822 Edmund Ave (duplex)

Dean Fjeld, partner and brother-in-law of John Zydowsky, owner, appeared.

Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

- *Cat 2 VB opened Jun 21, 2011 by Inspector Senty*
- *inspector's notes: house unoccupied; secured by normal means; damage and missing storm and screen windows; chipped, peeling paint; photos taken; posted placards on front and rear doors; garage door was open; tall grass and weeds, debris throughout yard; the Revocation had listed 42 deficiencies*

Fire Inspector Urmann:

- *original Revocation of the Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate was issued Jun 2, 2011; contained 49 orders*
- *building owner was notified that the Corrections had to be made of the building vacated*
- *upon re-inspection Jun 16, 2011, second Order was issued; the bldg was found to be un-occupied and was referred to the VB Program*
- *letter send to owner, listed 42 violations*

Ms. Moermond:

- *reviewed Fire C of O*

Mr. Fjeld:

- *appealing the Registered VB status*
- *purchased property Dec 2008 as a Cat 2 VB and were given a Code Compliance Certificate of Occupancy in Mar 2009*
- *tenants had been very reliable payers and very independent*
- *property has experienced a very rapid degree of disrepair over the last 6 months*
- *over-occupancy has been observed*
- *condition of the property spiraled quickly*
- *items always stacking up in the alley; they received multiple notices per month for debris, tall grass and weeds,*
- *they addressed all issues within a couple days*
- *Certificate of Occupancy re-inspection in Apr 2011*
- *they had a leaking roof and other needed fixes but most items were tenant abuse of the property*
- *had assigned his handyman to take a crew of 3 and address the issues as fast as they could - handyman falsely reported his activity there*
- *tenants had communicated to him openly about the status of the property and the deficiencies were noted*
- *he provided the tenants with a copy of the deficiency list, highlighting items they needed to address*
- *in the 2 weeks they were given to make the fixes, literally, nothing happened and the tenants were told to leave*
- *turned the property over to a new licensed contractor and a professional*

management company that was managing other properties for them
 - Mitch suggested that they appeal the VB status because the property was recently being shown
 - they hired a lawn service to take care of the lawn and someone to address the garage issue
 - 2 items on the deficiency list were not brought up to them when they received their C of O from their previous code compliance, 2009: 1) condition of the driveway; and 2) the flue liner
 - at this inspection, they were asked to install a flue liner and to completely take up the driveway and re-pave it
 - is requesting that those 2 items be observed in the light of the fact that they were not part of the C of O requirements for the previous code compliance
 - asked if the driveway could be patched instead of replaced (has 3 bids)
 - would like clarification on the flue liner (Fire is not asking for it)

Ms. Moermond:

- noted that the previous Code Compliance inspection report (2009) did not call out the driveway

Mr. Urmann:

- if the driveway wasn't deteriorated enough at that time, it wouldn't have been called out; after a period of time, however, it's going to deteriorate

Ms. Moermond:

- issues: 1) how quickly the bldg can be re-occupied; 2) paying the Vacant Building fee, itself; and 3) whether a Code Compliance inspection is needed on this bldg again before it can be re-occupied
 - she is happy to recommend a 90 day waiver on the VB fee premised on the Appellant getting the Fire Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Code Compliance re-instated within 45 days
 - if the work on the current list hasn't been completed within 45 days, Appellant will need to do the Code Compliance inspection
 - is OK with repairing the driveway instead of replacing it; if Appellant is successful, it won't be called out on the next C of O list
 - the VB people will monitor this as a VB; the Fire C of O people will give the VB people a nod that the Fire C of O can be re-instated
 - may not need a flue liner because the Fire Inspection letters first list the Code Citation that they are operating from; then, there will be a little dash and an explanation of what your specific thing is. In this case, the inspector wants Appellant to repair deteriorated brick and tuckpointing on chimney
 - if the driveway does not meet inspector's expectations, new Orders will be written on it

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

75 [RLH VBR 11-52](#) Appeal of Dan Gallaway to a Vacant Building Registration Fee at 1564 MCAFEE STREET.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [1564 Mcafee.appeal.7-8-11.pdf](#)

Appeal withdrawn by Department. Issue resolved per Supervisor Rich Singerhouse.

Withdrawn

- 76 **RLH VBR 11-55** Appeal of Brian Essler to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 120 MARYLAND AVENUE WEST.
- Sponsors:** Helgen
- Attachments:** 120 Maryland.appeal.7-15-11.pdf
- Grant the appeal. Appellant doesn't need to be in the Vacant Building Program. (Inspector Matt Dornfeld)*
- RE: 120 Maryland Ave W (single family)*
- Brian Essler, Ramsey County Public Works representative, appeared.*
- Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:*
- Cat 2 VB file opened by him per Steve Magner via a neighbor's complaint
 - garage door was left open; peeling paint on trim; multiple code violations on the home; yard full of junk and refuse;
 - at the time of his inspection, he noted that there was some peeling paint on trim; a couple of torn screens; the garage was open to entry; and the yard did have some misc. junk and refuse
 - photos of violations in file (Jun 24) and photos of broken door window (Jul 27)
 - Summary Abatement was issued for securing garage and yard clean-up (done by Ramsey County)
 - in the meantime, a west side entry door window of the home needed to be secured
 - exterior violations are not severe
- Mr. Essler:*
- Ramsey County is doing a road project there on Maryland Ave
 - due to a conflict of interest between the county attorney and one of the property owners, they could not acquire the right-of-way and they turned it over to the City of Saint Paul
 - that house was not supposed to be acquired (it was bought in error); in fact, they were not to acquire any homes
 - once it had been acquired and were made aware of the violations, they sent their Public Works Crew Arsenal Programs and have hauled about a dozen loads of garbage out, secured the buildings and fixed the windows
 - for the last 3 weeks, the bldg has been up for bid and there are interested parties
 - has been advertised for 3 wks
- Ms. Moermond:*
- bldg was originally found to be vacant in Jun 2011
 - there was one code violation that has been addressed
 - it doesn't meet the definition of a registered VB; it doesn't have multiple code violations
 - will recommend granting the appeal; it's not in the VB Program
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011**
- 77 **RLH VBR 11-56** Appeal of Patrick R. Casby to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 1969 ROME AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Harris
- Attachments:** 1969 Rome.appeal.7-18-11.pdf
- Ms. Moermond recommends waiving the vacant building fee for 90 days and not be*

in the vacant building program. Appellant must get the electrical mast repaired by a licensed electrician and maintain the property. Once in compliance, the house can be occupied. If not, the building will be in the Vacant Building Program. (Matt Dornfeld)

RE: 1969 Rome Ave (single family)

Patrick Casby and Peg Dahennhy, significant other, appeared.

Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

- *Cat 2 VB opened by him per neighborhood complaints*
- *main concern: downed electrical mast hanging from the rear of the home and the wires were hot at the time of his inspection*
- *Xcel was called; they cut the wires at the pole (no longer an issue)*
- *house is vacant and currently, doesn't have electrical service*
- *grass was very tall (has been taken care of by property owner)*
- *stagnant water buckets in backyard*
- *the wooden property fence needs some TLC*
- *exterior of the home is in relatively fair condition*

Mr. Casby:

- *electricians are lined up*
- *entered a statement of what they have repaired along with photos*
- *they had planned to move into the house and are still planning to move into the house*
- *their neighbors, who are very poor, are being evicted from their home; Mr. Casby is going to allow these neighbors to live in this house while Mr. Casby is healing from spine infusion (beginning ASAP); entered a letter of intent from these neighbors who need to be moved from their house by Sep 1, 2011*
- *neighbors will maintain the property and pay the expenses while they live there*

Ms. Moermond:

- *this will be settled in 90 days*
- *will recommend Appellant get a 90 day waiver on the VB fee and that he be allowed out of the VB Program to get the electrical mast fixed; get the fence repaired, replaced or down; keep the yard maintained*
- *an electrical permit needs to be pulled and finalized by the same electrician*

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

- 78 [RLH VBR 11-53](#) Appeal of Lee Yang and Tia Yang to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 929 WILSON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: [929 Wilson.appeal.7-13-11.pdf](#)

Appeal withdrawn. Department staff waived the vacant building fee for 30 days.

Withdrawn

Other

Staff Reports - Housekeeping

- 79 **RLH FCO**
 11-208 Appeal of Aaron Jensen, Green Mill Restaurant, to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1342 GRAND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Harris

Attachments: 1342 Grand.appeal.2-28-11.pdf
 1342 Grand.Green Mill Email and Floor Plan
 1342 Grand Ave.Documents.pdf
 1342 Grand Ave.Green Mill Ltr 3-22-11.doc
 Green Mill Affidavit Occupancy Signed.4-14-11.pdf

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

Window Variances: No Hearing Necessary

- 80 **RLH FCO**
 11-264 Appeal of Joseph Uebel to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1898-1900 FORD PARKWAY.

Sponsors: Harris

Attachments: [1898-1900 Ford.appeal.7-25-11.pdf](#)
 [1898-1900 Ford Pkwy.Uebel Ltr 8-2-11.doc](#)

No hearing necessary. Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows in all four bedrooms measuring 23 inches high by 33 inches wide. (Rick Gavin)

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

- 81 **RLH FOW**
 11-101 Appeal of Karen Hupp to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 873 JENKS AVENUE

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [873 Jenks.appeal.7-11-11.pdf](#)
 [873 Jenks Ave.Hupp PC ltr 8-2-11.doc](#)

No hearing necessary. Grant a 2-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in all three bedrooms. (Kelly Booker)

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/17/2011

- 82 **RLH FOW**
 11-105 Appeal of Son Nguyen to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 976 JENKS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Attachments: [976 Jenks.appeal.7-13-11.pdf](#)
 [976 Jenks Ave.Nguyen Ltr 8-2-11.doc](#)

No hearing necessary. Grant a 5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in the north and east bedrooms of Unit 2. (Kelly Booker)

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011

- 83 [RLH FOW
11-108](#) Appeal of 33rd Company, on behalf of Carleen Andert, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 1410 JULIET AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Harris
- Attachments:** [1410 Juliet.appeal.7-14-11.pdf](#)
 [1410 Juliet Ave.33rd Co Ltr 8-2-11.doc](#)
- No hearing necessary. Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in the first floor north and south bedrooms. (Rick Gavin)*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011**
- 84 [RLH WP 11-46](#) Appeal of Renewal by Andersen Corporation, on behalf of Max and Elizabeth Schultz, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1958 SAUNDERS AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Harris
- Attachments:** [1958 Saunders.appeal.7-18-11.pdf](#)
 [1958 Saunders Ave.Renewal by Andersen Ltr 8-2-11.doc](#)
- Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable height of four double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 23 3/8 inches high by 30 inches wide; grant a 5-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 19 3/8 inches high by 23 inches wide.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011**
- 85 [RLH FOW
11-106](#) Appeal of James Schmidt to a Re-Inspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 1030 THIRD STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Attachments:** [1030 3rd.appeal.7-14-11.pdf](#)
 [1030 Third St E.Schmidt Ltr 8-2-11.doc](#)
- No hearing necessary. Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the lower unit west bedroom; grant a 2-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the lower unit northwest bedroom; and grant a 4-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in the upper unit northeast and northwest bedrooms. (Wayne Spiering)*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011**
- 86 [RLH FOW
11-100](#) Appeal of Tia Yang and Lee Yang to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 929 WILSON AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Attachments:** 929 Wilson.appeal.7-8-11.pdf
 929 Wilson Ave.Yang Ltr 8-4-11.doc
- No hearing necessary. Grant a 6.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the first floor bedroom; and grant a 3-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the second floor bedroom. (Kelly Booker)*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/7/2011**

