



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
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8585

Tuesday, July 21, 2015

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 **RLH TA 15-378** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 702 AURORA AVENUE. (File No. CRT1511, Assessment No. 158211)

Sponsors: Thao

Graham Butler, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspections fees assessment
-initial fee + 5 re-inspection fees = \$700 + \$155 service charge = \$855
-this inspection process has gone on well beyond their normal acceptable deadlines partially due to Inspector Efferson leaving our office in 2013 and no one else was re-assigned to that file at that time; it did get re-assigned to Inspector Brian Schmidt, who inspected the property a couple of times and then, he was re-assigned to a different district; the file was then finished up by Mr. Neis in Feb 2015
-the disturbing part of this file is that the owner has had 2 1/2 years to bring the building into compliance and we still have open Orders on the building
-we have approved it with Corrections; subsequently, it's already due for renewal
-there have been some financial challenges

Ms. Moermond:

-asked Mr. Neis to go back and list the inspections; wondering about carry-over

Mr. Neis:

-Feb 20, 2013: Correction Orders issued; Mr. Butler re-scheduled the inspection, which was moved into Mar 12, 2013; 13 items were identified with re-inspection scheduled for Apr 15, 2013
-nature of those items: heating report; smoke detector affidavit; repair damaged ceiling on the 1st & 2nd floors; remove equipment; broken window; remove tires and excessive storage in the basement by 75%; install handrail on basement stairs; missing smoke detectors; unapproved heater on 2nd floor; roof needs repair; paint unprotected surfaces; junk vehicles; something was wrong with the sanitary sewer on the west side of the building -needed to be capped
-Jul 18, 2014 inspection with re-inspection Aug 5, 2014: ceilings still needed to be done; the roof was still in need of repair; we had unprotected surfaces around the windows, fascia and soffit areas
-Aug 5, 2014 inspection with re-inspection Aug 22: still have damaged ceiling; not done with roof; still have unprotected areas to paint

-recalls the owner delayed getting the ceiling repaired because of the roof issues (potential leaking)
-Jan 6 2015: he sent out the last extension letter, that gave until Feb 12, 2015 to which he did give additional time to: repair damaged ceiling on 1st & 2nd floor areas; have roof done by no later than Jun 1; to have the trim, window & fascia by no later than Jun 1, 2015
-as of now, Mr. Butler has still been in contact with him but even after giving the last extension notice and having over 2 years to complete the Orders, the roof, from his understanding is still not done and there are no permits on file
-he did sign off on the ceiling and he approved it with Corrections due to staffing issues
-he has not been able to get the roof done due to funding issues
-from what he can see, the inspections are valid

Ms. Moermond:

-please re-iterate the dates of Orders:

Mr. Neis:

-Mar 2013; another letter dated Apr 17, 2013; letter dated May 1, 2013 for re-insp on Jun 4, 2013; letter dated Jun 4, 2013 for re-insp to Jul 25, 2013; lapse of inspectors; letter dated Jun 25, 2013 for inspection Jul 10, 2013

Ms. Moermond:

-from the bill she is holding, there was an actual inspection Mar 12 and Jun 4, 2013; the letters around that are more or less re-iterating what was said before and scheduling a re-inspection

Mr. Neis:

-inspection done Mar 12 and Jun 4, 2013, documented by Inspector Efferson (notes: some work is completed but roof and water damaged ceiling on both 1st & 2nd floors hasn't; exterior painting was also in process on my arrival)
-Jun 18, 2014: inspection made, indicated by Mr. Efferson
-Jul 18, 2014: that inspection should not be assessed; there was a call, then, a cancelled appointment

Ms. Moermond:

-then, we skip 6 months forward to Jan-Feb 2014

Mr. Neis:

-Jan 6, 2014: Mr. Neis conducted inspection (notes: ceiling has large cracks on 2nd floor and lower unit still not repaired; he advised owner that he would give 30 additional days since this process has gone on so long; if not completed, he would Revoke the C of O; he was not able to see roof because of the snow cover but owner indicated that it no longer leaks but does need further repairs)
-Feb 13, 2015: final inspection when he approved only the exterior (notes: interior ceiling was complete; only exterior items remaining; he approved C of O with Corrections)

Mr. Butler:

-on the first Notice that he got, it appeared as if the billing of \$700 was for event; it didn't list all these other inspections

Ms. Moermond:

-the bill she is looking at does show all of that

Mr. Butler:

-the inspection in Jan 2015 of the 1st floor ceiling; there was leaking in the bathroom from the 2nd floor water - that was fixed and approved
-there were no large or small cracks on the ceiling; but he was sure that there were and he was looking but he couldn't see any; Mr. Butler showed the inspector the outside porch where the leaks had been and where that had been repaired; was approved
-for purposes of this hearing, I'm sure you have to accept what he says as correct
-the remaining problem on this house is the roof replacement; it's never been replaced; it has 3 layers of shingles; he got 4 estimates and he has gone with one of them but he has applied for a Reverse Mortgage so that he can get the roof fixed at a cost of \$11,200; his application for Reverse Mortgage will be approved or disapproved within the next 2-3 weeks
-2013 inspections with Mr. Efferson: Inspector Efferson did inspect and then told him that he would be moving and someone else would cover; Mr. Butler thought the repairs had been made; there had been painting going on, which Mr. Efferson noted; if touch-up painting needs to be done, it will be done in the next month
-now, that he knows the bill covers all these inspections, he has a better understanding but what comes in the mail does not state that there were 7 inspections; it says the amount plus another amount plus \$35;
-my address with the city: 2499 Rice St N Ste 125, Roseville, MN 55113-3724
-he got the bill summarizing and that's the reason for his appeal; if he had gotten a bill that had been itemized, he would have understood better and wouldn't have wasted the hearing officer's time
-he thinks there was confusion on Inspector Neis' part as well as his own as to whether it was a drive-by inspection, a Notice or an actual inspection was done; he knows that there were 2 inspections by Inspector Efferson, one by Brian Schmidt, and 2 by Inspector Neis - a total of 5 inspections

Mr. Neis:

-5 inspections is correct

Mr. Butler:

-he is looking for a reduction in the total amount because of the work that Mr. Efferson said was done; we had an on-going conversation from the very start about the replacement of part of the roof; he decided to replace the whole roof after he talked with 4 contractors; so, he'd like some consideration given; he's applying for Reverse Mortgage to pay everything off; he's not making any money; the purpose of buying this house and 2 others was to provide strong housing and also for income when he retires
-it's an investment property, although he is living there now

Ms. Moermond:

-she will definitely knock off \$100 for one of those inspections
-it sounds like the ceiling was an on-going issue from beginning to end

Mr. Butler:

-No; there were 2 ceiling problems: 1) in the outer porch area, during Inspector Efferson's time, which was repaired and approved by him; it was also approved by Inspector Schmidt; (there have never been large or small cracks after the repair) and 2) 2nd floor bathroom down to living room was a problem with cold water faucet
-the Rice Street address is his business address
-the property across the street is his domestic partner's property (about 10 years)

Ms. Moermond:

-asked him why he hadn't appealed sooner

Mr. Butler:

-at one point I did appeal; he was hoping, in good faith, to talk to the person who was taking calls in DSI (Marcia Schauer??); they kept playing phone tag - with no response for him and consequently missed the LH

-the roof has not leaked into any area except to the outside porch, which was fixed while Mr. Efferson was still here and approved

-the roof was the overall problem and still is, even though it's not leaking now; there is no inside damage; not in the attic or the 2nd floor

-the 3 layers of shingles need to be removed - start from scratch to re-roof

-it didn't occur to him to appeal the Order on the roof

Ms. Moermond:

-the roof was going on through out

-a copy of the bills were mailed to you; Mr. Neis will provide another copy

Mr. Neis:

-asked if this was homesteaded

-is this address on your driver's license?

Mr. Butler:

-there no point in homesteading until you are an occupant on Dec 1 and you have to be current on your taxes before you can take the homestead exemption

-the address was changed on my driver's license

Mr. Neis:

-if you can provide documentation that you are actually living there, I will close the C of O file because this is due again for inspection

Ms. Moermond:

-regarding this fee, she will knock off 1 inspection fee where an actual inspection did not occur (Jul) and will also knock off the fee on the other date where there was confusion (Jun) - that's a reduction of \$200; she will knock off another \$100 because this took so long to get taken care of, which gets the cost for inspections down to \$400 and that's where we end today

Reduce from \$855.00 to \$400.00.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 2 [RLH TA 15-372](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 691 BEDFORD STREET. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

No show; approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 3 [RLH TA 15-354](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1511A, Assessment No. 158524 at 530 CHARLES AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thao

John Pilaczynski, property manager, appeared on behalf of Lewis Yang. Frank Ryman appeared; he works for Mr. Yang and was the supervisor in charge of disposing of the trash at this property.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement Orders sent Mar 30; compliance Apr 3; re-checked Apr 3
- work done Apr 7 for a cost of \$416 + \$160 service charge = \$576
- no returned mail
- sent to: LT & Associates LLC, 1467 Pulaski Rd, Buffalo, MN; Muon VY, 8054 Narcissus Ln N, Maple Grove, MN; and Occupant
- mattress was gone; cushion remains along with TVs, dumped charcoal, letter, refuse, debris
- including mattress in rear yard; cushion on east side of garage

Ms. Moermond:

- noted that there were 2 garages; which side is 530 on the photo? (the left side)

Inspector John Peter Ross:

- pointed out that the adjoining property, 536, received similar Orders a few days later

Mr. Pilaczynski:

- Mar 27 - had a fire
- they got a call from the Fire inspection in charge of that area who told us that they were at the property with the police; something about a welfare check; they said that at the time the smoke detectors were taken down; he immediately dispatched a crew; the chain was removed and put back all the smoke detectors; his point: they had scheduled a fire inspection for that property Apr 3, 2015; he met the inspector there and they discussed the garage, etc. and none of that debris was there, none; it had been cleaned up by them, not by the city
- he believes the problem has to do with the vacant property next door; it was a gift to the city for a garden and all the junk and debris ends up on his property; the people who live there are in their 80's - they go outside very seldomly
- the debris could have been from a man who was forcing himself to be there - that situation has been taken care of
- he believes that this assessment on their property is invalid because their crew went over to clean it up

VIDEO - city crew did do some clean-up: TV, refuse around the garage; scattered litter and debris throughout

Mr. Pilaczynski:

- the debris was cleaned by them, not by the city; the VIDEO shows different debris
- those TVs and cushion back there weren't there when they cleaned
- when the fire inspector came thru, he went with us around the garage, etc; thinks we need to have him testify because that debris, etc. wasn't there when he was there; he looked at and around the garage

Ms. Moermond:

- the original Order talked about mattresses and couch cushions; she saw only 1 cushion in the VIDEO
- inspector's notes: on re-inspection, the mattress was gone; 1 cushion remained along with TVs, refuse & debris
- doesn't see an additional Order on those other items; there should have been and you should be on top of that
- you did make a good faith effort to address the problem at hand
- will recommend deleting this assessment; however, there is a problem with dumping or with tenants leaving their garbage everywhere; hoping he has garbage service adequate to meet the needs of the tenants; if there is dumping going on, it's your job to clean is up

Mr. Pilaczynski:
-for the record, he never did receive an Abatement Order on it

Ms. Moermond:

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

4 [RLH TA 15-366](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 948 COOK AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1511A, Assessment No. 158524)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Nader Kazeminy, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:
-Summary Abatement Order sent Apr 3; compliance Apr 7; er-checked Apr 8
-work done Apr 9 for a cost of \$316 + \$160 service charge = \$476
-no returned mail
-sent to: Nader Kazeminy, 13336 Cardinal Creek Rd, Eden Prairie; Ali Haghghi, 13336 Cardinal Creek Rd, Eden Prairie; and Occupant
-furniture, rubbish, mattress in yard near alley

Mr. Kazeminy:
-he received the Notice; went to see his tenant and showed him the letter; the father and the son started moving it; there was also a chest of drawers, etc.; he said that he was going to borrow his friend's truck to move it; so, he left and thought that they had taken care of it; in fact, he called them last week and talked to the son, who speaks English, and told them to move everything; the son said that his dad was going to move the 2 items that were left but unfortunately, he didn't; then, he received the cost of \$476, which is too much for the tenants can pay; so, he is fighting on their behalf to see what Ms. Moermond can do
-he knows that they moved most of the stuff

VIDEO - furniture, etc. on the ground

Ms. Moermond:
-the city gave the Orders; you received those Orders but the work wasn't done by the deadline; it was done by the city after proper Notice was given
-it's the responsibility of the property owner to pay for this clean-up

Mr. Kazeminy:
-they removed most of it; the city charges too much

Ms. Moermond:
-the big items were left

Ms. Seeley:
-has been at this property 3 times and there's always trash, garbage in the back

Ms. Moermond:
-will recommend approval of this assessment

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

- 5 [RLH TA 15-381](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 2135 FIFTH STREET EAST (File No. J1507E; Assessment No. 158309).

Sponsors: Finney

Deanna Hartshorn, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

*-2 Excessive Consumption fees: \$240 + \$35 service charge = \$275
-there are several excessive consumptions
-a fine for noncompliance of the Orders that were sent; in this case, for failure to maintain exterior property
-Orders sent Feb 26; compliance Mar 5; re-checked Mar 5
-noncompliance of illegally parking vehicles on an unapproved surface
-\$120 EC for multiple violations; and a \$120 PACE (Work Order was sent but done by owner)
-a Correction Notice was also sent for parking on an unapproved surface
-photo taken Mar 5*

Ms. Hartshorn:

*-the crew showed up and she had the Orders in her hands; they said, "OK"
-the Orders showed that she had time and she showed them the Orders*

Ms. Seeley:

-Mar 5, he sent a hauler Order because there was no trash service and a Vehicle Abatement Tow Order; compliance date was Mar 5 - sent Work Order Mar 5; the crew must have gone out; so, it still generates a PAEC

Ms. Moermond:

*-you paper work says that you had until Mar 5 (prior to Mar 5, it needs to be done); after that, the city could take action; inspector went out Mar 5; doesn't know what Mr. Hartshorn is looking at
-will recommend approval of this assessment*

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 6 [RLH TA 15-368](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 336 FULLER AVENUE. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Thao

Delete the assessment. Summary Abatement sent to wrong address.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 7 [RLH TA 15-343](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1509A2, Assessment No. 158530 at 1016 IGLEHART AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thao

No show; approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 8 [RLH TA 15-379](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 874 MARGARET STREET. (File No. J1508P, Assessment No. 158407)

Sponsors: Finney

Delete the assessment; waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 9 [RLH TA 15-376](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 979 MARION STREET. (File No. J1510A1, Assessment No. 158532)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Kevin Redfield, husband of owner, Deborah Konechne, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

*-snow/ice letter sent Feb 27; compliance in 48 hours; re-checked Mar 3
-work done Mar 4 for a cost of \$160 + \$160 service charge = \$320
-no returned mail
-set to Occupant and Deborah Konechne, 984 Galtier St
-photos & Video*

Mr. Redfield:

*-he maintains that property all year
-he usually doesn't look thru all of his mail, piece by piece
-was out of town during Mar; it was the time of the year when most of the snow had been removed*

VIDEO - city removed snow & ice; salted and sanded

Ms. Moermond:

-say that one of the neighbors had a clean sidewalk; the other did not

Mr. Redfield:

*-he was out at the property on Mar 4
-it's arbitrary that any neighbor can call on anybody
-he has had an issue in the past with neighbors: his tires have been flattened on the car and he caught the kids who did it because of these neighbors
-he has parked in front of his house at 984 Galtier St without issues for 12 years and all of a sudden, he's getting tickets
-his issue: if it's a complaint-based system, he may be targeted*

Ms. Moermond:

*-she sees that the crew was out there Mar 4
-it could be that you are targeted*

Mr. Redfield:

-he must have been there right after the city came out - photos

Ms. Moermond:

*-will recommend approval
-you were out of town and probably didn't look at the Notice you received*

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

- 10 [RLH TA 15-369](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 990 MARION STREET. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

No show; approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 11 [RLH TA 15-370](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 2097 NILES AVENUE. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Tolbert

No show; approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 12 [RLH TA 15-374](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 987 REANEY AVENUE. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Finney

No show; approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 13 [RLH TA 15-373](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1511 ROSE AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Delete the assessment; inspector made a mistake on sending EC.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 14 [RLH TA 15-371](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1891 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No.158309)

Sponsors: Finney

Laura Schulte, ING Property Management, appeared on behalf of Alex Eaton

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Excessive Consumption fee: \$120 + \$35 = \$155

-PAEC fine for failure to have refuse removed by the compliance date

-Summary Abatement Order sent Mar 11; compliance Mar 16 (ton of garbage, furniture, rubbish, debris all around the dumpster); re-checked 16

-sent Work Order; work done by owner which generated the PAEC

-sent to Twin Empire Investments LLC, 3168 Berwick Knoll, Mpls; Twin Empire Investments/Robert King, 3168 Berwick Knoll, Brooklyn Park; and Occupant

-no returned mail
-photo
-quite a history: 4/6/15; 5/7/15; 6/19/15

Ms. Moermond:

-it was cleaned up by the time the crew arrived but not by the time of the inspector's re-check

Ms. Schulte:

-Twin City Empire owned the property at this time
-DTAE LLC purchased the property May 5, 2015; so these charges are prior to us owning it

Ms. Moermond:

-unfortunately for you, they attach to the property not to the human being; they should have been disclosed to you prior to purchase
-it's the property owner that's responsible for the cost of the assessment

Ms. Schulte:

-I called and spoke with Ed Smith and he said that she could disregard the letter because they hadn't owned the property at that time

Inspector John Peter Ross:

-there is no such policy that he knows of
-if Mr. Smith's intent was to disregard it, he had 30 days, he could have deleted the PAEC; obviously, he didn't

Ms. Seeley:

-reading Inspector Smith's notes: The property has been cleaned up by Parks Abatement crew; I spoke to ING Property Management and cancelled the \$120 EC fine for not being in compliance (May 12)
-the Jun 19 Order was addressed to Twin Cities Investment and to DTAE LLC, 33 6th St. Unit 4160

Ms. Moermond:

-Orders that went out May 7 was during your period of ownership but the Order went to the previous owner and so, you would not be responsible for that - you weren't properly noticed that there was an issue at the property (paperwork hadn't caught up); that one should be deleted; it won't come forward
-for the one we are looking at now - it's for Mar, prior to your ownership and attaches to the property
-the one in May should be deleted and the one on Jun 7, the city actually did do the clean-up

Ms. Schulte:

-it's an 11-unit building; currently, they are down to 2 units; the others have been evicted
-they strive to give people a good place to live; they have a team that comes through
-they brought the building up to code; it's been a headache for the owners
-they need to get the right tenants in and a good caretaker

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-that property is being handled by Supervisor Shaff
-there was a Condemnation on Jun 19, 2015; then, it was lifted again Jun 25, 2015; the conditions were corrected to warrant the lifting of the Condemnation
-will recommend this assessment be deleted

Ms. Moermond:

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 15 [RLH TA 15-375](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 735 SNELLING AVENUE NORTH. (File No. CRT1511, Assessment No. 158211)

Sponsors: Stark

No show; approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 16 [RLH TA 15-347](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1511A, Assessment No. 158524 at 1138 THOMAS AVENUE

Sponsors: Stark

Denise Day, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Order sent Mar 20; compliance Mar 26; re-checked Apr 6

-work done Apr 7 for a cost of \$228 + \$40 = \$268

-no returned mail

-sent to Denise Day Walton, 1138 Thomas Ave; and Occupant

-including mattress, tire and refuse

Ms. Day:

-that's not true; those tires were removed; Mr. Joel gave her a citation; she called him and asked what the citation as for? She had no idea that she can't keep her own tires in her yard; he explained that the tires need to be removed because the harbor mosquitoes, so, she removed them immediately

-the mattress - she called her garbage pick-up and asked how much they'd charged; and it is their contention that they picked-up that mattress on Apr 3

-when she got this letter and saw this assessment, she was shocked because her garbage company, Coolidge, said they picked it up (it's on the invoice)

-after she filled out the card, she was told that someone would call her to set it up; but no one ever called so she went back down and found out that the date was on the letter (she would have been at that last hearing but she was confused with the 2 hearings)

VIDEO - city picked up 3 tires (no mattress) from rear yard

Ms. Day:

-the mattress is gone and I had only 2 tires, not 3

-that VIDEO had to be an earlier video because she had only 2 tires and she had removed those

Ms. Moermond:

-let's take a look at the time stamp

Ms. Seeley:

-Joel gave her a week extension

VIDEO again - don't see a date stamp

Inspector John Peter Ross:

-the VIDEO was taken between Apr 6 and Apr 8; no date stamp

-the photo shows 3 tires on Apr 6, 2015

Ms. Day:

-Joel re-scheduled her hearing and she gave him a copy of the invoice

-that can't be because I didn't have but 2 tires along my fence that he complained about

Ms. Moermond:

-she sees that the mattress was removed and a good faith effort made on the other items

-clearly, there are some tires left in the yard

-notes that an extension was granted

-total assessment now is \$268; she will reduce it to \$134

Ms. Day:

-something is not right here because the tires were the first thing that she removed

Ms. Moermond:

-watched VIDEO one more time

Reduce from \$268 to \$134 and spread over 2 years.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

17 [RLH TA 15-387](#)

Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 673 WESTERN AVENUE NORTH. (File No. J1507E, Assessment No. 158309)

Sponsors: Thao

Charlene Pham, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-PAEC for trip charge: \$120 + \$35 = \$155

-Snow/ice Order issued Feb 13; compliance Feb 20; inspector went out and sent a Summary Abatement Order Feb 20 giving the owner a second chance; compliance Feb 23; re-checked Feb 23; took photo

-Inspector Gavin noted that the sidewalk was shoveled but not fully cleared

-no returned mail

Ms. Moermond:

-will recommend this be deleted

-snowfall chart

-thinks owner should have salted and sanded

-will give her good faith on this one

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015

- 18 [RLH TA 15-359](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1508P, Assessment No. 158407 at 850 WHITE BEAR AVENUE NORTH (852 & 854 White Bear Avenue also under same PIN).
- Sponsors: Finney
- Delete the assessment; waiver on file (address on waiver is 846 White Bear Avenue - not found in STAMP); inspector contacted appellant not to come to hearing.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015**

Special Tax Assessments - ROLLS

- 19 **RLH AR 15-52** Ratifying Collection of Fire Certificate of Occupancy fees billed during February 4 to March 11, 2015. (File No. CRT1511 Assessment No. 158211)
- Sponsors: Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015**
- 20 **RLH AR 15-53** Ratifying Excessive Use of Inspections or Abatement services billed February 20 to March 20, 2015. (File No. J1507E Assessment No. 158309)
- Sponsors: Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015**
- 21 **RLH AR 15-54** Ratifying Graffiti Removal services during February 8 to April 24, 2015. (File No. J1508P Assessment No. 158407)
- Sponsors: Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015**
- 22 **RLH AR 15-55** Ratifying Boarding and/or Securing services during April 2015. (File No. J1510B, Assessment No. 158110)
- Sponsors: Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/2/2015**

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary Abatement Orders

- 23 [RLH SAO 15-54](#) Appeal of Chris Arendt to a Summary Abatement Order at 781 COOK AVENUE EAST.
- Sponsors: Bostrom
- Deny the appeal (No show)*

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

Correction Orders

- 24 [RLH CO 15-11](#) Appeal of Sia Lo, Lo Law Firm, on behalf of Ying Vang and Chee Xiong, to a Correction Notice and Summary Abatement Order at 2153 BEECH STREET.

Sponsors: Finney

Vang Lor, appeared for Sia Lo, Lo Law Firm, on behalf of Ying Vang and Chee Xiong, owners.

Thomas Brase, adjacent property owner at 2157 Beech, also appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

*-at last LH, this was changed from a SA Order to a Correction Order
-the question is, "Who's responsible for the wall?" as far as it's repair*

Mr. Lor:

-his clients owns the lower property; the property onto which the retaining wall is falling

Ms. Moermond:

*-the Correction Order said to repair the erosion
-the problems that come about from not repairing the wall will accrue, most obviously, to the upper level and also could undermine the lower accessory building, eventually
-ultimately, that mess is the responsibility of your client (timbers laying in the yard)
-will let you clients decide how to build the wall again in court
-she will allow a long time period for the timbers to be cleaned up so that hopefully, when this is in civil court, it still can be discussed as to who should be doing that work*

Mr. Lor:

*-the next natural step will probably be mediation instead of litigation
-they would like to utilize the Neighborhood Mediation Center to try to resolve this;
asked to time to do that
-estimates 6 months to get thru with this
-believes that Mr. Lo has gotten an expert opinion as to who is to fix the retaining wall
-in a recent similar case, the neighbors actually split the cost*

Ms. Moermond:

-will give time to do that

Mr. Brase:

*-he appeared here last month to appeal; Ms. Moermond granted the appeal
-provided evidence of a surveyor's drawing of the property that clearly showed that the wall was built on the neighboring property at 2153
-also entered a flashdrive of photos that was entered into the record
-he also brought a statement from the previous owner, who was there when this wall built; and it was built by the neighbor at 2153; he allowed reinforcements to be placed on 2157 Beech; they are tie backs placed underneath his driveway, which was paved over
-he can't allow this to go on; it's undermining his driveway and another 6 months of rain will only make matters worse; it's hurting his property value and has already cost him more money - he had to jac up the driveway
-he was looking to this counsel to help alleviate this and stop the expense of all the*

legal fees

-he has clearly presented that this is not his problem

-he doesn't want to split the cost of a wall that he doesn't own; he doesn't want to sacrifice more of his property to build a wall on his neighbor's property

Ms. Moermond:

-the Orders were on Mr. Brase's property to begin with and there were subsequent Orders issued to the adjacent property

-this has become a disputed property line

-she doesn't think that it's in her jurisdiction to choose the property line, if it's disputed; the Council doesn't do that and she doesn't do that; it's a private civil matter that the courts would address

-if the neighbors are Ordered to repair it and they don't want to, she can't stop it; it wouldn't be her place to stop that

-will give a healthy length of time to get this resolved

Mr. Brase:

-this has been going on for 2 years; the neighbor called him over to show the erosion and Mr. Brase said, "This is your lawn; you'd better address it soon or it's going to fall over."

Ms. Moermond:

-Mr. Vang has an attorney now and for the city's sake, she needs to go thru the attorney that's representing him

Mr. Brase:

-his attorney is Mr. John Gearin

Ms. Moermond:

-will give this until Jun 1, 2016 to be addressed; if things worsen to a point where additional Orders have to be issued because of significantly worsening conditions, we can talk about it then; otherwise, we need to treat this like the Baker - Hall case and allow this to be resolved

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Steve Magner said that he wanted Summary Abatement Orders to be issued to both properties; have a contractor tear out that wall and assess both properties; the SA Orders were sent May 22

Ms. Moermond:

-she doesn't have a SA in front of her; she has a Correction Notice

-we converted that SA here to a Correction Notice

Mr. Lor:

-Mr. Lo has tried to reach out to opposing counsel; haven't heard anything back

-they tried to resolve this within those 30 days

Ms. Moermond:

-will grant an extension to Jun 1, 2016 for the wall to be corrected

Grant until June 1, 2016 to address the retaining wall issue.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

Sponsors: Thao

Charles Greer, owner, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

-blvd garden

-will recommend that the City Council grant your appeal

Grant the appeal.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

26 [RLH CO 15-17](#) Appeal of Patricia Hoffman to a Correction Notice at 1040 SIMS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Patricia Hoffman, owner, appeared.

Ms. Hoffman:

-the places she called for financial assistance were very slow to respond

-she filled out some applications: one on Fri; one on Sat; however, she doesn't need either one because she also came into some money so that she can pay for her own roof

-hoping that Ms. Moermond will allow her about 6 weeks to get it done and she'd like to screen roofing contractors, too

-she did get all the other little things done, too

Ms. Moermond:

-your original deadline was Jul 24, 2015

-will give her a new deadline: the roof should be repaired by Oct 16, 2015 with all permits signed off; all done

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

27 [RLH CO 15-16](#) Appeal of Daniel Craig Solberg to a Correction Notice at 103 FRONT AVENUE.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Daniel Craig Solberg, owner, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

-this was either to be finished or demolished

Mr. Solberg:

-most of it is torn down now; not with my approval; some family members tore it down; however, the base (platform is still there)

-I have always intended to put a gazebo back there or some place to gather but....

-he has owned this property for more than 20 years and he always intended to build something back there but family costs always get in the way and keep holding him back

-has talked with Zoning about what to do next

-the family took away the top part - the 2x4's; all that's left is the 2x10ft floor joists (treated lumber); it's not a slab; it's treated lumber

-the machinery that he was going to put in there is also gone

Mr. Ross:
-no permit was taken out for the demo

Mr. Solberg:
-he didn't know about the permit
-whether he keeps the platform or not depends on what he can figure out with Zoning

Ms. Moermond:
-not thrilled about the platform being left; it creates a trip hazard; however, that's not in front of her right now
-the nuisance condition has been substantially abated
-that base won't age well being exposed to the weather
-we will let it be for now
-you will need to pull a permit when you decide what you're going to do with it

Grant the appeal as owner has come into compliance. NOTE: no permit was pulled for the demolition.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

28 [RLH CO 15-19](#)

Appeal of Samuel J. Edmunds on behalf of Joseph & Patricia Rigatuso to a Correction Order at 2135 LOWER SAINT DENNIS ROAD

Sponsors: Tolbert

Joseph & Patricia Rigatuso, owners appeared represented by Samuel J. Edmunds.

Inspector John Peter Ross:
-this case originated with Inspector Ed Smith back in May 2011
-original complaint cited living conditions inside the home: excessive clutter creating health and safety hazards; pictures reveal that it was found to be true; at some point, Kay Wiltgenstein, HouseCalls, was involved; more than a dozen appointment letters from Ed Smith were sent; however, the conditions continued unabated
-the issue is not with refuse; it's just clutter: clothing; excess furniture; books; electronics; household items, etc. throughout the house, which presents an access hazard to emergency personnel if there were an emergency or a fire
-subsequent complaints have come in regarding the garage: possible rodent infestation; Inspector Smith was never allowed access to the garage so that issue remains unresolved
-in talking with Mr. Edmonds, he suggested granting more time to come into compliance
-latest Orders are from Jun 2015
-he suggested that since the on-going nature of this situation, it would be best to bring before a hearing officer
-the hope is that timelines can be established
-expressed the importance of a full inspection of the structure, including the attached garage
-the basement is also full of clutter
-photos
-the exterior issues have been taken care of

Ms. Moermond:
-the photos from 2011 are substantially similar to those we have now

Mr. Edmonds:
-has not been inside the house

-his clients agree that there is a problem; have been working with Mr. Smith for 4 years and over time have made progress; the exterior has been remedied; now, only the interior remains

-his clients tell him that they were never aware of any deadline until this most recent Notice deadline of Jul 30; and given their physical limitations, they need more time

-we request 90 days to complete the work

-ask that the city provide more specificity about what needs to be removed or how much needs to be removed; the Notice just says, "Remove clutter"

-they do understand that they need clear passageway into all the rooms, the doors and windows

-their daughter and son-in-law are able to help them; they have a plan in place and intend to get this work done

Mr. Ross:

-there's a long trail of re-checks (2011):

-owner has medical problems

-the living room, hallways and stairways are good

-the freezer has been moved into the basement

-clutter removed combustibles away water heater

-it's been slow

-will be sending an appointment letter for 1 more inspection, including the garage; when a house is cluttered in this manner, the garage often follows suit

-an updated Correction Order will be issued after that inspection

Mr. Edmonds:

-up until now, his clients have declined inspection of the garage; there's no reason to believe that there's a problem in the garage; there's no legal basis for it

Mr. Ross:

-he disagrees; a complaint came in about a rodent infestation in the garage from a neighbor, who, allegedly, has seen a rat leaving the garage when the door was open, which is why he is interested in inspecting the garage

Ms. Moermond:

-for specificity, there should be 4-foot passage ways, which include access to windows and doors

-in terms of decreased volumes of materials, some rooms are very, very full; others, not as much

-the basement is perhaps the worst area and should be decreased by 50% - 75%

-basement has a lot of books lining the walls

-upstairs bedroom is full with no direct access to the closet/window; decrease by 75% for sure

Mr. Rigatuso:

-a lot of these things were removed after those photos were taken

Mr. Neis:

-there are a lot of challenges with clutter; talked about "heavy content" (dead load on the structure)

-under fire conditions, the floor joists are strained; they will fall much quicker

-heavy content in a garage: a fire may be smoldering for a long time before anyone notices

-all this poses a hazard to the occupants and especially, to the responders; and if soaked with water, content becomes even heavier and poses even more of a hazard

Ms. Moermond:

- three's both the issues of the paths and getting in emergency personnel if an ambulance is needed or in case of a fire
- the heavy load is a problem and there is more chance of mice and insect harborage in these conditions
- a lot of this will need to go because it's just not safe
- wants a reduction of 50% content by Sep 1, 2015
- wants a reduction of 75% by Oct 1, 2015
- there will be a 30-day inspection and then a 60-day inspection
- Housecalls Program has dumpsters available for this - 651/266-1290
- kitchen and living room are the least problematic of all the rooms

Mr. Ross:

- he can't show the latest complaint but it read: "Rat ran out of the garage.....stacked mostly with junk...." (couldn't understand him)
- possible rodent infestation of the garage is still an issue in his mind

Mr. Rigatuso:

- their cars are packed outside on the driveway
- the attached garage door has never been opened and there are no windows in the garage; so a rat could not have run out of the open garage door; and there are no holes, either; plus the side door is also always locked (Patricia Rigatuso)

Ms. Moermond:

- no city inspector has been in the garage; and she strongly encouraged them to clean out the garage, too

Mr. Neis:

- since this is a tuck under garage, it is even more imperative that it gets cleaned out
- garages are designed to have a 1-hour fire separation from the house; they are designed for only a normal situation
- if a garage is filled from floor to ceiling with excessive clutter, that again, poses an imminent dangerous risk to not only the first responders and fire fighters but the occupants, as well
- a heavy content garage is even more dangerous than 2 cars filled with gas

Ms. Moermond:

- the city could go into the garage if there were obvious signs of clutter
- the problems that are associated with clutter on the inside of a house are just as bad when they are inside of a garage; you have to fix this
- whether or not an enforcement officer inspects the inside of a garage, for your own safety, you need to clean out the garage

Mr. Edmonds:

- re: the photo of the basement with a lot of books; many of those books are important to Mr. Rigatuso and many of them are arranged neatly on floor-ceiling shelves along the walls of the basement; do they pose as much of a hazard that way?
- if the rest of the items were removed, could the books on shelves remain?

Mr. Neis:

- the way the books are stacked along the basement walls does not pose a great a hazard - the basement is most likely on a concrete slab type construction; when books are densely packed pose less of a hazard than the combustibles stored around and near the shelving - boxes, stacks of stuff
- noted, in relation to allowing access, for a routine fire inspection, whenever a house is attached to a garage, the garage is automatically inspected (or if there's a

complaint because it's all part of one structure) (Mr. Ross agrees)

Ms. Moermond:

-the books on shelves can remain if the passage ways are open

Mr. Ross:

-he was denied access to the garage; Mr. Smith never inspected the garage, which raised a red flag for Mr. Ross (Mr. Rigatuso: Mr. Smith never asked for access to the garage and if he would have asked, he would have been allowed)

Ms. Rigatuso:

-a further extension is needed if you are including the clean out of the garage, too

Mr. Edmonds:

-as he understands it, there has been no Correction Notice related to the garage; so, if there were to be one in the future, then, that would set a deadline in the future...

Ms. Moermond:

*-she agrees that access to all rooms is needed; there is a lot of concern about what's going on in the garage and all of this is a part of the same structure, as Mr. Neis has explained and therefore, access to the garage should be allowed; a different Order should be issued or this Order should be amended to include the garage
-will stick with the deadlines for the house; they are reasonable
-the garage deadline will be Nov 1, 2015*

Ms. Moermond:

-Orders should be amended to include anything found in the garage; and if access to the garage is denied, she would anticipate that they would seek an Administrative Search Warrant to get into that space; those are typically issued within a few days

Mr. Edmonds:

*-it's a unique situation
-no one has any idea of what's inside that's garage; the only thing to support the issuance of an Administrative Search Warrant would be the complaint of a rat*

Ms. Moermond:

*-actually, it's within the same structure; and she thinks that it was a "miss" on the part of Code Enforcement that they didn't get in there; and that the Fire Inspector's analysis is probably more sound
-the new part of an amended Order, itself, is appealable*

Grant until September 1, 2015 to reduce the volume of excessive accumulation throughout by 50%; grant until October 1, 2015 for heavy content; allow access to garage; grant until November 1, 2015 for compliance; all passage ways must be at least 4-ft to doors and windows.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

11:30 a.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

- 29** [RLH VO 15-36](#) Appeal of Tit-Shing Cheng to a Condemnation and Order to Vacate at 2133 FOURTH STREET EAST

Sponsors: Finney

Tit Shing Cheng, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

- Condemnation Order / Order to Vacate by Fire Inspector Laura Huseby*
- inspection conducted May 12, 2015; re-inspection May 21*
- there was a previous appeal to give tenants time to vacate*
- this further appeal is because all conditions warranting Condemnation have been addressed*
- no inspection has been made since then*

Mr. Cheng:

- the key issue here was that the mechanical contractor for the new heating system did not pull the permit on time; when he contracted with him, he was very specific that the permit needed to be pulled before. There was a 3-way phone conversation with the contractor, Inspector Huseby and Mr. Cheng when the contractor assured them that the permit was pulled and it was in the system*
- the permit was pulled late; he got a copy; it had been doubled feed; since then, it's been finalized*
- another issue was the roaches in the house; they have a contract with Guardian Pest Control to come in monthly and treat the problem; the pest control people have told him that this is not an issue that can just be sprayed away; keeping the house clean is the number 1 issue; this can't be done in a short period of time; entered receipts from Guardian*
- the tenants that were there have moved out*
- asking that since all the condition have been met,*
- they will be putting new flooring in the kitchen and living room*

Mr. Neis:

- a good faith effort has been made to abate the roaches; a contract was signed with Guardian in Mar, 2015 (treatments were done in Oct, Nov & Dec of 2014; Apr 2015; and treated 11 days ago)*
- a gas and warm air permit was pulled for a furnace; both permits have been finalized and they abate #1, #3 & #4*

Ms. Moermond:

- asked Mr. Cheng to call Inspector Huseby to come out within the month to look at the floor; that should take care of getting your C of O re-instated*
- will recommend the VB registration is granted pending the re-instatement of the C of O*

Mr. Cheng:

- he provided the inspector with the smoke detector affidavit*

Mr. Neis:

- he can abate that right now and put it into the notes*

Ms. Moermond:

- Mr. Neis will lift the Condemnation and have the C of O re-instated*

Grant the vacant building pending the reinstatement of the Fire C of O certificate; condemnation has been lifted.

8/19/15: Inspector Laura Huseby had an inspection done on August 17. From that inspection she stated the following:

I inspected the prop flooring and it is satisfactory. I did not receive any documentation of pest control treatments.

On another note, I had no smoke or CO detector for one bedroom and a CO detector that had been painted over for the other two sleeping rooms so I ordered those replaced. I returned for inspection yesterday and the smokes and CO detectors are in place and working. While there, a live roach came running across the floor and stopped below the foot of the owner. I reminded him again of the need for invoices for the pest control activity. The PO indicated that he will be replacing the range (I believe the source of roaches-gas range in kitchen) and an AC in living room area. Tentatively scheduled to visit again on 8/28 at end of day for these issues, but not sure if I need to re-visit for this.

Ms. Vang clarified with Ms. Huseby to see if this means the C of O is now reinstated. She said it appears from the decision above regarding the flooring only that she can approve the C of O. She forwarded my message to her lead, Leanna, but cannot reach her. She will approve the C of O.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 30 [RLH FCO
15-113](#) Appeal of Barbara Otto, Program Manager at Lifetrack, to a Re-Inspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 709 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST.

Sponsors: Thao

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 7/28/2015

- 31 [RLH FCO
15-136](#) Appeal of John Prassas to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1999 NOKOMIS AVENUE

Sponsors: Finney

John Prassas, Carrington Property Services/PMC Northern, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire C of O Correction Notice issued by Fire Inspector Jonathan Gaulke on Jul 9, 2015

-re-inspection scheduled for Aug 7, 2015

-only 1 item being appealed: #2 - ceiling height is not quite 7 feet; it measures 81 inches, 3 inches shy

-Mr. Prassas show him pictures prior to the start of this hearing and the 2nd floor looks as though it was remodeled within the last several years; it appears that the ceiling is sloped with dormers; a dormer was also added to the exterior - it doesn't appear to be original; perhaps they bumped out the roof to make more living space

-property is in very, very nice condition

-a 3-inch variance is being requested

Ms. Moermond:

-what kind of pitch are we talking about

-viewed the photos on Mr. Prassas' phone

Mr. Neis:

-it's not a regular slope; there's 81 inches in height, then 2-3 feet across before it starts to slope

-doors appear to be regular size

Ms. Moermond:

-50% of the sq. footage is above 5 ft; at least 2/3 - 3/4 of that area is 6'9"

-will recommend granting a 3-inch variance

Grant a 3-inch variance on the ceiling height in the upper level bedroom.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 32 [RLH VBR 15-42](#) Appeal of Tonja Miller to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 1732 REANEY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Finney

Tonja Miller, C of O Responsible Party, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Inspector Efrayn Franquiz went out Jul 16, 2015 and wrote a list of Correction Orders

-in review of those Orders, there is nothing that appears to warrant a Condemnation -7 code issues: sidewalk issues; fresh paint on garage painted over address; all in progress; handrail is needed; door knob for laundry room; a couple loose electrical outlets; door frame in basement

-a compliance deadline: Aug 28, 2015 at 2 pm; if compliant, there's no reason not to approve the Certificate of Occupancy

Ms. Miller:

-she put the house on the market; an offer came in on Fri after Mr. Franquiz had been there, which she accepted

-they are working on details; it's a cash offer; looking at a fairly quick close

-she inherited this property, so, she has to file in probate

-she would like to have Sep 1 as the deadline

-is confused as to why Mr. Franquiz did a full re-inspection and now there's another list

-the painting of the house has been negotiated with the purchaser

-any minor issue she will take care of

Ms. Moermond:

-the reason that there was a full re-inspection is that she had recommended that Ms. Miller's appeal be granted on the Vacant Building Registration but that the fire inspector had to go inspect and write a new set of Orders to be complied with (trade off)

-the exterior items will be done by the new owner; and you will do the rest of the minor interior things

-will grant extension to Sep 1 on the interior; Nov 1, on the exterior

-at closing, you are required to disclose these existing Orders, which you already

have done
-the extension should accommodate the new owners

Mr. Neis:
-Inspector Franquiz will sent a new letter for an appointment after Sep 1

Ms. Moermond:
-please contact the fire inspector with the new owner's contact information

Grant until September 1, 2015 for the interior issues and November 1, 2015 for the exterior issues.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/5/2015

33 [RLH VBR 15-52](#) Appeal of Tom Gavic to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 150 ACKER STREET EAST

Sponsors: Bostrom

Tom Gavic, owner, appeared.

Mr. Gavic:
-bought the property 5 years ago; the building was never a house or used for any purpose
-the building was moved onto the property many years ago
-there's no heat, electrical, plumbing, etc.
-the building is being demolished; already contacted a contractor; should be done fairly quickly
-that whole piece of property will be cleared

Inspector Matt Dornfeld:
-so far, there's no demo permit

Mr. Gavic:
-he talked with his demo contractor on Fri and he said that he knows everyone down at DSI; he would email it
-the asbestos inspector has already been out there
-said that they needed to get a rodent inspector out there, too
-6 tires are still there and a bag of aluminum cans, too; they will be gone

Ms. Moermond:
-will give him until Sep 1, 2015 to have the building razed; otherwise, he will have a Vacant Building fee

Grant until September 1, 2015 to get the building(s) demolished under permit.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

34 [RLH VBR 15-54](#) Appeal of Bryndee Barton to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 415 BANFIL STREET

Sponsors: Thune

Waive the VB fee for 90 days.

Bryndee Barton, BNP Homes, appeared.

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:
-opened Vacant Building file Jul 28, 2014
-Sale Review was approved to BNP Homes LLC on Apr 21, 2015 by Inspector Soley
-Code Compliance Inspection Report on file
-all permits open
-maintained
-VB fee is due Jul 29, 2015

Ms. Barton:
-the house is already done
-inspections next week
-has been sold

Ms. Moermond:
-will recommend a 90-day VB fee waiver

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

35 [RLH VBR 15-51](#) Appeal of Jin Zun Zou to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 1592 MCAFEE STREET

Sponsors: Finney

Jin Zun Zou, owner, appeared.

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:
-Category 2 Vacant Building file opened Jul 18, 2014 by Inspector Dave Nelmark
-Mr. Zou went thru Sale Review and was approved by Inspector Soley on Mar 11, 2015
-Code Compliance Inspection Report on file
-all trade permits open
-property has been maintained
-no problem with the property
-will discuss the VB fee which is a few days past due

Mr. Zou:
-asked for a 60-day waiver
-everything should be done

Ms. Moermond:
-will recommend granting a 90-day waiver

Waive the VB fee for 90 days.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

36 [RLH VBR 15-46](#) Appeal of Thomas W. Igar, on behalf of the Estate of William S. Igar, to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 1032 MARGARET STREET.

Sponsors: Finney

Appeal withdrawn per Rich Singerhouse and appellant.

Withdrawn