



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Meeting Agenda - Final Legislative Hearings

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer
Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator
Jean Birkholz, Hearing Secretary
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8560

Tuesday, October 12, 2010

10:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 1 [ALH 10-190](#) Appeal of Dan Mills to Vacant Building Registration at 528 Harrison Avenue. (Ward 2)

Sponsors: Thune

Legislative History

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Waive the vacant building fees for 90 days per DSI

Correction Orders

Fire Corrections Notice

- 2 [ALH 10-146](#) Appeal of Daniel J. Ruza to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Order at 1629-31 McAfee Street. (Ward 6)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Legislative History

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Withdrawn
Appellant Daniel Ruza (13234 20th Street Ct. N., Suite 1, Stillwater, MN 55082) appeared.

Mr. Ruza said he was there about the dryer vents. He said he didn't object to the code requirement and had repaired the vents to code, but hadn't been able to get an answer about whether a permit was required. He said he hadn't installed the vents but had only repaired the existing ones. He said he was also told he couldn't purchase permits because he didn't live in the house; he asked whether a variance was required for him to purchase a permit. He said he had six units in three side-by-side properties and having a licensed contractor come to look at dryer vents would be expensive. He expressed frustration over the difference in requirements for owner-occupied and non-owner-occupied dwellings.

Ms. Moermond said she couldn't make a decision on permits, and she suggested that Mr. Ruza contact building inspector Jim Bloom.

Ms. Shaff asked how long the vents had been in the buildings. Mr. Ruza said he'd owned the building for 25 years. Ms. Shaff confirmed with Mr. Ruza that what had been called for was insulation on the first three feet of vent as it entered the house. She said the code was not retroactive, and if that was all that had been called for DSI would withdraw the order.

- 3 [ALH 10-184](#) Appeal of Xai and Yer Xiong to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 2030 Fourth Street East. (Ward 7)
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Legislative History**
- 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 4-inch variance on the openable width of the egress window in the upper floor bedroom (swing-out window) measuring 16w by 40h. Deny the egress window in the second crank-out window with dimensions of 13w by 54h and granted an extension to December 31, 2010 for the window to come into compliance.
- 4 [ALH 10-180](#) Appeal of Bruce Mitchell to a Fire Inspection Correction Order at 499 Lynnhurst Avenue West. (Ward 4)
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Legislative History**
- 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
No one appeared. Deny the appeal.
- 5 [ALH 10-181](#) Appeal of Sharon Murphy to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 1831-1833 Orange Avenue East. (Ward 6)
- Sponsors:** Bostrom
- Legislative History**
- 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant the appeal for Items 4 and 13 (dryer vents); grant a 7-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows for both units measuring 17 inches high by 31 inches wide (Item 7); deny the appeal for Items 10 (provide/maintain interior in a clean and sanitary condition), 18, 19 and 21.
- 6 [ALH 10-182](#) Appeal of Barbara Madigan to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 1499 Pacific Street. (Ward 7)
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Legislative History**
- 9/14/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Ms. Moermond asked for a progress report. Inspector Shaff said the matter had been continued for 60 days so the appellants could finalize the sober house licensing process. She said the re-application for the license had been submitted on September 1 and was still being reviewed, the July 1 window permit application was still open, and a Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) parking variance hearing was scheduled for October 4. She said the garage had been changed to a living space without applicable permissions and permits. Ms. Moermond asked whether that had been discovered during the sober house application review process. Ms. Shaff said the department knew about the

garage and parking issues at the time the application was filed.

Ms. Moermond asked Ms. Madigan why it had taken so long to submit the sober house license application. Ms. Madigan said they'd received a reply from DSI on July 13 regarding their original application and had not understood the need for a parking variance. She said she had contacted Council President Lantry who had received a clarification from Corine Tilley, and the variance application had been completed and filed. She provided a copy of her correspondence with Ms. Tilley. Mr. Madigan said they had joined and been inspected by the Minnesota Association of Sober Houses (MASH) since the July hearing. He said the windows were done but had not had a final inspection. He said there was a concrete slab in front of the house for four cars and they hadn't understood the variance requirement.

Ms. Moermond asked how many residents there were. Mr. Madigan said there were seven in the house; he said it as a six-bedroom home not including the garage area. Ms. Moermond asked whether there was a bedroom in the garage area. Mr. Madigan said there was but there would be access to the house if a service door was put onto the house. Ms. Madigan said the bedroom was not in the actual garage.

Ms. Moermond noted that there was nothing in the orders addressing a bedroom in the garage. Ms. Madigan provided a floor plan of the house; she said the garage was a family room and not a bedroom.

Ms. Shaff said there were no permits for the conversion. Mr. Madigan said the house in the condition it was in when they purchased it and the only change they'd made was removing the garage door and putting in a wall. He acknowledged that it had been done without a permit.

Ms. Shaff confirmed with Mr. Madigan that he'd purchased the house from his father.

Ms. Moermond said she would lay the matter over to October 12 after the BZA hearing.

[BZA app approved 10/19. Appeal granted.]

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings
Continued to November 9

- 7 [ALH 10-183](#) Appeal of Robert Stein of RDS Investments to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 1091 Rose Avenue East. (Ward 6)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Legislative History

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Withdrawn
Withdrawn by property owner

- 8 [ALH 10-179](#) Appeal of Nancy Rowe to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1522 Hague Avenue. (Ward 1)

Sponsors: Carter III

Legislative History

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred to the Legislative Hearings

Nancy Rowe appeared.

Inspector Shaff reported that this is a 3 unit property with one (1) of the units over the garage. The Fire Code is quite specific about the separation between the garage and a dwelling unit. Part of the problem is that the garage and the dwelling unit over it were sharing the same furnace with common venting. The Code requires that not only the ceiling but the walls and all supporting structures be fire protected to give people time to get out of the dwelling unit in case of a fire in the garage. The owner has pulled a permit for sheetrocking the ceiling. The building inspector inspected the sheetrocking. What was actually needed was an occupancy separation.

Ms. Rowe stated that she thought Inspector Shaff's statements were misleading. She had met with the inspector on May 18, 2010 which produced a deficiency list. He knew that the furnace was in the garage and that it was shared with the dwelling above. He asked her to install a sheetrocked ceiling with a fire rated separation and a shut-off valve for the furnace. She complied with the original Order. What happened is that now the inspector said he made a mistake. Now, he said need two (2) separate furnaces, after the whole garage had been sheetrocked. She has complied and spent thousands of dollars to do what needed to be done. Why was this not caught in the first place? We did exactly what we were asked to do and now we need to do it differently. On October 7, 2010, we met with the building inspector, the fire inspector and the mechanical inspector to figure out exactly what needed to be done; and at that time, they still weren't sure what needed to be done. When she got the letter on September 27, 2010, she was very concerned because she worked very hard to comply with the safety issues; the letter was very disturbing. She emailed both Inspector Urmann and Inspector Beumer and was very upset. She expected them to get back to her quickly but they didn't. She called other people who very nice but told her they were not the people with whom she should talk.

Inspector Shaff said that she is looking at the file from 1994 and it appears that the residential heating units were replaced but they were done without any finalization of permits; and it also appears that another unit has been added, not necessarily done under permit. Unfortunately, when things are not done under permit, inspectors don't know what's been done.

Ms. Moermond stated that she has been researching the file and the summary has been quite accurate; however, it appears that the building inspector did not catch that the sheet rocking was to be done with a fire rated separation. The appellant responded that her understanding from the contractor was that she passed the inspection.

Laid Over Items

9 [ALH 10-114](#) Appeal of William Wengler to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 857 GRAND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thune

Legislative History

9/21/10 Legislative Hearings Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings

9/28/10 Legislative Hearings Referred to the City Council

Ms. Moermond will review codes and old orders and put a decision on the record in two weeks. The property owner will provide a letter from Viking

Sprinkler regarding the design plate. The matter will be on the agenda for a City Council public hearing on November 3.

Appellant Bill Wengler appeared.

Ms. Moermond asked what was being appealed. Mr. Wengler said he was appealing Items 15 (lighted exit sign), 16 (sprinkler system design information sign), 18 (unapproved lock), 20 (sprinkler coverage in green room), and 29 (egress door swing).

Inspector Urmann reviewed the code requirements for the items being appealed. He said the note in Item 20 about a licensed electrician was an error.

Ms. Moermond asked about the appeal of Item 15. Mr. Wengler said the exit sign had been moved to its current location to comply with orders from the previous inspector. He said it was lighted and very visible, and was hard-wired with a battery back-up. Ms. Moermond said she would review the old orders.

Mr. Wengler said they had been there 30 years and always complied with orders. He said everything cited had been covered in previous inspections, and he'd never seen a deficiency list like the current one.

Ms. Moermond asked whether the sprinkler system was checked regularly. Mr. Wengler said the system was tested twice a year by a licensed, bonded sprinkler contractor.

Inspector Urmann said Item 16 should be an easy fix. Mr. Wengler said it was not an easy fix. He said it was a large building and the system had been installed in 1980, and had passed all inspections since then. He said the contractor had told him the design plate would cost between \$6,000 and \$10,000, and he couldn't afford that. He said he could provide a letter from the sprinkler contractor stating that the coverage was adequate.

Ms. Moermond asked about the order addressing an illegal lock. Mr. Wengler said there were thumb locks and panic bars everywhere they were required. He said he wasn't present at the inspection and wasn't sure what the inspector was referring to.

Ms. Moermond said Item 20 was not clear because of the statement about a licensed electrician being required. Mr. Urmann said it appeared to address sprinkler coverage in the green room, and the sprinkler contractor should be able to determine whether the coverage was adequate. Mr. Wengler said the green room was added in 1990 and the plan had been approved by the City, and no sprinkler coverage had been required at that time.

Ms. Moermond asked for a clarification of the code citation in the order. Mr. Urmann said the code required that all areas be sprinklered if any were. Mr. Wengler said the sprinkler contractor had told him when the green room was added that a sprinkler system wasn't required; he said if it had been required they would have put it in.

Ms. Moermond asked about the appeal of the order related to door swing. Mr. Wengler said the doors cited were not designated egress doors. Mr. Urmann said the requirement applied to any door that could be used as an exit. Mr. Wengler said that wasn't consistent with what he'd been told by the previous inspector.

Ms. Moermond said she would review codes and old orders and put a decision on the record in two weeks. The property owner will provide a letter from Viking Sprinkler regarding the design plate. The matter will be on the agenda for a City Council public hearing on November 3.

10/5/10

Legislative Hearings

Referred to the City Council

Heard on September 28, 2010

Appellant Bill Wengler appeared.

Ms. Moermond asked what was being appealed. Mr. Wengler said he was appealing Items 15 (lighted exit sign), 16 (sprinkler system design information sign), 18 (unapproved lock), 20 (sprinkler coverage in green room), and 29 (egress door swing).

Inspector Urmann reviewed the code requirements for the items being appealed. He said the note in Item 20 about a licensed electrician was an error.

Ms. Moermond asked about the appeal of Item 15. Mr. Wengler said the exit sign had been moved to its current location to comply with orders from the previous inspector. He said it was lighted and very visible, and was hard-wired with a battery back-up. Ms. Moermond said she would review the old orders.

Mr. Wengler said they had been there 30 years and always complied with orders. He said everything cited had been covered in previous inspections, and he'd never seen a deficiency list like the current one.

Ms. Moermond asked whether the sprinkler system was checked regularly. Mr. Wengler said the system was tested twice a year by a licensed, bonded sprinkler contractor.

Inspector Urmann said Item 16 should be an easy fix. Mr. Wengler said it was not an easy fix. He said it was a large building and the system had been installed in 1980, and had passed all inspections since then. He said the contractor had told him the design plate would cost between \$6,000 and \$10,000, and he couldn't afford that. He said he could provide a letter from the sprinkler contractor stating that the coverage was adequate.

Ms. Moermond asked about the order addressing an illegal lock. Mr. Wengler said there were thumb locks and panic bars everywhere they were required. He said he wasn't present at the inspection and wasn't sure what the inspector was referring to.

Ms. Moermond said Item 20 was not clear because of the statement about a licensed electrician being required. Mr. Urmann said it appeared to address sprinkler coverage in the green room, and the sprinkler contractor should be able to determine whether the coverage was adequate. Mr. Wengler said the green room was added in 1990 and the plan had been approved by the City, and no sprinkler coverage had been required at that time.

Ms. Moermond asked for a clarification of the code citation in the order. Mr. Urmann said the code required that all areas be sprinklered if any were. Mr. Wengler said the sprinkler contractor had told him when the green room was added that a sprinkler system wasn't required; he said if it had been required they would have put it in.

Ms. Moermond asked about the appeal of the order related to door swing. Mr.

Wengler said the doors cited were not designated egress doors. Mr. Urmann said the requirement applied to any door that could be used as an exit. Mr. Wengler said that wasn't consistent with what he'd been told by the previous inspector.

Ms. Moermond said she would review codes and old orders and put a decision on the record in two weeks. The property owner will provide a letter from Viking Sprinkler regarding the design plate. The matter will be on the agenda for a City Council public hearing on November 3.

10 **ALH 10-149** Appeal of Yolanda Menchaca to an Order to Vacate and Vacant Building Registration Notice at 480 Lawson Avenue West.

Sponsors: Helgen

Legislative History

10/5/10 Legislative Hearings Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings
Laid over to October 12. Fire will conduct an inspection of the interior.

Appellant Yolanda Menchaca appeared.

Inspector Dornfeld gave a staff report. He said the property had been referred to Fire because of a water service shut-off on July 22, and Inspector Martin had condemned and transferred it to Vacant Buildings on August 10 because the water was still off. Inspector Kalis inspected the property and opened a Vacant Building file on August 11. The home was in foreclosure, and the bank's attorneys had been in contact with Inspector Kalis and wanted the property vacated. The tenants had been offered and declined a cash for keys option, and were occupying the house illegally. Mr. Dornfeld reviewed Inspector Martin's condemnation list which included furnace and smoke detector affidavits, and windows and screens. He said there he had no confirmation that water service had been restored.

Ms. Menchaca said the house was placarded on the same day she learned of the bank ownership. She said they had lost their jobs and let the water service go, but it had been restored on August 24. She said they were working with an attorney to continue to rent the house and were drawing up a lease. She said the door screen had been fixed immediately, all of the window screens had been repaired, and there was a carbon monoxide detector and smoke detectors. She said the previous landlord had not owned the property since April but they'd continued to pay rent through July.

Ms. Moermond asked whether there had been an interior Certificate of Occupancy inspection. Mr. Urmann said there had not.

Ms. Menchaca said the Cash for Keys packet had been sent to the old owner and passed along on August 19 at the same time as the summary abatement notice.

Ms. Moermond noted that the house had been condemned and placarded on August 10, but Ms. Menchaca had not vacated or appealed. Ms. Menchaca said noting had been sent to them, and Inspector Kalis hadn't told them anything about an appeal. She said she had learned about the appeal process by contacting the mayor's office, and had received the summary abatement notice on the same day she'd filed the appeal. Mr. Dornfeld said the summary abatement notice had gone to the old and new owners and to Occupant at 480 Lawson, but the summary abatement was not related to the condemnation. Mr. Urmann said the building was posted when it was condemned, and the placard

includes appeal information. Ms. Menchaca said the order had the wrong address and it took them a few days to contact Inspector Kalis to confirm the address.

Ms. Moermond said she would lay the matter over for a week so there could be an inspection of the interior.

Mr. ? (appeared with appellant) asked whether the placards being referred to were the blue ones on the front and back of the house. Mr. Dornfeld said the initial placard would have been white. Mr. ? said the only placard on the house was blue, was on the front and back of the house, and they'd received one visit from Inspector Kalis. Ms. Menchaca said the placard had the wrong address. Mr. ? said the notice gave them five days to vacate; he reiterated that they hadn't known about the appeal process until he called the mayor's office.

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred to the City Council
Grant an extension to November 8 to vacate the building.

11 [ALH 10-140](#) Appeal of Justin Bowser to a Fire Inspection Order at 312 BURGESS STREET.

Sponsors: Helgen

Legislative History

9/28/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution

Deny the appeal and grant the following extensions:

- Item 1 (exterior painting): May 30, 2011
- Item 4 (parking surface): 60 days (Class V may be used)
- Item 5 (porch foundation): Forthcoming. Ms Moermond will ask Dave Tank for his assessment.
- Item 9 (deconversion of third floor): Three years or until the end of the current tenancy, whichever comes first.
- Item 10 (egress windows): December 31, 2010
- Item 16 (cupboards): Laid over for two weeks. The inspector will clarify the order at the reinspection. The item will be heard on October 12 at 1:30 if necessary.

Appellant Justin Bowser (9700 275th Street, Chisago City, MN 55013) appeared.

Inspector Urmann reviewed the items being appealed. He said the property owner had attempted over the course of two years to paint the exterior of the building (Item 1) but the product peeled and the inspector was unable to approve it. He said the parking surface (Item 4) was not being maintained, the deconversion plan for the vacant third floor (Item 5) had not been submitted, and work had been done without a permit.

Mr. Bowser said the inspector had verbally given an extension to spring 2011 for painting the exterior but the letter didn't reflect that. He said he had painted it two or three years before and the paint hadn't adhered; he acknowledged that a good portion needed to be painted again. He said he'd been trying to control the weeds in the parking surface, and he asked whether he could add more Class V rather than paving it with asphalt. He said it was in better condition than the alley. He said a building inspector had looked at the porch and found nothing structurally wrong with the foundation. He said he currently had tenants living in Unit 2 who did not need the third floor space and he would like to use it just for storage. He said the egress window size (Item 10) was now

adequate but he'd been told it was still out of compliance because it exited to the porch; he asked whether he could have a variance. He said he was working with Ramsey County to have all of the windows replaced as part of the lead-based paint program. He said the inspector was coming to look at a storage area he'd built under the stairs (Item 12). He said he didn't know what was being referred to in Item 16, and Item 18 addressed the third floor.

Ms. Moermond said she would recommend an extension to May 30, 2011 for the exterior painting. She asked whether there were photographs of the parking surface and whether the alley was gravel. Mr. Bowser said it was gravel. Ms. Moermond said adding more Class V to repair the parking surface was acceptable as long as the material was durable and dustless, and the surface was in a defined area and maintained. She said she would grant 60 days for compliance on the parking surface. Mr. Bowser confirmed that a permit was not required for that work.

Ms. Moermond asked about the porch and roof. Mr. Bowser said the roof had needed caulking and been taken care of, and there was nothing structurally wrong with the porch. Ms. Moermond asked when the building inspector had looked at the porch. Mr. Bowser said he'd asked the inspector to look at the porch when he was there to inspect the back steps. Ms. Moermond said she'd speak with the building inspector about the porch and her decision on that item would be forthcoming.

Ms. Moermond asked Mr. Bowser what his plans were for the third floor. Mr. Bowser said the tenant didn't need the space, had a lease until March and might want to renew it. Ms. Moermond said the space had to be deconverted. Mr. Bowser said he'd removed the kitchen except for the refrigerator. Ms. Moermond asked for a time certain for completion of the deconversion. Mr. Bowser asked if he could have three or four years and use the area for storage in the meantime. Mr. Urmann said storage was occupancy as far as the code was concerned. Ms. Moermond said the refrigerator that was already there could stay but the third floor could not be used for other storage. She said she would grant three years or until the end of the current tenancy for deconversion.

Ms. Moermond said she would grant until December 31 for completion of the Ramsey County lead abatement (egress window replacement). Mr. Bowser said the inspector had first cited the openable area and when that was corrected had cited that it exited into the porch. Ms. Moermond said the orders were not written that way but it was still a code issue. Mr. Urmann said it may have been that the room was not being used for sleeping at the time of the first inspection. Mr. Bowser said the room was vacant. Ms. Moermond said the window would be in compliance if the porch was not enclosed. She reiterated that the issue wasn't currently in the orders.

Mr. Bowser asked for clarification of Item 16 relating to cabinets. Ms. Moermond asked whether all of the cabinets were in good condition. Mr. Bowser said they'd been painted. Ms. Moermond said she would lay the matter over for two weeks. She asked that Mr. Bowser accompany the inspector at the reinspection to have the items clarified, and she asked Mr. Urmann to be present at the reinspection as well. She said a follow-up hearing would take place on October 12 at 1:30 if necessary.

October 1, 2010: DSI staff confirmed at the reinspection that the cupboards had been removed.

10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings
Item 16 - per DSI staff, cupboards were removed; Item 5 - Still forthcoming

Window Orders

- 12 [ALH 10-169](#) Appeal Renewal by Anderson, represented by Bryan Horton, on behalf of Mona Koebele to a Building Permit Denial for Non-Compliant Egress Windows at 1369 Avon Street North. (Ward 5)
Sponsors: Helgen
Legislative History
 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 1 and 1/8-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 22 7/8 inches high by 32 inches wide.
- 13 [ALH 10-185](#) Appeal of Gerald Peterson to a Building Permit Non-Compliance Determination for Egress Window Dimensions at 1795 Hillcrest Avenue. (Ward 3)
Sponsors: Harris
Legislative History
 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 4.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows measuring 19.5 inches high by 27.5 inches wide.
- 14 [ALH 10-186](#) Appeal of Jay Bockoven of JWB Construction to a Building Permit Denial Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1949 Old Hudson Road.
Sponsors: Lantry
Legislative History
 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 1.15-inch variance on the openable width of five replacement bedroom egress windows measuring 40.14 inches high by 18.84 inches wide.
- 15 [ALH 10-187](#) Appeal of Jay Bockoven of JWB Construction to a Building Permit Denial Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 365 Luella Street North. (Ward 7)
Sponsors: Lantry
Legislative History
 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 1.15-inch variance on the openable width of sixteen replacement bedroom egress windows measuring 40.14 inches high by 18.84 inches wide.
- 16 [ALH 10-188](#) Appeal of Teri Breton to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 1337 Portland Avenue. (Ward 1)
Sponsors: Carter III
Legislative History
 10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in the lower level southeast and northwest bedrooms measuring 23 inches high by 27 inches wide and grant a 3.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress

windows in the upper level south and north bedrooms measuring 20.5 inches high by 27 inches wide.

- 17 [ALH 10-189](#) Appeal of Jeff Anderson to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 1231 Raymond Avenue. (Ward 4)
Sponsors: Stark
Legislative History
10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable width of the egress bedroom window in Unit #1 measuring 24 inches high by 17 inches wide.
- 18 [ALH 10-191](#) Appeal of James Lennon of New Library Management to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 1052 Agate Street. (Ward 5)
Sponsors: Helgen
Legislative History
10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows in Units 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 measuring 21 inches high by 44 inches wide.
- 19 [ALH 10-192](#) Appeal of Richard G Brovitch to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Order at 45 Luella Street South. (Ward 7)
Sponsors: Lantry
Legislative History
10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 3.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the main floor northwest bedroom measuring 20.5 inches high by 29 inches wide.
- 20 [ALH 10-193](#) Appeal of MBJ Development Corporation to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 2111 Gordon Avenue. (Ward 4)
Sponsors: Stark
Legislative History
10/12/10 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution
Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows in Unit 1 measuring 21 inches high by 27 inches wide.