



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final

Legislative Hearings

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

Tuesday, August 13, 2024

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

1 [RLH RR 24-17](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 887 CHARLES AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the May 1, 2024, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Bowie

Layover to LH September 10, 2024 at 9 am. PO to submit evidence of financing, affidavit, work plan including bids and schedule by noon September 9, 2024.

Voice-mail left at 10:08 am: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about 887 Charles Avenue. We will try reaching you again in 30 to 60 minutes to talk with you about moving forward. We were expecting to have work plans, financing now.

Moermond: we tried reaching out to the owner, Kyle Runbeck, who emailed back he is having cell phone issues. We don't have what we were looking for by today, which is work plans, financing, affidavit, etc. He also indicated he hadn't received the Code Compliance Inspection Report though it was issued July 29. We emailed it to him. I'll continue this to September 10 with the expectation by September 9 he will have delivered those items missing.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/10/2024

2 [RLH RR 23-10](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 1117 JENKS AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the April 19, 2023, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Yang

Recommendation to grant 180 days forthcoming pending submission and approval of financing, affidavit, and copy of purchase agreement.

Eden Spencer, Greater MN Housing Corp, appeared via phone

Moermond: checking in, left a detailed message earlier about where the closing and financing is at?

Spencer: we expect to close next week, it is still with financing. They needed more documentation. We expect final approval any day. I don't foresee any issues; title work is done. Just waiting for our lender, Greater MN Housing Fund to give final underwriting for closing date. It won't take long to close.

Moermond: you've already received bids, right?

Spencer: yes, we have bids and general contractor under contract. We had to have that for financing.

Moermond: those numbers are what?

Spencer: \$160,000. We have a 5% contingency as well for things that pop up.

Moermond: sounds good.

Spencer: I'm 100 percent confident on financing. The timing is what I don't have confidence on but we've worked with them for seven years.

Moermond: when do you want to start rehab once you close?

Spencer: probably just permit length approval. Hoping to get the bulk of exterior work done so we can keep working on interior through the winter. I think our timeline is about a month behind our original timeline.

Moermond: we'll put this in front of Council September 11 and get permits greenlighted before the Council vote hopefully. We'll try and fast track it from this end.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/11/2024

3 RLH RR 23-31

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 455 ROBERT STREET SOUTH within fifteen (15) days after the August 2, 2023, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Noecker

Purchaser to submit financing, affidavit, work plan, bids and schedule and have closing date by COB Friday, August 23, 2024.

Scott Blake, attorney in lieu of Tom Radio, appeared
Jeff Hogue, managing director of Wakota Commercial advisors, appeared
Bob Craft, o/b/o WSCO, appeared

Moermond: when we talked last, this file got sent to Council July 2023. There was the exploration of demo or rehab, sales and marketing plan, working with you to get this sold and rehabbed, but mostly get the nuisance condition abated. Most recently the biggest deal was underground contamination to the parcel to the south. I haven't had any results of the phase 2 environmental review yet. Sales transaction proposed currently. I am needing a closing date and we have to have that rehab plan. I don't have the buyer present and I have a file that's old. I need that commitment to move forward because I'm not willing to ask the Council for more time without a precise end game on this.

Yannarely: some issues with security as far as the fence. Another breach in the fence last week.

Blake: it was general ransack. There was vandalism and discussion between parties

on cost to repair and how it affects the sale price. Buyer has made a counteroffer to account for that vandalism. Our client is considering that. Disputes between quotes to remedy the vandalism. Hopefully we can soon provide a counter or accept theirs. If we agree the rough closing is 30 to 60 days.

Hauge: the delays in this sale have been from outside forces. Not the buyer and seller. She isn't here because she's apprehensive to speak in front of people since she's ESL. The buyer has already purchased equipment for the new restaurant. Seller has reduced price twice already to get it done. The vandalism the last couple of months. Prior to that there has been a lot of lender delays. When they finally did get back to them, there were a lot of requirements. The Phase 2 was done and my understanding was the buyer will get a no action letter from the State. They didn't cause the issues, it's coming from next door. That's all buttoned up. The last item is what we just talked about. Every piece of wire was removed. The electrical boxes removed. Every plumbing part of any value has been removed. We've been as diligent as possible in trying to keep it secure. Oftentimes we know about these because the buyer drives by twice a day every day. We need bids for replacement of everything that's been pirated and coming together on that price. The buyer did float an offer based on her bids. They'll meet in the middle on price. I spoke to Council in Houston last night, and we'll probably close this thing without any lender involvement. It's a cash deal as long as it has been reduced. Take the lender out of the picture because the lender has been so slow.

Moermond: Often with gutting and rebuilding it amounts to the complete rewiring of a building, especially with commercial properties and different uses. Is this not a marginal difference?

Houge: it's a balancing act. The seller doesn't want to give an amount of money based on wiring the building for the end use. The vandals pulled the wire from under the ground, under the street. The bid isn't providing money for the end use, it is replacing what was in there and they would have been able to reuse. That's what the money is towards. They certainly could have reused some of that plumbing and electrical wiring.

Moermond: what's the general idea of dollars?

Houge: \$150,000 to \$250,000. We just have to get that more defined. It is just coming up with a number both parties feel good about. They'll reduce again, we just have to come up with that number.

Moermond: I've been talking to Mr. Radio about providing a plan, buyer developed. Do they have an architect, how close are things to being able to apply for a permit. I've been looking seriously for that so I have something to hang my hat on at Council. Here we are, we'll sell between 30 and 60 days is what you're saying. How long have we been doing this? Is she ready to go? Will she be done in six months? We're in a holding pattern that feels uncomfortable.

Houge: we can't say by August 31 it will be done, but in every deal there's been a roadblock to get over. So many twists and turns. No delay on buyer or seller on this deal. I can give you a floor plan of what she intends to do.

Moermond: I need what she will bring to Department of Safety & Inspections to apply for permits. Contractor bids associated with those plans. That level of analysis. It isn't an accident that this is in this process. This was years of inactivity and it being a significant problem property for the neighborhood. It took a lot to get the owner's attention to have this conversation. I know that was before you were involved. All we

have is a couple of electrical bids and a floor plan, that's hard to bring to Council. Can we put together a schedule about how this job gets done in six months?

Both: yes.

Moermond: this goes to Council next week. I'd like that no later than Monday. If you can get some documentation in it would be really helpful. I'm not working against you but I have to have something to demonstrate progress. Actually, let's aim for August 28 for plans, which I want by August 22. Then I'll have a better idea of what to present to Council. I'd like to see the proposal and purchase documents as well.

Mr. Radio has been great at keeping up to date with memos with the most recent changes, which is useful, but it is time. And we can get an interpreter with even a days' notice, we do it all the time. I don't want that to be an impediment to her advocating for herself.

Craft: do you know there's still a big fence hole in the back of the property? The chain link fence has been removed at the rear, about 10 feet of it. The cutting of the hedge improved access. Whoever cleaned up the trash removed the bush.

Houge: I requested the bush be removed. There was a huge bush which makes it easier for the vandals to hide. We'll get the fence fixed. We'll get property management over there to fix it.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

4 RLH RR 24-29

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 291 STINSON STREET within fifteen (15) days after the September 4, 2024, City Council Public Hearing. (Refer to September 10, 2024 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Bowie

Refer back to LH September 10, 2024 (rescheduled due to property rep family emergency).

No one appeared

Moermond: we've received word from Carrie Nelson that her sister was in a car accident and passed away and would like this continued. We'll push this hearing from today out to September 10. At the Council Public Hearing on September 4, we'll have it referred back.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/4/2024

5 RLH RR 24-30

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 929 YORK AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the September 18, 2024, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Yang

Layover to LH September 10, 2024 for further discussion & review of documents. PO to confirm cancellation of contract for deed, post \$5,000 PD, submit work plan, schedule, bids, financing and affidavit (CPH 9/18).

Alex Delendik, owner o/b/o Homestead Road, appeared

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Delendik: I am the owner of the deed. I sold the property to a General Contractor to fix and due to health reasons he disappeared. That's when the City inspector gave the work order to him. It wasn't a Category 2 in April. He failed to complete the work. The City sent it to be a Category 3 immediately since they saw it was boarded and could be dangerous. He also stopped cooperating with me. I filed for cancellation of the Contract for Deed. After that, I took possession, secured the property, took care of the landscaping and mowing. I did get that Code Compliance Inspection Report too.

Moermond: Mr. Delendik, you are associated with MN Housing Corp, but you also show up with associated with Homestead Road, which is your email address. How do those two things fit together?

Delendik: MN Housing Corp is the owner. We use Homestead Road when we do rentals. This house is probably not very high market price, better to repair and rent it I think. Homestead road is basically a "doing business as".

Moermond: and Mike's contractor was the General Contractor?

Delendik: yes, the one who was to fix the house and failed to do so.

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: The building is a one story, wood frame, single-family dwelling with a detached two-stall garage on a lot of 6,273 square feet. The property did not have a Certificate of Occupancy even though it was non-owner occupied. Certificate of Occupancy inspector referred the property to Vacant Buildings due to utilities shut off by Xcel. Files were opened on November 7, 2022.

The current property owner is Mikes Contracting LLC, per Amanda and Ramsey County Property records. Minnesota Housing Corp indicated they have taken possession of the property; however, a Cancellation of Contract for Deed has not been filed with Ramsey County Property Records to date.

On April 10, 2024, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An Order to Abate a Nuisance Building was posted on June 5, 2024, with a compliance date of July 5, 2024. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code. Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$25,000 on the land and \$79,600 on the building. Real estate taxes are current. The vacant building registration fees were paid by assessment on December 3, 2023. A Code Compliance Inspection was done on July 18, 2024. As of August 12, 2024, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted.

There have been ten Summary Abatement notices since 2022. There have been twelve work orders issued for: Garbage/rubbish, Boarding/securing and Tall grass/weeds. Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$75,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$30,000.

Moermond: have work orders increased or decreased since Mr. Delendik took over?

Yannarely: there's a current Summary Abatement Order. Two Summary Abatement Orders in May. It has been constant. It is boarded, that is why there's more work orders than Summary Abatement Orders.

Delendik: I took possession in June when I got notice of the condemnation.

Moermond: it looks like you received notice July 16 of this hearing and the order to abate a nuisance building June 5 also went to you in St. Louis Park.

Delendik: that's what I got, yes. I have a General Contractor to provide a general estimate, how does the City work on the process if there is a potential investor/buyer. I know you can't sell the deed until it is repaired. Does the City hold the deed in escrow? How does that work?

Moermond: the City at no point is in the ownership change. Sounds like the County Recorder's office hasn't received that contract for deed cancellation yet. There are some loose ends there to deal with. If you want to be transferring to a developer I think it was covered in the emails, but what we look for is an agreement that would provide the property is not transferred until the rehab is completed, or demolished. The nuisance has to be abated before title transfer. You're aiming to get the six-month grant of time for yourself or a partner to get the job done.

Delendik: as far as the cancellation, it takes 60 days in Minnesota. That's why it isn't recorded. We started mowing grass after June. Obviously the potential buyer is scheduled to spend as much as \$75,000 or more they want to have security. I was reading chapter 43 and other paragraphs describing the Category 3 process. I thought I provide the deed but the City holds it in escrow.

Moermond: we have nothing to do with the deed. The City doesn't hold it, it isn't in the chain of title. What the City will say is it doesn't recognize a transaction of this property without arrangements it would be impossible to pull permits.

Delendik: I understand. I've been doing this a while. I got the Category 3 notice.

Moermond: it got your attention. July 16 you got notice of this hearing and the Order to Abate went to you June 5.

Delendik: that's the one I got. The only question I have is I have a general contractor to provide estimate and financials. How does the City work on the process if there is a potential investor contractor, buyer. If I sell to him it isn't allowed until the work is done. How does that work?

Moermond: the City at no point is in the ownership change for the building. Sounds like the County hasn't received that contract for deed cancellation. If you want to sell for a developer, we look for an agreement that would provide the property isn't transferred until the rehabilitation is completed or demolished. The nuisance has to be abated before title can transfer. We have to see and approve a written agreement before a grant of time is made. You're aiming to get the six months from Council for yourself or a partner to get the job done. I can say that this has been a policy in place a long time so buyers aren't unaware of the levels.

Delendik: we have a professional general contractor. It takes 60 days in Minnesota to do that contract for deed cancellation. We took immediate possession in June. When the potential buyer is scheduled to start spending over \$75,000. I was reading chapter 43 describing Category 3, I thought City keeps the deed in escrow.

Moermond: the City has nothing to do with the deed or chain of title. What the City will say is it doesn't recognize the transaction of this property. Without arrangements it is impossible to pull a permit.

Delendik: I understand that. They want to secure their interests before spending \$75,000.

Moermond: the most common is a purchase agreement with addendum or a mortgage that can be foreclosed upon.

Delendik: the other question I have is about timing. Let's say we secure that; can we do the contract for deed again so they become the owner but there's no transfer?

Moermond: you can prepare something for us to look at but that's certainly trickier.

Delendik: and then post the \$5,000 Performance Deposit.

Moermond: once it is posted, if there is performance the \$5,000 is returned. If there isn't, the City has the right to forfeit that money. It is automatically continued if you are at 50% or greater at 6 months, otherwise it is at Council's discretion.

We look for that Performance Deposit, a scope of work, bids from various contractors.

Delendik: does the general contractor need to provide subs, or as a general can he do the total amount and scope of work?

Moermond: we've had general contractors do the whole package, other cases where someone like yourself is managing the subs.

Delendik: is there a way to remove the Vacant Building fee if we're making progress?

Moermond: no, what I would suggest is we revisit this in the assessment process and we can discuss possible proration of the fee.

Delendik: I just want to make the costs clear to the General Contractor. How much time do I have to get this to you?

Moermond: this goes to Council Public Hearing September 18. If you end up needing more time to sort through, what I ask for is to see the \$5,000 posted and the Code Compliance Inspection Report. That tells me you are in and participating. We can talk September 10 if we need too.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/10/2024

10:00 a.m. Hearings

Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

6 [RLH RR 24-32](#) Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 188 ACKER STREET EAST in Council File RLH RR 23-62. (Public hearing continued to September 25, 2024)

Sponsors: Bowie

Continue CPH to September 25, 2024. Recommendation forthcoming pending issuance of CC certificate.

Carolyn Brown appeared o/b/o owner

Staff update by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: Clint Zane was out there and said 90%

Moermond: a great report.

Brown: it is just the front porch. He wanted to talk about the footings and structure. They're meeting with the contractor tomorrow about whether to rebuild or repair.

Moermond: need to verify front footings beneath addition. Built without and with non-compliant footing.

Brown: we'll know more tomorrow.

Moermond: is this an additional cost you hadn't anticipated?

Brown: no. It's a small porch. I feel confident in two weeks.

Moermond: I'll send this to Council on August 28 and I'll ask them to make a finding that it is not yet abated but grant an additional 30 days to complete the project. I'll ask them to lay the matter over to September 25. Hopefully we can just close the book at that time.

Yannarely: her Vacant Building fee is coming due August 19.

Moermond: Ms. Vang, if we get that renewal letter and appeal form. Let's put that on for September 24 here, at 1:00. If you're done I'll recommend the fee is waived, no assessment. The question after that is doing a waiver if you aren't done.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

7 **RLH RR 24-33** Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 1726 FOURTH STREET EAST in Council File RLH RR 23-51. (September 10, 2024 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Johnson

Layover to LH September 10, 2024 at 10 am for further discussion after progress report % given by building inspector. (CPH 9/11)

Carolyn Brown appeared o/b/o owner

Staff report by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: Clint wasn't called for a progress inspection and haven't been since the Code Compliance Inspection. Plumbing permit was cancelled. Mechanical, and building no inspections. Electrical has been finalized.

Moermond: sounds like you're at the beginning?

Brown: we do have a new plumber. HVAC should be almost finalized. We did get the steps done. As soon as they finish 494 Edmund and Lawson, they'll move to start on this address. If I have to call Clint I can.

Moermond: it will no doubt help Clint to give greater percentage complete if mechanical can get its rough in and final. Then the new plumbing permit pulled. Let's get that scheduled. Council Public Hearing August 28. The goal is that 50% to continue the Performance Deposit, or we talk about forfeiture. Let's push the Council Public Hearing to September 11 to get those walk throughs and get contractors to move things forward a bit more.

We can talk September 10th. If it isn't resolved before then, and Council Public Hearing on September 11.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/11/2024

8 [RLH RR 24-31](#) Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 594 BRUNSON AVENUE in Council File RLH RR 24-10.

Sponsors: Noecker

Layover to LH September 10, 2024 at 10 am for further discussion. PO to post additional \$5,000 PD (at which time permits can be pulled again), submit updated financing, schedule, and bids if using new contractor(s).

Elizabeth Sibet, owner, appeared

Moermond: we're checking progress on the work. Most importantly is the Performance Deposit. 50% it is automatically continued. Less than that, it isn't automatic and we have to figure out where to go.

Staff report by Supervisor: there has been no progress according to Mr. Zane. I haven't been there since Code Compliance Inspection Report. Building permit applied for August 9, and is ready but not picked up yet. No other permits applied for.

Moermond: tell me where things are at?

Sibet: the contractor is an older guy and out of town a lot and working on other things. I explored having other contractors. He did apply for the permit recently, was turned away, then received it. I didn't get a call on the plumbing and electrical. I called to schedule but couldn't because permits weren't pulled. We spent thousands of dollars on cleaning. I spent thousands on tree removal. It is clean, secure again. I think the contractor is really committed. He said to get the water and electricity on so he can get working. It was a lot of months of working on his own stuff. That was difficult. I think some other contractors were saying they were on board but wouldn't even get me quotes. This contractor is most likely to get it done, it just didn't go well so far. We've been able to secure it and not have anyone in for a while now, but it has been costly fixing the doors and all of that. No complaints, I've spent a lot mowing and trimming so it looks good outside. He is really committed to getting it done. This has been just the worst financial situation of my life with this house and not knowing it was going to be condemned when I bought it. I would like one last chance for 180 days; I understand I may lose that \$5,000. But if it gets torn down, I have loans, it would be devastating. I do want to make it affordable housing for people. I've had a lot of setbacks. My divorce being finalized. My mom and daughter both being hospitalized. Not making excuses, I have designs I just need them to do the work.

Moermond: I think what may have been throwing this off a bit was the permit desk looking at the calendar being a bit tight with that 180 days. I'm concerned that the plans, money and contractor didn't get the job done in the first six months. In fact, it didn't get it done at all. I'm glad you're mowing, but that's just basic property maintenance. Let's get some updated plans, bids, financing and be able to look at that and plan a course of action. I need a higher level of assurance than what I had before given where we're at. The grant of time is a serious things and cards on the table, I'm looking at asking the Council to require an additional \$5,000 Performance Deposit, but not forfeit the original. That doesn't mean the money is gone at least. Let's talk again and give you a chance to talk to your people and look at your previous plans and go through them again so we have clean information.

Today is the 13th. Could you have updated information in by Friday, September 6?

Sibet: definitely.

Moermond: earlier means we review earlier. I would anticipate I'll ask for an additional \$5,000 and we'll figure out those logistics down the line. Have that in your thoughts. This is doable but the heat is getting turned up.

Sibet: if I needed to change contractors, I lose the \$1,000 for the permit?

Moermond: I'm not saying to change contractors. Sometimes people build in expectations for timing, so maybe a contract change, but that's between you and them.

Sibet: with the \$80,000 I spend on renovation what is the level of standard? Is there a chance they say it doesn't pass? Then I lose the loans?

Moermond: without being a trades inspector the plumber will pull a permit, and it will say it will do all the work on the Code Compliance Inspection Report. This is the minimal list of things. The inspector then comes and does a rough-in and give any corrections needed. Then those are done and permits are finalized. We will continue having conversations about how to make it right, unless we have another 0%. I need accountability but I also want you to be able to do this. Pull together those plans and money, and work on posting another \$5,000. We'll talk again September 10. As soon as the second \$5,000 Performance Deposit is posted, we'll allow permits to continue to be pulled.

[discussion about Vacant Building fee and pending assessments]

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/10/2024

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Correction Orders

9 **RLH CO 24-5** Appeal of Lesley Anizor to a Correction Notice at 692 WILSON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Johnson

Deny the appeal and grant an extension to December 2 to get approval for intermodal container to remain OR be removed by February 3, 2025.

*Lesley Anizor, owner, appeared
Johnathon McClellan, son & attorney, appeared via phone*

Moermond: we had a conversation July 16 and I'll restate the basics. [Moermond gives background of appeals process] July 16 Ms. Anizor was talking about a couple of things, and she was saying this intermodal container had been present for a number of years and thus should be allowed to continue to be there. She was thinking it preceded the existence of code on storage containers and therefore shouldn't be required to abate.

McClellan: my understanding after contacting Code Enforcement was that didn't

come about until 2017 and this was there well before that. I am aware of prior communication and testimony and I would rest on that.

Anizor: isn't there a grandfather clause, didn't you find that out from the inspector?

McClellan: there is for nonconforming zoning but the issue I ran into was that even though they have that they tend to believe it has been policy to grandfather things like this as nonconforming. That's typically how they classify it. That's all I was able to dig up when researching.

Moermond: that's more of a zoning concept than having to do with property maintenance standards. I was able to determine that the Code didn't go into place in 2017, it existed in 2005 and I think in 1999. The problem with the 1999 item was the original ordinance was microfilmed, so the yellow section didn't work well so it was grayed over. That seems to be the juncture at which the code changed. This is exterior maintenance problem under chapter 34. Intermodal containers are not allowed. I am going to say it is problematic to say it can say because it existed before the code. I think previous provisions in the Code before would cover this, either accessory structures or stored materials. I know changes in federal transportation law got us a lot more intermodals and they became more prevalent.

What I'm looking at whether this needs a deeper conversation, can it stay or automatically has to go. If you wanted to build a shed the first question is how it is built, secured to the ground, exits, under MN building code. This is being used as a structure. If a permit was pulled when it was put into the yard, would that permit have been granted and finalized for a large metal cube as opposed to a structure with the code requirements at the time. That's one balancing thing. I am not the building official. The second piece is if it is considered a structure it has to go through plan review and look at setbacks and property lines. That goes back to the beginning of zoning. I'm going to ask that this be a permitted structure and the changes be made to make it a permanent structure, or it be removed. The Council may look at it differently. I do believe the minimum property maintenance code applies. If you would have built a shed this size, you would have had to pull a permit building. I'd like to give a reasonable length of time to come to an answer with building and zoning to make this a doable endeavor and also give a time certain for removal that doesn't work. As well as giving you time to talk to Council later, if you want to.

That brings us to a timeline. They will look for some plans to make this qualify as a building under the code. Where it is located is the second question and the person reviewing the permit looks at that as well. They'd give you feedback about that and you can make decisions. This isn't instantaneous. I'd like to send this to Council Wednesday, September 4.

Anizor: I can't do the first week in September.

McClellan: I'm out of town August 28.

Moermond: can you testify by phone?

Anizor: I wouldn't be able to be here. We'll be in Texas so I don't know how well my phone would work. I have two weeks down there.

Moermond: I'll do September 11 and I'll recommend this need to be approved for existence in this location as a structure by---

McClellan: I would ask that if you're asking it to be approved as a structure I would

like something that indicates an acceptable structure but encompass the fact it has been there since the 90's and if there's some type of grandfather provision. That's something the Council should decide.

Moermond: I don't have documentation of when this was put there. You could testify to that. With respect to grandfathering in, I'm not making a finding about whether or not this is grandfathered in, except that I do believe the minimum property maintenance codes do apply. Grandfathering would be a concept you could likely talk about in terms of building or zoning code. The building code would have required you to pull a permit in the past in order for there to be a grandfathering. The building code of 1900 is different than 2024, so no one is making people redesign staircases that are too steep. My recommendation is to deny the appeal but grant an extension to December 2 to get approval for it to be there OR it should be moved by January 2, 2025. I do believe property maintenance will give it to you

Anizor: John, I don't have \$3,000 to move it.

McClellan: one problem is the cost and burden for a homeowner that is elderly and living off Social Security. If the City or Zoning makes a determination that this structure is allowed to stay, then what? Is there room in the order to allow the City to work in this gray area you spoke of earlier. That's my concern, that we're providing the City and Zoning and building permit and everyone to sit over here and operate in this space because they may have something we are unaware of that says yes. I want to be able to have the possibility to work with that within the order, but if the order says we're homing in on it without these other things then we kind of put ourselves in a box without the ability to move and shift as the law does and has. I want to make sure that we have that ability to do that. We can talk to the City and figure this out with them, but we want to make sure they aren't looking at orders saying I'm only complying with this even though it says that.

Moermond: I am not saying this is a structure right now. There is an actual building code definition of a structure and I am not implying that is what this is. I am saying there are other people who need to make that determination.

My thought on giving to December 2 is to allow adequate time for there to be these conversations, permit applications, zoning review and handling any disagreement with those conclusions time to appeal. If it isn't, then to figure out a map forward from there. That was my intention. The zoning code isn't gray in my world, neither is the building code. September 11 it will go to Council. You use it as a structure, so let's make it a structure with the proper setup.

McClellan: December is the cold months; I would say it would take more time than that. Is there a review hearing in December? if it ultimately needs to be moved, if we have time to figure that out.

Moermond: what is your ask? Time beyond January 2 to remove if that's what is required?

McClellan: yes.

Moermond: I'm thinking about logistics and MN weather. If we're moving something that size, heavy equipment is involved. I could see my way clear to give another 30 days, but I'm not willing to give a recommendation beyond that. I'll say February 3 if you don't have success. That is the same time frame for executing any changes needed by building or zoning.

McClellan: I would be remiss if I didn't mention there's been discussion about increasing the property size, buying the property next door. That may change some things. The streets have changed since the placement of that container, so to get a truck in that space, I'm thinking about snow on the ground and ice and navigating the streets. Logistically I obviously have concerns about that having been there and seen the container.

I didn't create this situation. I'm doing my best. I know Ms. Anizor was using the neighbor's backyard to be able to drive out. Is that what you were describing before?

Anizor: yeah, because you guys took out my---

McClellan: Mom, this isn't about that. This is about the container specifically in relation to the property and property lines and logistics, but also how to work with the City to get it so it is an acceptable structure. Also, how the City deals with prior construction on a property in relation to new code. That's something we can talk about with the Council and ordinances. They may have something they're willing to accept because of these reasons. It is my understanding that the Hearing Officer is saying that's what she needs to be able to let it stay. It has to pass through that process, whatever it is. Setting a timeline around that for compliance.

Moermond: any other questions today?

Both: no.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/11/2024

Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

10 [RLH SAO 24-48](#) Appeal of Michael Nayman to a Notice to Cut Tall Grass and/or Weeds at 1818 BLAIR AVENUE. (Legislative Hearing August 13, 2024)

Sponsors: Jalali

Grant extension to August 26, 2024 for compliance.

Michael Nayman, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Moermond: I have photos from when the orders were written and then updated photos from this morning.

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: we received a tall grass and weeds complaint, orders issued July 19, 2024 for grass and weeds over 8". The reinspection was to be July 23, we noticed the entire boulevard and yard is probably six feet tall. I'm not sure if this is weeds or intended to be a boulevard planting, but even so they can't be above 36". We can't even see the address number on the home due to the tall grass.

Moermond: I do see some things have been taken care of. Less volume. I see progress.

Martin: the side of the property has been cut back, but still overhangs into the street. The front is still not in compliance. Still can't see address numbers. Work to do to bring into compliance.

Nayman: normally they don't get that tall, but due to the rain it has amazed me how tall it has gotten. It is goldenrod, it is a Minnesota wildflower and it promotes pollinating insects. Those I would like to leave. They should be done blooming within a couple of weeks. I'd like to wait until that happens then I'm glad to cut them. I thought I'd pretty much complied with the original orders. There are many boulevards with sunflowers on them in my neighborhood. Many flowers on people's boulevards higher than 36" so I didn't realize it was a thing. I would like to keep the goldenrod until they're done blooming, then I'm happy to remove them completely, it has gotten out of hand even for me.

Moermond: here's the thing, setting the pollinator issues aside, the primary issue is the height. That's all about visibility. You have to be able to see the kid on the trike coming out from behind the overgrowth and not being hit by a car. That's why its 18" when within 5' of driveway or intersections. In terms of getting that down, I am happy to work on an extension but not a long one. Moving forward you are more than welcome to have pollinators of that height as long as they don't qualify as tall grass and weeds. The State of MN defines clearly what native plantings are. You're looking at managed natural landscapes I think. We can send you a copy of that. I know the original order talks about just tall grass and weeds. This looks four to six feet tall.

Council Public Hearing August 21 and give you through the 26th to take care of it. On the 27th we'll take a look to see if it was addressed. Then Council authorizes the City to take action .August 28.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/14/2024

11 [RLH SAO 24-34](#) Appeal of Gonzalo R. Sanchez to a Summary Abatement Order at 1040 BUSH AVENUE.

Sponsors: Yang

Layover to September 10, 2024 at 11 am for discussion of work plan after site visit by inspector(s).

Gonzalo Sanchez, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: Lisa Martin and I are talking about the various orders and permits pulled and trying to get it organized. There are a lot of moving parts. Would it work if there was going to be another inspection from Lisa, a building inspector and an electrical inspector. I'm curious about if there are any hazards that may need to be top priorities and provide assistance that the permits pulled cover the things you are working on. Bottom line is, are you ok with another visit so we can get a cleaned-up list that takes into the building, electrical and yard issues in one package?

Sanchez: yeah, you can come anytime. We've been working around the house. I am still recuperating from my surgery so I'm not very fast.

Moermond: I know you have your wife and the friend who came to the first hearing who was helping. Paulino Ortega? Is he still around?

Sanchez: yes.

Moermond: would you like to talk to the inspectors and figure out a time and then let Mr. Sanchez know that time.

Martin: I noticed he cut the grass and they've been working on the yard. I'll call you

by Friday with that.

Moermond: we'll look at the results and recommendations with concrete deadlines and have it voted on September 18 hopefully.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/10/2024

12 RLH SAO 24-51

Appeal of Michael E. Corcoran to a Summary Abatement Order and two Correction Notices at 1478 AMES AVENUE.

Sponsors: Yang

Layover to LH September 3, 2024 at 11 am for further discussion. PO to submit work plan with timeline/schedule by COB August 30, 2024.

Michael & Angelique Corcoran, owners, appeared

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: we sent a Summary Abatement Order to dispose of the gas cans, cardboard boxes, Compliance date of August 5. Photos attached. Two other orders. One is for vehicles, a correction notice issued the same day, July 24 to remove all boats, commercial vehicles, and vehicles from unapproved parking surface (grass). Compliance date of August 7. One other exterior complaint that is a correction notice, issued the same date by Inspector Williams to secure the shed in the rear yard. We did deem these structures were unsafe. It was referred to the building inspector and Inspector Brash posted a stop work order. I spoke with the owners and am happy to give some time to give compliance.

Moermond: what are you looking for today?

Corcoran: we have been working on this for years. I realize looking at the photos, I realized when snow would start flying I'd start covering it where I could. That happened throughout the years on some of it. I don't have a problem taking care of this stuff. Through the end of the year would be appreciated. I do have a plan for all the cars. Anything there I can take care of. I did speak with Jason regarding my rear deck and everything. I'll see what I can do with him regarding what he wants done. I don't have a problem with anything necessary. I built the house in 2000. Originally was built as if I was going to retire and turn it into a triplex. That won't happen now, but last June I ended up with all the I beams in the backyard and stairways and whatnot to put up proper stairways in the rear of the house. I talked to Jason about this. I ended up purchasing this cheap from work. I'll just take all of it out right now. I do have people who want it. I don't have a problem with taking care of the shed. I did inherit a lot when I got that shed as far as the junk. I bought it from a little old lady.

Angelique: we just need a lot of time. I am handicapped, I can't do things outside anymore. I used to garden and there was a lot of stuff I have accumulated that contributed to this. We just need more time to remove everything we need to. I've been working on it all summer; I just can't do much in one day.

Corcoran: the street out front was being replaced when I built my house. I requested the 17' wide apron in the driveway. The gentleman said as long as I had the parking pad I could park. They gave me the extra apron. I had approval for a driveway that an organization was going to pay for, but they went out of business, so I never got my driveway. That was 2000 when we built the house. I put down the recycled asphalt all the way to the hill. There's a lot in there. Apparently that was supposed to be okay to do, at least I thought so.

Angelique: at that time, you could have asphalt or a certain type of gravel, which was allowed in 2000, and I think it was changed in 2017. So, the asphalt, class 5, was approved back in 2000 because we didn't get our driveway. It is so expensive to tar that much. It was \$50,000 back in 2000.

Corcoran: I had to put those within the property lines when I bought it. They're 60' lots. It's a diagonal street. I had wanted to give the extra lot to my son.

Angelique Corcoran: we have temporary structures they tagged us for, required us to remove.

Martin: a lot would be considered dangerous. A lot of those 2000 permits were done without ever being inspected and closed.

Corcoran: they were giving away permits at half price back then. I was the general on that.

Angelique Corcoran: it would take a couple of years to do it ourselves. But we've called a couple people for help.

Corcoran: I've called Willie to ask about zoning and parking.

Moermond: we can certainly discuss driveway surface, but I'm more concerned about the stuff and the vehicles written up aren't for being on class 5, it was for being parked on the grass.

Martin: yes, there is a lot going on out there. Again, I'd be happy to meet with them out there and walk through the orders and get some timeframes down.

Moermond: I want a "to-do" list with deadlines attached. I'm not willing to look at a 1- or 2-year deadline. This is narrowing it down. I want to have periodic check-ins. Have a plan to my office by August 30. We'll talk about it if needed on September 3. You are the ones who own the development of the plan. Ms. Martin gives feedback on safety issues. I want you to think through what is involved and the timeline. Think through costs.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/3/2024

13 RLH SAO 24-50

Appeal of Virginia Dunivan to a Summary Abatement Order at 1746 LINCOLN AVENUE.

Sponsors: Jost

Grant to October 15, 2024 for compliance.

Virginia Dunivan, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: July 25, 2024 a Summary Abatement Order was issued to owner & occupant for boulevard plants so they don't exceed 36" in height and don't overhang any portion of the sidewalk or street. Photos attached and new ones this as of this morning. Majority are now under 36", still some too high. A private tree.

Dunivan: the City planted that tree. I didn't. I wanted to give the pollinators extra time

with the flowers over 36". It is prime time for them and the reason we did the boulevard. What are the procedures to change the law so we can have plants over 36". 36" in the center of the boulevard I would like to see change.

Moermond: sounds like you have permission from forestry to have that tree, which is great. The other thing is we're talking about a few plants, not a lot, over 36" still. I feel good that it is thinned out enough it isn't creating a visibility problem. I call it the tricycle rule, can you see the trike going down the sidewalk at the alley, driveway, or corner. That isn't an issue here since it's clear. Moving forward it is something you may need to wrestle with that location. As far as changing the ordinance, I would suggest reaching out to Councilmember Jost, and that is typically where things start. It basically comes down to visibility lines.

Dunivan: I have a lot of cars parked in front of my house. Those are harder to see through than plants. I know we are trying to increase the availability for the pollinator it is arbitrary to say three feet.

Moermond: definitely something to talk to Council about. I know City and State law are supportive of that, but your yard is also a place to do so, too. I don't have an answer as far as how it relates to small pedestrians. We can include that information in a follow up letter. I'm comfortable saying you are good to October 1, 2024.

Dunivan: can we do October 15 because with weather there may still be some pollinators.

Moermond: I can go to October 15, yes.

[long discussion about how Department of Safety & Inspection's complaint system works]

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

14 RLH SAO 24-53

Appeal of Angela Glenhue to a Summary Abatement Order at 1941 STANFORD AVENUE.

Sponsors: Jost

Layover to LH August 20, 2024 at 11 am (unable to call PO during hearing window).

Voice-mail left at 1:11: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about the orders at 1941 Stanford. We're calling a bit after the window we gave, so I'd like to continue this to next Tuesday. we'll try to have you at the top of the lineup at 11.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/20/2024

1:00 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

15 RLH VBR 24-43

Appeal of Yia Jef Yang to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Letter at 1688 EUCLID STREET.

Sponsors: Johnson

Grant the appeal and release the property from the VB program.

Ya Jef Yang, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: we were asking you make application for a Fire Certificate of Occupancy and staff said you have. We'll get a quick update from them.

Shaff: the application was received and stamped August 8, 2024.

Moermond: so, I'll recommend the appeal granted and released from the Vacant Building program. Make sure you show up when you get an appointment letter from the Fire Certificate of Occupancy program.

Yang: I did that, and also enrolled in the Landlord 101 class.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

16 RLH VBR 24-41 Appeal of John S. Jagiela to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 134 MONTROSE PLACE.

Sponsors: Jalali

Grant the appeal and release the property from the VB program and allow occupancy of one unit on condition that the other 2 units are not rented/occupied until Fire C of O is reinstated. Balance of orders to be referred to Code Enforcement.

John Jagiela, owner, appeared

Moermond: trying to figure out how to get your needs met while addressing the code violations. I want to ask inspectors about the roof damage and you can occupy one, and the other two can't be lived in until they are certified.

Shaff: Inspector Imbertson did the inspection and he is out so it wasn't possible to confer with him.

Jagiela: how can you tell me that, this is my house. I've lived there 34 years. You're telling me I can't occupy my own house?!

Moermond: I started this out saying I want to work with you, I don't want confrontation. I was looking for a solution that would meet your needs as you described them.

Jagiela: you know how you would feel if someone told you that you couldn't occupy your house.

Moermond: I know if I have Fire Certificate of Occupancy orders and didn't mean the compliance date and I assumed because I had no more renters they would understand that and the orders would evaporate. The thing is, we talked last time these are not orders just for rental properties. It applies to all properties, including owner-occupied properties. You've been broken into, and I have tremendous sympathy for that. At the same time, you weren't there and didn't have a security system. There isn't culpability on the part of the City for that having happened. That happens to a lot of people, owner occupied or not. I want to figure out whether you can occupy the first or second floor based on the nature of the code violations in the second floor and move forward from there. Your paperwork says the second floor is where you occupy.

Jagiela: that's all gone now. My bank accounts, my checks, tax returns. That place is

trashed. They took all the crystal, glasses on the floor. They kicked in the doors. There is supposed to be a procedure for declaring a property a Vacant Building. You're supposed to get a notice, a chance to be heard. That didn't happen here. They sent me the letter after the appeal period expired and they already put my house on the internet as a vacant house. That's a violation of my due process rights. There is responsibility; there is case law in Minnesota that says if you don't provide people with due process under the MN constitution they will be liable.

Moermond: you didn't receive the July 5 notice sent to your address on Montrose?

Jagiela: I received something July 15.

Moermond: I tell you what, if you want to present that information to Council, fine. We're talking about how to get you out from under the Vacant Building registration and what a reasonable approach is. When asking about the second floor, I'm asking them for feedback on the soundness of the ceiling and if there are any electrical concerns with the leaking. If there are, then that directs us one way. If it is just a temporary fix from before keeping water out, it is different.

Jagiela: I live there, you realize that?

Moermond: I understand that is what you've said throughout. I'm just going with it. It is what it is.

Jagiela: you're saying the Fire Inspector, or some other Department, has the authority to tell me I can't live in my house?

Moermond: yes. But we're working on it. Tell me about the second floor and ceiling damage.

Shaff: the upper unit has been uncertified for quite some time, and was not to be occupied. There were people in the first-floor unit at the time Inspector Imbertson stated that at the time of the 10/25/23 approval with corrections, basement and second floor were both uncertified and not approved. Would require plumbing and building permits. Only first floor was occupied as a rental at time of info. Per the owner's info on appeal form they moved out November 2023, and neither of the other units were certified for re-occupancy. It should have been in the Vacant Building program since then.

Jagiela: that property is homestead by Monica Clark, not me.

Shaff: Supervisor Vue pulled up photos from July 25, 2023 showing significant ceiling damage.

Moermond: at that time, it wasn't condemned due to that damage?

Shaff: just uncertified saying you can't occupy it.

Moermond: I'm going to recommend this is released from the Vacant Building program. One unit of the three may be occupied and may not be used as a rental property until Fire Certificate of Occupancy is reinstated. Balance of orders to be referred to Code Enforcement.

Jagiela: I appreciate everything done and I think you did as much as you could.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

17 [RLH VBR 24-44](#) Appeal of Sheree Brundage to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Letter at 931 CHARLES AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bowie

Deny the appeal.

Sheree Brundage, owner, appeared via phone

Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: 931 Charles Ave was made a Category 2 Vacant Building on June 7, 2024 per a form 4 St. Paul Fire Department referral to code enforcement on May 15. That report reads excessive storage/health and safety concerns. Code followed up on the 16th and had no answer at door, but sent an appointment letter. Smith spoke with property owner who said she was not at property due to medical condition. June 6, 2024 Inspector Smith notes that at the inspection he "met property owner's brother and sister as well as 2 other family members helping clean out the property. They were aware of inspection and allowed access. Significant amount of garbage and clutter in entry and living room, couldn't get past living room due to volume. Inspector Kedrowski told me to condemn and not post a placard. property owner's brother informed me they boarded the back door. property owner will not be returning to the property, per the family. Sent to Vacant Building program. I opened the Vacant Building file June 7, 2024 per that referral and issued a Summary Abatement Order for tall grass and weeds. June 25 and July 23 I noticed the property appeared to be vacant, secured and maintained."

Moermond: Ms. Brundage, sounds like you have family helping you and a lot going on. What are you looking for today?

Brundage: I really can't afford a \$2,000 charge. We're trying to work on it and they said it will cost \$10,000 to clean it up. My son reached out to a flipper who offered an amount to take as-is. Then we'll just be done with it. I will just be done with it. I was in the hospital, very sick in May and June, and then when I got out I had to go back for another 10 days. Then I went to transitional care for a week. I'm staying with my sister. I spoke with an attorney, too. That cost me \$4,300, with an additional \$1,500 for incidentals. New will, health care directive, something else. Then \$2,000 to have it boarded.

Moermond: it sounds like you're ready to sell and someone has looked at it and ready to purchase?

Brundage: yes.

Moermond: right now, the concern is the Vacant Building fee. Don't pay that bill. It will then come forward as an assessment. That is an appealable thing, so the people buying it will need to deal with that when they get ahold of it. They can appeal it, if you still owned it you could. At that point I could make it payable over 5 years if you still own it. If someone is in there again, then you may not have any fee at all.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

18 [RLH VBR 24-46](#) Appeal of Megan Giesen to a Vacant Building Registration Notice and Summary Abatement Order at 1676 EUCLID STREET.

Sponsors: Johnson

Grant the appeal and release the property from the VB program.

Meg Giesen appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: was made a Category 1 Vacant Building by me on July 25, 2024 per receiving a Vacant Building registration form from a Bronx Incorporated. They are representing Celine Finance out of Dallas TX. Due to that proactive registration form, we went out to look at the house and found the grass over 2 feet tall and gave the impression it was vacant. Not being maintained. So that file was opened per that referral from the bank. Since then, I talked to Ms. Giesen July 30th who refuted its vacancy and said she would cut the grass. I advised her to file this appeal and told her that is the easiest way to get out of this.

Giesen: I want to be out of the Vacant Building program. I apologize for wasting City resources and taxpayer's dollars on not mowing. I've been trying to get ahold of the bank to figure out what is going on. I purchased it in 2007 from my grandparents who built it. I work 60 hours a week and am the only able-bodied person able to mow. On top of that my mower broke, then I borrowed a friend's after I got the tall grass and weeds notice.

Moermond: it's a Category 1 meaning it's a turnkey property, someone living there is fine. You are there and I don't see any issue other than this institution sent that form. That's not anything definitive. I will recommend the Council grant your appeal and get you out of the Vacant Building program.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

19 [RLH VBR 24-47](#) Appeal of James Swartwood to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 729 FOURTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Johnson

Rescheduled to August 20, 2024 at 1 pm (per PO's request).

Moermond: request to reschedule for one week to next Tuesday, August 20.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/20/2024

20 [RLH VBR 24-45](#) Appeal of Karin Jordahl to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 2184 PRINCETON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Jalali

Grant the appeal and release the property from the VB noting that electrical service has been restored.

[Confirmation by staff of restoration of electrical service on 8/15 - JZ]

Karin Jordahl, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: July 15, 2024 we received a complaint that it appeared vacant and there was tall grass and weeds. Inspected July 15, tall grass and weeds orders issued. July 22, 2024 a Category 1 Vacant Building was opened due to the house appearing to be vacant, tall grass and weeds were documented,

and there has been no water usage since February 15, 2023 according to SPRWS.

Moermond: Ms. Jordahl what is going on?

Jordahl: I live in my house. I have no idea where this is coming from. I've lived here since 2022. I'm baffled. I won an alley award for pollinator garden. I am an herbalist; I grow things I use for natural medicine. I have a front yard of violets I don't need to mow or water. A no mow lawn. Lawn to Lagoons?? Gave me an award. I think that was 2022. I love my home. I put on a front porch. I've done many things. I have my mom in the room who I have been in and out caring for. I find it an overreach that people are checking my water usage. That is complete overreach and an invasion of privacy. Every single tax has been paid on time, even early. Every bill on time. I'm baffled out of my mind. I feel like I need help from the constitution, 1776 style, we the people. I don't feel I need to be pushed into this direction. The City Councilmembers have been illegally put into office. I feel like I'm being targeted because I am a Trump supporter.

Getting back to my home. I've been there since 2002. I've been caring for family members who needed me on site. I've been back and forth, to my home. When they came in July I was probably caring for some relatives. I don't understand this type of threat and it is an overreach of the City in my opinion.

Moermond: when the Vacant Building program gets a complaint a place is vacant and it sort of looks that way. Category 1 means it is in good shape, it is turnkey, they're trying to figure out what is going on. Often they can get a clue from the water usage, as an investigative tool. I think you're right; it isn't definitive. As of August 4, Xcel energy referred it to the City for lack of electric. You do lack that basic facility. I am happy to get you out of the Vacant Building program. Complaints need to get investigated. I just need that electric back on so it I can deem it habitable.

Jordahl: I thought I paid. I had no idea it happened that fast, then when I realized I thought ok.

Moermond: this sounds reasonable. I'll let this sit for a couple of days and give Mr. Dornfeld time to call Xcel and when they confirm the power is back on I'm happy to recommend this appeal is granted and the file closed. I'll lay this over a week. If you can turn a light bulb on, we have no problems. Otherwise, we'll give you a quick ring to see what is going on.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy

21 [RLH VO 24-26](#) Appeal of Mark Thieroff, attorney for owner, to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 251 MARIA AVENUE.

Sponsors: Johnson

Grant through October 18, 2024 for compliance (as permit application was submitted in full to DS/HPD as required as of 8/16/24).

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/28/2024

22 [RLH VO 24-29](#) Appeal of Angela Seard for Willow & Brook to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation and Order to Vacate at 518 DAYTON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bowie

Rescheduled to LH August 20, 2024 at 1:30 pm.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/20/2024