



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final Legislative Hearings

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

Tuesday, May 1, 2012

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 [RLH TA
12-136](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1204B, Assessment No. 128813 at 752 BUSH AVENUE. (Public hearing continued from April 4)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Approve the assessment because the work is not done and the code compliance inspection has expired.

RE: 752 Bush Ave (single family)

No one appeared.

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- nothing's been done on this property*
- there's an expired Code Compliance Report*
- recommends approving the assessment*

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend the Council approve the Vacant Building fee assessment*

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

- 2 **RLH TA
12-268** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1205E, Assessment No. 128305 at 1845 CARROLL AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Delete the assessment due to clerical error by inspector.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

- 3 **RLH TA
12-270** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 88 CLEVELAND AVENUE NORTH.

Sponsors: Stark

Delete the assessment due to the fact that it was on utility equipment on the right of way.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

**4 RLH TA
12-284**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 84 GERANIUM AVENUE WEST.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

**5 RLH TA
12-245**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 208 HOYT AVENUE WEST.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Delete the assessment because a waiver is on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

**6 [RLH TA](#)
[12-247](#)**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1206B, Assessment No. 128105 at 1434 KENNETH STREET.

Sponsors: Tolbert

Reduce from \$416.95 to \$261.95 and spread the payments over 2 years.

RE: 1434 Kenneth St (single family)

Lorraine L, Lutgen, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Emergency Boarding: Saint Paul Police Dept (SPPD) for a total of \$416*
- burglary; forced entry at 7:30 pm Jan 23, 2012*
- police reports*

Ms. Lutgen:

- complimented SPPD - did a wonderful job; officers were very responsive, compassionate and understanding*
- she came home from out of town and walked into the mess*
- burglars used a rammer to ram through a solid wood back door and broke it; the dead bolt came through the dry wall; all of the door frame was pulled off and the lock was still in tact; the door was totally not functional and now, she was there alone (she walked into the house and called 911 immediately; she asked the police to seal the door; Respro came and secured it; she called her contractor the next day to come out and replace the door. When he came, he asked who put the seal in because it was an unacceptable seal; all of the screws/nails were on the outside of the door, not the inside, so that someone could remove those from the exterior part of the door. The contractor re-sealed the door from the inside, securely, so that she could feel safe while the new door was being ordered, etc.*
- burglars took everything*
- is looking for a reduction of the assessment based on: 1) the shoddy nature of the*

seal; 2) the fact that it needed to be redone; and 3) Respro's charge for re-sealing the door (she asked her insurance company what the average cost was for sealing a door when it's an emergency after hours; they said about \$150); she is not OK with a \$416 bill for a job that she feels was not done adequately and isn't consistent with market trends

Ms. Moermond:

- asked staff about the call out rate
- asked staff why the screws were put on the outside, not the inside; thinks it may be standard practice
- boarding/securing an occupied structure is not as common as boarding/securing a vacant structure

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- bidding for securing property is not done very often by the city
- they just recently renewed Respro's contract (done through contract and analysis)
- they was more than 1 bidder
- the lowest qualified bidder gets the job
- more competitive when it's not "emergency" securing situation
- Respro uses a specific screw bit

Ms. Lutgen:

- has worked for Hennepin County and knows that during the bidding process you not only consider the low bid but also the specs of the bid and the quality; you don't necessarily take the lowest bid
- thinks external screws for securing are fine for an abandoned building, but not for an occupied house and one that's already been targeted by burglary; in a house that is occupied, one should secure it so that no one can get in it
- thinks that there should be different specs written for an occupied building vs. a vacant building (Inspector Essling disagreed: a boarding is to secure it until the owner can be called or comes home and then, then the owner can call a contractor; it's not meant to be secured permanently.)

Ms. Moermond:

- it is the owner's responsibility at any time to manage securing their own house
- the police can't leave the scene unsecured; they have to close it up; the Applicant was present but doesn't have the ability to get a contractor at that time at night but the city does have that ability
- maybe there should be a different way to handle securing a door/opening; that can be discussed in the future for perhaps, changing a contract
- she has to, under the Charter, look at whether the service was provided and they did what they had to do
- Appellant is asking for a reduction because of the quality of the work and because it was sealed from the outside
- asked staff whether this is billed out ahead of time (Mr. Yannarely said, "Yes, a charge is billed to the owner." Ms. Lutgen said that she was told not to pay anything until after this hearing, which she would have gladly paid had they told me to pay it.")
- she checked the police report to see what they told the applicant (couldn't tell from the report about the conversation)
- she wants to call one or both of the responding officers and find out what their understanding is of the charges associated with this particular action and if those were communicated to Ms. Lutgen effectively (Ms. Lutgen said she thinks they were responding to her insistence because being alone in a home that's been ransacked with a broken door.....)
- will recommend reducing the assessment from \$416.95 to \$261.95 payable over 2 years.

- will contact Ms. Lutgen regarding her communication with the officer(s)

5/9/12 I reviewed the police report, and it is silent on any discussion about boarding the door, or any costs associated with its boarding. -MM

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

7 [RLH TA](#)
[12-227](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1209A, Assessment No. 128515 at 770 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Forthcoming; need to see the video.

RE: 770 Minnehaha Ave E (duplex)

Dennis Dresler, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- *Summary Abatement Order issued Jan 27, 2012 to clean-up some debris behind the garage and bags of garbage in the rear of the house*
- *compliance: Feb 3, 2012; re-checked it Feb 2, 2012 and sent Work Order to Parks*
- *Parks did the work on Feb 7, 2012*
- *sent to owner in Hudson WI*
- *no returned mail*
- *cost: \$443*
- *have photos; forgot the Video*
- *issued Orders to the neighbors next door for the debris behind the alley too; homeowners are responsible even though it's an unimproved alley*
- *the neighbors cleaned up their part of the right-of-way*
- *show Mr. Dresler his property on the plat map*

Mr. Dresler:

- *asked to see that description of what the clean-up was supposed to be for*
- *he thought the notice didn't really explain what was needed so he called his tenants and asked what was going on; tenants said the canopy fell in the yard and there were a couple bags of recycling in the back; so, he went over and confirmed that and told her to clean up those things; she said that she did; he wasn't aware of and didn't see anything behind the garage; he made sure the yard was cleaned up*
- *doesn't know that the area behind the garage is his property, which is a dead end to the alleyway*
- *when he purchased the property, it was his understanding that his property line was the back end of the garage*
- *you know, dumping is going on back there*

Ms. Moermond:

- *looking at the photo; the unimproved right-of-way dead ends right at Mr. Dresler's property*
- *in the same way that a homeowner is responsible for the boulevard, he is also responsible for the right-of-way (to the center of)*
- *Mr. Dresler could ask for the right-of-way to be vacated; then, it never could be turned into alley*
- *would like to see the Video to get a better idea; evidence*
- *she anticipates decreasing this assessment according to the evidence provided by the Video*

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/15/2012

8 [RLH TA](#)
[12-264](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207G, Assessment No.128707 at 693 ORLEANS STREET.

Sponsors: Thune

Approve the assessment.

RE: 693 Orleans St (single family)

Robert J. Laskey, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Orders sent Jan 31, 2012; compliance Feb 6 for failure to provide trash service*
- re-checked Feb 7, 2012 and found noncompliant*
- sent to owner and Occupant; no returned mail*
- cost: \$200 plus \$155 service charge = \$355 for 1 week of trash service, plus drop-off fee and pick-up fee*
- Summary Abatement Order sent Jan 31, 2-12 regarding several bags of garbage (no visible trash container)*
- perhaps inspector called Waste Management about this or she finally did get the owner's message and then closed it*

Mr. Laskey:

- had been doing some remodeling and his brother put some of the refuse on the blvd without telling him*
- got Notice to remove it - he removed it the next day (he thought the problem was taken care of)*
- a few days later, he got a Notice saying he was being provided with a weekly garbage service (he already took care of that)*
- apparently, there was a record player, fertilizer and a couple other things behind the garage (he wasn't told about that originally; didn't know it was part of the problem - including in the original Notice even though it wasn't mentioned)*
- immediately, he called for garbage service; he tried to let the inspector know about that by phone but he never got a hold of anyone; eventually, the city's container disappeared but the city only picked up 1 week's worth of garbage)*
- he was told about the front trash only so, he took care of that; and they said that if he took care of getting a trash service, the city would not provide a trash service; ("take care of it or....."); Ms. Moermond said what she normally sees is "take care of it or the city will come and do a clean-up")*
- the city's website says that you don't need a garbage service; you can haul it yourself*
- originally, he wasn't Ordered to get a garbage service or told that he would be provided one; it just said, (Ms. Seeley said the hauler Order and the SA were both issued Jan 31, 2012)*
- insisted that he called many, many times but he couldn't get a hold of anybody so, he hit #0 to talk to an operator and she said, "Well, she should be getting your messages." He left multiple messages and never heard back from anyone. (Notes in the file say there was no call from the property owner.)*

Ms. Moermond:

- if you are Ordered to get garbage service, you have to demonstrate that you have provided for that*
- is not thrilled about the dept's record keeping on this but at the same time, there was culpability on the owner's part to communicate back again and before the deadline (compliance date Feb 6); Mr. Laskey called the city the same day he called Waste Management to set up service, which was the same day that the city's*

container showed up (Feb 8); the Waste Management container was dropped off about a week after he called them.

- will recommend approval of the assessment
- City Council may look at this differently; CCPH Jun 20, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

9 [RLH TA
12-283](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. CRT1206, Assessment No. 128205 at 1402 PORTLAND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Reduce the assessment from \$830.00 to \$408.00.

RE: 1402 Portland Ave (apartments)

No one appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

- 14 Unit Fire Certificate of Occupancy fee: \$680 plus service charge of \$150 = \$830
- bill was sent Nov 8, 2011; Dec 8, 2011 to property owner, Laurel March, Biwabik MN
- recommended that 2 of the re-inspections fees at \$136 each = \$272 and the service charge of \$150 be deleted (total \$422)
- there were permits on the property
- inspector went to the property when it was not necessary on 2 occasions
- recommend approval of \$408 inspection fee

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend to City Council that they reduce the assessment to a total of \$408; however, she will change it to maintain the service charge and decrease the department's total to \$258 because Real Estate processed it anyway and the \$150 mistake really goes to the department (DSI)

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

10 [RLH TA
12-275](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1209A, Assessment No. 128515 at 1743 SEVENTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Delete the assessment.

RE: 1743 Seventh St E (duplex) Clean-up J1209A

Raymond Connors, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement issued Feb 6, 2012 for failure to maintain exterior property; compliance Feb 9, 2012
- re-checked Feb 9
- work done Feb 10, 2012 for a cost of \$471
- sent to Lakewood Partners LLC, White Bear Lake, MN and Betty Ann Moses at this address
- a lot of mail was returned for Connors and Moses

Mr. Connors:

- purchased property from Lakewood Partners LLC Jan 10, 2012; didn't get changed over until March 2012; so, he hadn't gotten any Notices
- most of the garbage was the neighbor's garbage - check out the photos
- ordered garage service the week after he purchased property and the previous landlord still maintained his garbage service until the end of Jan 2012 so there were actually 4 containers there but the neighbors keep on taking the containers and using them for their garbage
- after he found that out, he spoke with Mr. Reardon about it; there is still a problem with the neighbors - they have a humungus piles of garbage there (at the end of his fence, so, it sort of looks as though it could be on my property)
- since he has been there, he has hauled out 13 tires, TV, broken furniture that people put right against his garage - he keeps hauling it away; doesn't know what else to do with it
- Mr. Reardon asked Mr. Connors to call him when it piles up so that he can come to get photos
- Mr. Reardon ordered 2 garbage containers more; Mr. Connors already had 2 containers there and so did the previous landlord
- the neighbors have no garbage containers; they throw the garbage on the ground (1741 7th St E)

Ms. Moermond:

- asked if the neighbors have garbage service/containers
- asked Ms. Seeley to check to see if 1741 7th St E has garbage service
- asked why the returned mail (Ms. Seeley said that the purchase was not recorded with the county until Mar 2012 so, they didn't know that Mr. Connors owned the property until later)
- will recommend deleting this assessment; owner didn't receive proper legal notification

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

11 [RLH TA
12-265](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207G, Assessment No. 128707 at 1743 SEVENTH STREET EAST.

.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Delete the assessment.

RE: 1743 Seventh St E (duplex) 3 weeks trash service J1207G

Raymond Connors, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement issued Feb 6, 2012 for failure to provide trash service; compliance Feb 9, 2012
- re-checked Feb 9
- ordered trash hauling service Feb 9, 2012 for a cost of \$555 (3 weeks of trash service 2-15-12 thru 2-29-12)
- sent to Lakewood Partners LLC, White Bear Lake, MN and Betty Ann Moses at this address
- a lot of mail was returned for Moses and Connors

Mr. Connors:

- purchased property from Lakewood Partners LLC Jan 10, 2012; didn't get changed over until March 2012; so, he hadn't gotten any Notices
- most of the garbage was the neighbor's garbage - check out the photos

- ordered garage service the week after he purchased property and the previous landlord still maintained his garbage service until the end of Jan 2012 so there were actually 4 containers there but the neighbors keep on taking the containers and using them for their garbage

- after he found that out, he spoke with Mr. Reardon about it; there is still a problem with the neighbors - they have a humungus piles of garbage there (at the end of his fence, so, it sort of looks as though it could be on my property)

- since he has been there, he has hauled out 13 tires, TV, broken furniture that people put right against his garage - he keeps hauling it away; doesn't know what else to do with it

- Mr. Reardon asked Mr. Connors to call him when it piles up so that he can come to get photos

- Mr. Reardon ordered 2 garbage containers more; Mr. Connors already had 2 containers there and so did the previous landlord

- the neighbors have no garbage containers; they throw the garbage on the ground (1741 7th St E)

Ms. Moermond:

- asked if the neighbors have garbage service/containers

- asked Ms. Seeley to check to see if 1741 7th St E has garbage service

- asked why the returned mail (Ms. Seeley said that the purchase was not recorded with the county until Mar 2012 so, they didn't know that Mr. Connors owned the property until later)

- will recommend deleting this assessment; owner didn't receive proper legal notification

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

12 **RLH TA**
12-274

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 1402 SHERBURNE AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

13 **RLH TA**
12-271

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No.128406 at 1666 SHERBURNE AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

14 **RLH TA**
12-278

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 1032 SIMS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

- 15 **RLH TA**
 12-276
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 1932 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST.
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Delete the assessment. Waiver sent on April 13, 2012.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012**
- 16 **RLH TA**
 12-273
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406 at 2441 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST.
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Delete the assessment. Waiver on file.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012**
- 17 [RLH TA](#)
 [12-142](#)
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1204A, Assessment No. 128812 at 724 WILSON AVENUE. (Public hearing continued from April 4)
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Approve the assessment.*
- RE: 724 Wilson Ave (duplex)*
- No one appeared.*
- Inspector Joe Yannarely:*
- Feb 21, 2012, Ms. Moermond made a deal that with Mr. Brennan that if the property was off the Vacant Building list by May 1, 2012, the Vacant Building fee would be cut in half.
 - the building is not off the VB list
 - the Code Compliance Inspection has not yet been done
 - he spoke with Jim Seeger who said that the building had been broken into, the copper removed and asbestos was all over the place so, the inspectors would not go in there until the asbestos was abated
 - Code Compliance Inspection will be done shortly but obviously, far from any rehab going on
- Ms. Moermond:*
- will recommend approving the assessment.
- Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012**
- 18 [RLH TA](#)
 [12-282](#)
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1209A, Assessment No.128515 at 126 WYOMING STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:** Thune
- DSI staff recommends reducing the assessment from \$443 to \$50. The cleanup was so minor the inspector should have just sent \$50 EC.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**

- 19 **RLH AR** Ratifying Graffiti Removal Services during January 30 to February 26, 2012.
12-58 (File No. J1207P, Assessment No. 128406)

Sponsors: Lantry

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

- 20 **RLH AR** Ratifying Demolition Services during January to February 2012
12-59 (NON-C.D.B.G.Funds). (File No. J1210C, Assessment No. 122010)

Sponsors: Lantry

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

- 21 [RLH AR](#) Ratifying Trash Hauling Services during February 2012. (File No. J1207G,
[12-60](#) Assessment No. 128707)

Sponsors: Lantry

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

- 22 **RLH AR** Ratifying Boarding and Securing Services during February 2012. (File No.
12-61 J1207B, Assessment No. 128107)

Sponsors: Lantry

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2012

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary Abatement Orders

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

- 23 [RLH VO](#) Appeal of DaNeana Ulmer to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation and
[12-28](#) Order to Vacate 1645 BURNS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Forthcoming. Waive the VB fee until August 15, 2012.

RE: 1645 Burns Ave (single family)

DaNeana Ulmer, tenant, appeared, along with owner, Eric Heard.

Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:

- Revocation of a Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate*
- Mar 16, 2012 is the correct date on the letter attached to the appeal*
- vacate date of Apr 16, 2012*
- inspection conducted by Inspector James Thomas*

- 7 items on deficiency list
- case started Nov 2011; have had repeated "no shows" and "no response" for the owner of the property, Eric Heard
- the Appellant is the owner's niece
- no repairs have been done as of the 16th
- not sure about the implications of a HUD owner (HUD notified); Mr. Heard stated that it's not a HUD property anymore

Ms. Moermond:

- the letters were addressed to HUD c/o Eric Heard, P.O. Box 27986, Golden Valley
- DaNeana, in this case, is the Appellant

Mr. Heard:

- he had a HUD property that he had to order a Code Compliance inspection for
- and now, when his name comes up, HUD comes up, as well
- the city continues to send him letters after that property had been sold with HUD on it so, he didn't open them up because he no longer had the HUD property -it had been sold; that address was 317 Topping
- this property, 1645 Burns Ave, is not a HUD property but somehow the HUD record of 317 Topping has been merged with 1645 Burns Ave and so now all the Notices come to him as HUD c/o Eric Heard
- the previous Notices from the city that he has opened addressed to HUD c/o Eric Heard have always been related to the 317 Topping address, so after a while, he stopped opening the Notices

Ms. Shaff:

- the inspector's notes reflect that as early as Dec 2, 2011, the inspector spoke with the owner; so, she believes that the owner is quite aware they are in an inspection process for 1645 Burns Ave
- it is up to the owner to give them current information as to where the mail should be sent; the form is online
- has spoken to Mr. Thomas regarding the letter; Mr. Thomas states that he sent the correct letter and emailed the correct letter; he also states that the owner came down to the office on Apr 24, 2012 stating he filed an appeal and he's not sure of the re-inspection date. Unfortunately, the people at the main counter gave him the incorrect letter

Ms. Ulmer:

- just letting the city know that everything is complete and that when inspector came in Mar, he said that she needed to fix what needed to be fixed; he was mainly concerned about the dryer vent, apparently, the person who installed the vent didn't put in the correct one
- the new person never gave her any paperwork stating how much time she had to finish the work (she's gone all day for work and school)
- she introduced the letter and the email from the inspector
- the inspector said she needed to leave the house
- Mr. Heard had come down, got the letter of which she was given a copy
- she sent an email to the inspector asking for a little more time but he said no; he said I should file an appeal (filed Apr 24) and get the work done

Ms. Moermond:

- there was confusion with the date
- there are some repairs that are on-going
- asked what the Order looked like after they gained access
- straight forward simple set of Orders

Ms. Shaff:

- Dec 2, 2012 - first inspection; he wrote Correction Orders and when he spoke with the owner who said that when he gets letters from the city, he just throws them away
- Jan 20, 2012 - next inspection;
- Feb 21, 2012 - inspection "no show"
- Mar 16, 2012 - inspection "no show" by owner
- there is a residential heating report - received last week (the carbon dioxide number seems low; need to re-check)

Ms. Ulmer:

- she, not the owner, got the work done; she, not the owner, paid for it, too
- \$150 for the plumber; \$2?? for the furnace and dryer vent
- pays \$1,100 in rent
- has a family; does not have Section 8 assistance

Ms. Moermond:

- told Mr. Heard that he had no idea how disappointed she was she is in this situation; he has no idea what a bad landlord he has been
- Mr. Heard said he was not really a landlord but he is collecting the rent
- told Mr. Heard he is the responsible party here (he said that it was not what she thought it was; he doesn't think that he needs to explain to her; it's a family matter, an extended family issue) Ms. Moermond said she wasn't accepting that. He was throwing away the city mail and collecting the rent. Whether it's a family member or not, he is saying that the C of O needs to be taken care of by the resident but the law says otherwise. The city is holding Mr. Heard responsible and accountable; he's the owner. Mr. Heard said the situation is not what it seems to be and he doesn't think that an explanation is relevant.
- these are basic repairs and if a permit needs to be pulled, it's on Mr. Heard
- Ms. Ulmer's appeal is her decision to be made
- Ms. Ulmer says the work is done and she wants to stay in the house; she made sure the work was done and she paid for them
- Ms. Ulmer will take the cost for the work she paid for off her rent
- directed Mr. Heard to open the mail and show up for the appointments
- the house should have been vacated on Apr 16, 2012, legitimately
- Mr. Thomas will need to re-inspect between now and May 15, 2012
- this decision will be forthcoming for May 16, 2012 at City Council Public Hearing
- between now and then Ms. Ulmer will not have to leave
- if the work hasn't been done to the inspector's satisfaction on May 16, she will ask the City Council to make the vacate date Jun 1, 2012
- Mr. Heard will let the tenant know when the inspector will come to re-inspect (he said he will check his P.O. Box more frequently)

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

24 [RLH VO](#)
[12-27](#)

Appeal of Sunshine Quinn to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate and Vacant Building Registration at 631 THOMAS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Deny the appeal. Appellant will need to order a Code Compliance Inspection. Waive the VB fee until August 15, 2012.

RE: 631 Thomas Ave (duplex)

Sunshine Quinn, owner, appeared. Mai Vang interpreted.

Fire Inspector Mike Urmann:

- I referred this on to Inspector Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings
- started as a fire inspection Oct 2011; came to them under a referral as a building in disrepair and in foreclosure
- bldg was unoccupied but not at a point where he could Revoke VB because it wasn't a vacant building under the standard definition
- recently, he found that the bldg was being gutted and work was being done without permits
- lots of debris outside; lots of broken windows; he was unaware that it had been sold to a new owner
- because of the condition of the building last month, he had to Revoke the Certificate of Occupancy and send it to the Vacant Building Program
- interior walls had been torn out; see photos; all of the debris is outside the structure
- this is a duplex with a carriage house in the back
- 2 units in the front bldg (631) are vacant and are under demolition and rehab; there are no licensed contractors or permits
- he has not been able to see or gain access to the carriage house

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

- opened a Category 2 Vacant Building file as a result of the Certificate of Occupancy Revocation
- at the time of his inspection, he, too, could not gain entry
- photos were taken looking over a fence
- appears that the duplex is being stripped down without permit
- lots of scrap wood in the yard
- Mr. Peng stopped by the office last Friday to discuss what was going on at this address (Mr. Urmann had a similar conversation with Mr. Peng)
- they were intending to rehab the duplex and occupying the rear carriage house
- thinks that the property owners do not understand the Certificate of Occupancy Program or the Vacant Building Program
- the duplex is currently unoccupied; the carriage house is occupied by the owners

Ms. Quinn:

- bought property Feb 2012; told realtor that they did not want to buy property that needed a code compliance; they were told that this property has no code compliance
- as soon as they bought it, they began to fix it up but they are from out of state and were not aware that permits needed to be pulled
- are living in the carriage house and there is no nuisance that they are aware of
- they hadn't ordered a code compliance inspection because they didn't know about it
- they put electrical wiring in
- they weren't given any kind of documents about the condition of the house
- they were told by their realtor that they could fix up the house any way they wanted to
- they have taken down walls are will put up new walls
- does not want to have to do a code compliance

Mr. Urmann:

- does not see any inspection being provided to them at all; was there a Truth in Sale and Housing? (Ms. Moermond sees a Jan 2012 TISH Report but it doesn't say that it's a vacant building; it wasn't one at the time)
- through the windows, he could see that most of the interior walls are now missing; down to studs in 75% of the structure

Ms. Moermond:

- the problem: the front duplex is unoccupied and it's ripped up which means that it does constitute a nuisance; the construction is incomplete and therefore, not

habitable

- definition of a Vacant Building: you have an empty building with something else going on; if there are major code deficiencies, it's a building that has to have a code compliance inspection. The fact that the walls have been ripped out does mean that it has major code deficiencies. It's a Category 2 VB so it would need to have a code compliance inspection and before it can be re-occupied, it needs a Code Compliance Certificate

- paying the annual VB fee: she is willing to be flexible on when the VB fee would begin (could waive it for a while); Apr 24 is anniversary date

- next you need to pull permits and rehab the building

PAUSE while Ms. Quinn discusses the situation with her uncle; Mai Vang also participated in the discussion.

Ms. Vang:

- Ms. Quinn thinks there's no other way and Ms. Moermond is so insistent about needing the Code Compliance Inspection; so, they will order the Code Compliance Inspection

Ms. Moermond:

- Ms. Quinn needs to have all work stop at the duplex; they can pull permits for the carriage house and work on it, but not the duplex

- she will notify the Sr. Trades inspector to red tag the the building activities being pursued without a permit

- permits will need to be pulled once work commences on the duplex, as well

- will recommend that the City Council waive the Vacant Building fee until Aug 15, 2012

- will recommend the appeal be denied; Appellant will need to order a Code Compliance Inspection

Mr. Urmann:

- noted that the duplex and the carriage house both have the same address so, they will have to designate that they are pulling permits for the carriage house or they won't be able to get a permit for that address (Mr. Dornfeld will also make a note of that)

Ms. Vang:

- Ms. Quinn had to leaver earlier but want to put on the record that she was not at all happy with the result of this hearing

- she was upset about the outcome because she was not aware of the city code; she was told by her real estate agent that she could fix it in any way she wanted, not realizing that she needed to pull permits. She is new to Minnesota and because she is not aware of the codes and permits, this should be forgiven and this be changed to a Category 1 and she would not have to go through Code Compliance

Ms. Moermond:

- Ms. Quinn's realtor was incorrect in saying they could do anything they wanted without pulling a permit and perhaps she has a claim against the realtor, in this case, for not accurately portraying the situation; in spite of the fact that she didn't know, she has to comply. This situation exists; you have to pull permits to do this work. It's outside anything the realtor can speak to.

Ms. Vang:

- noted that at that time, it wasn't a Category 2 until she took out the walls, etc. It was an unoccupied building when she bought it but when she started to take out the walls, she turned it into a Cateogry 2 VB

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

25 [RLH VO
12-29](#)

Appeal of Joel Ashbacher to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation and Order to Vacate 104 DALE STREET.

Sponsors: Carter III

Laid over to May 15 Legislative Hearing. City Council on May 16.

RE: 104 Dale St (single family)

Joel Ashbacher, tenant, appeared.

Fire Supervisor Leanna Schaff:

- *Revocation of a Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate*
- *Apr 12, 2012 inspection conducted by Inspector Bill Beumer*
- *part of the issue here is the long history of noncompliance*
- *1st appointment letter sent Aug 2011 and re-scheduled*
- *multiple "no shows"*
- *haven't been able to gain access to the interior at all and have had repeated "no response"*
- *property owner's dad, Joe Ryan, is the local contact*
- *asked Mr. Ashbacher if he noticed the Revocation sign posted on the door (Mr. Ashbacher said he did not see anything posted on the door)*

Mr. Ashbacher:

- *moved into the house a week ago*
- *about 2-3 years ago, he also rented this property from the owner, James Ryan; now, he's back*
- *a gentleman named Art had been living there pretending to be the owner (was recently evicted); he had rented out rooms to other people*
- *they have been working on the deficiency list and have made quite a bit of headway (James, who lives in Miami, and he are working together)*
- *since he just moved in, he doesn't want to move back out right away*
- *is asking for more time*
- *James' father, Joe Ryan, lives here and is helping him fix things*
- *the biggest item on the list is the vent pipe that goes up from the furnace and water heater; it needs to be lined (need permit for)*
- *he requested that before he moved in, some things needed to be done*
- *he will be at the property to allow inspector access*
- *the owner did have someone managing the property, Kelly Fleetham, who provided the materials to begin repairs (Ms. Fleetham is no longer managing the property)*
- *when Art moved out, the locks were all changed so Joe Ryan may not have had new keys*
- *asked what they needed to do in order for him to remain in the house; he wants to stay because he loves this house*
- *had emailed what things had been done on the list*

Ms. Moermond:

- *we need Inspector Beumer to look at the interior; need confirmation of things that are checked off as done*
- *wants to see the results of the re-inspection before she comes up with a recommendation, especially, life safety issues*
- *will lay this over to May 15, 2012 LH at 11:30 am; a re-inspection will have happened before then*
- *City Council Public Hearing May 16, 2012*
- *Ms. Shaff will have Inspector Beumer call Mr. Ashbacher to set up an appointment*

for the re-inspection

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

11:30 a.m. Hearings

26

[RLH VO
12-30](#)

Appeal of James Reinitz (tenant) to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation/Condemnation and Order to Vacate at 885 GRAND AVENUE #2.

Sponsors: Thune

Deny the appeal and grant an extension to June 1, 2012 to vacate the property.

RE: 885 Grand Ave #2 (apartments)

James Reinitz, tenant of Unit #2, appeared.

Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:

- photos in Amanda*
- this is part of a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection conducted on Apr 30, 2012 by Michael Efferson*
- in Unit #2, he found issues resulting in the Condemnation*
- obstructed access to bedroom egress window; unsanitary conditions throughout the unit; excessive combustibles; multi plugs; and cigarettes are being put out in the carpet; some bathroom issues, etc.*
- the Condemnation is from being unsanitary and the excessive combustibles*
- vacate date is scheduled for May 17, 2012 from our Orders*

Mr. Reinitz:

- currently, he has a partner, who throws his trash near the sofa where Ms. Shaff said cigarettes are being put out in the carpet*
- asked for a copy of the Orders*
- would like Ms. Moermond to rule that he would be allowed to live there until May 31, 2012 to give him time to pack and clean-up the place; also, he'd like her to rule that his partner not be allowed to reside in that residence*
- he has lived there since 1999 and never had a problem with the inspections*
- his partner moved in about 10 years ago*
- over that time, his partner has had several run-ins with ambulances because of prescription drugs; since Oct 2011, a lot of things have changed (he introduced a 5 page letter)*
- his partner is currently in the hospital and the state is trying to commit him to a facility to get care*
- about one month ago, Mr. Reinitz told his partner that the relationship was over*
- while he's on the prescription drugs, he doesn't know what he is doing*
- his partner takes all his clothes out of the closet and throws them on the floor; Mr. Reinitz has to clean up after him*
- Mr. Reinitz lost his job at Ford in Oct 2011 and he is supposed to be looking for a job but instead, he's been his partner's social worker taking him to Dr.'s appointments, etc. His partner has been in the hospital several times since Oct 2011; when his partner is in the hospital, it gives Mr. Reinitz a chance for some peace and also gives him a chance to clean (every day he spends about 2 hours just picking up after his partner).*
- Monday, last week, Mr. Reinitz got Notice to clean the house for the fire inspector*
- his partner flipped Mr. Reinitz' car on Tuesday and he didn't even realize that he did that*
- Mr. Reinitz is trying to make sure his partner gets committed because that's the only*

way he can get help; he can't live like this anymore
 - he not only needs to clean everything but also split their belongings and he needs time to do that
 - his partner cannot clean, he cannot wash clothes, he can't pick up - he's addicted to prescription drugs
 - Mr. Reinitz will be moving back to his mother's in Minnetonka because he hasn't even had a chance to look for a job
 - partner's commitment hearing is tomorrow; was committed a couple years ago for the same thing; has various states of disorientation

Ms. Moermond:

- there are several critical concerns: 1) you must not obstruct the egress - you've got to be able to get to the egress window in order to get out of it; 2) you need to get rid of the candles, the open flames and the burning items; 3) the unit needs to be in sanitary condition; 4) the volume of material in the unit needs to be decreased (Mr. Reinitz showed Ms. Moermond and Ms. Shaff photos of the way the unit looks today without a lot of the material gone)
 - discussed recycling paper and scanning documents; bank may already have scanned old records
 - need to throw things away; shred paper; get some freedom from the past
 - will recommend an extension to Jun 1, 2012 to clean and sort and pack up
 - hook up with Kay Wittgenstein 266-1285, House Calls Program, Public Health
 - vacate date Jun 1, 2012

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Correction Orders

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 27 [RLH FCO](#) Appeal of James Warren to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice
[11-569](#) at 812 ATLANTIC STREET. (Public hearing continued from January 4)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Deny the appeal. Appellant need to put in good boundary to prevent grass from growing, put in Class 5 and provide adequate drainage.

RE: 812 Atlantic St (duplex)

No one appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

- follow-up
 - Order was to re-surface the driveway
 - photographs now show that there is gravel and very deteriorated asphalt on most of the driveway area; rain water is eroding gravel onto the sidewalk; towards the garage there is a parking area with ill-defined boundaries - it's mud, not Class 5, and there are weeds growing up through it (photos from previous hearing were taken in Dec right after a snow fall)
 - Appellant must take out the asphalt and put in Class 5
 - must provide some boundary on both sides of the driveway

- must provide adequate drainage from the driveway so that it doesn't erode into the right-of-way
- eliminate haphazard parking in the back yard area

Fire Inspector Mike Urmann:

- his photos near the garage also show that there was an asphalt pad there that has deteriorated as well
- he believes that at one time, it all was asphalt but was not maintained

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

**28 RLH FCO
12-249**

Appeal of Dwight Stampley to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1020 FULLER AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Deny the appeal and grant until August 15, 2012 for compliance.

RE: 1020 Fuller Ave (single family)

Dwight D. Stampley and Cynthia L. Stampley, owners, appeared.

Fire Inspector Mike Urmann:

- can give only basic information because there is no written explanation for the appeal
- there is work on the property that needs to be done
- no permit at this point and work is progressing
- 31 items on the deficiency list

Mr. and Mrs. Stampley:

- we are asking for more time on everything
- entered photos
- house was originally Mr. Stampley's parents; then, these Stampley's lived there; then, Mrs. Stampley's mom lived there; then, Mrs. Stampley's sister lived there; then, there was a series of bad renters
- their daughter-in-law died and they are raising their grandchildren
- then, their roof blew off - there's been a lot of stuff
- they wanted their older children to take over the house at 1020 Fuller; however, that hasn't yet worked out
- in the meantime, they haven't done much with the house
- Mr. Stampley would like to sell the house but Mrs. Stampley would like to fix it up and have one of their kids buy it "contract for deed"
- 60 days to make all the required repairs is just not realistic; so, they appeal to see if they can get more time
- Mr. Stampley works rotating shifts and has been too tired to do much fixing and the kids have been too irresponsible
- they want to be in compliance; just need time
- they pay the taxes and take care of the grounds
- Mr. Stampley contacted water utilities last week; something is rusted tight where the water comes in from the street so, now, they need to dig it up to find the problem

Mr. Urmann:

- there are some plumbing issues; some electrical; some mechanical for which you need a licensed contractor under permit (can get a current list of licensed contractors from the Department of Safety and Inspections (DSI))
- the reason he hasn't issued a Condemnation Order on the property is because it is unoccupied at this time

Ms. Moermond:

- this is a difficult situation for the Stampley's
- the house has been empty for quite a while and deferred maintenance has built up; now, it needs a lot of work
- noted that she can stave off the inevitable for a little while but inevitably, this will end up in the Vacant Building Program and need to do a Code Compliance inspection on it (4 trades inspectors go through, write up the violations and what the Appellant needs to do to bring it up to minimum code); she estimated a cost range for possible repairs between \$5,000 and \$25,000
- technically, someone could move into the house
- she can hold off on the VB Program and the Code Compliance inspection for a while but it will end up there unless the Fire Certificate of Occupancy is re-instated and address the items on the list
- she'd rather see this fixed up sooner than later
- if Appellants choose to sell the house, she advised them to sell it now
- will recommend the City Council grant until Aug 15, 2012 to come into compliance
- when that time expires, the work either needs to be complete or the house goes into the Vacant Building Program (Mrs. Stampley noted that it takes months before contractors can come out, sometimes; she thinks 90 days is unrealistic)
- at City Council Public Hearing Jun 6, 2012
- will get an appointment letter from Inspector Sean Westenhofer shortly after Aug 15, 2012

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

29

[RLH FCO
12-251](#)

Appeal of Anthony Westcot, on behalf of G Ventures West, to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1203 REANEY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Rescheduled to May 15.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/15/2012

Window Variances: Hearing Required

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

30

[RLH VBR
12-27](#)

Appeal of Patricia Reyes to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 905 WILSON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Deny the appeal and appellant will need to order a code compliance inspection.

RE: 905 Wilson Ave (single family)

Patricia Reyes, owner, appeared.

Supervisor Rich Singerhouse, Vacant Buildings:

- Vacant Building Registration requirement
- Inspector Nelmark found the house to be empty and opened up a Category 2

Vacant Building Apr 11, 2012 due to the Revocation of Mar 8, 2012

- 28 items listed on the Revocation
- Inspector's notes say it's in pretty bad shape
- the roof needs shingles; peeling paint throughout; lots of exterior work; cracks in foundation; windows; frames; front concrete landing deteriorated

Ms. Reyes:

- purchased the house about 14 years ago and has worked very hard to keep it clean and repaired
- couldn't believe all that needed to be done
- is not familiar with all the required codes
- she did repair many of the items but does not have any more money to continue
- all the jobs require licensed contractors under permits and she can't afford that
- by Dec 2011, she realized she couldn't afford the house; is 4 months behind on her mortgage
- all the money she saved she put into the house
- she asked someone to help with a short sale
- she owes \$130,000 on the house; the short sale price is \$50,000; the only offer was \$30,000
- at this point, she can't sell the house because it's a Category 2 Vacant Building
- she is asking that the house be changed from a Category 2 to a Category 1 so she can sell her house
- she can't afford to put anymore money into it
- she is very sad and depressed; she can't even sleep
- the people who used to live in the house really wanted to buy it and they stayed until the last minute, Mar 27, 2012
- currently, she lives in Rosemount, owns a home with someone else
- she realizes that she should have sold it long ago but it was hard for her; there are a lot of memories
- she doesn't want to rent it anymore

Mr. Singerhouse:

- if Ms. Reyes owes \$130,000; a short sale will not help her

Ms. Moermond:

- thinks Ms. Reyes needs a good credit counselor - someone that she trusts, financially
- it's just a "maybe" that the mortgage bank will forgive the rest of the balance (\$100,000) after the short sale
- if you let the house go back to the bank, you won't make anymore payments on it and it'll be in foreclosure; the city's fees on the house would also go to the bank; they won't follow Mr. Reyes
- she is concerned about Ms. Reyes throwing good money after bad
- this house is empty and in a condition which should be in the Vacant Building Program, according to the city's codes
- suggested Ms. Reyes speak with Laura Carrol in the city's Mortgage Foreclosure Prevention Program (got her on the phone; Ms. Carol will call Ms. Reyes tomorrow because she is really busy this afternoon)
- will recommend denial and the house go into the Vacant Building Program; an \$1,100 annual VB fee goes with that; if that fee isn't paid, it'll become a tax assessment and won't be due until later
- will need to have a Code Compliance inspection unless Ms. Reyes lets it go back to the bank and they they have to do that
- whomever buys the house has to show that they can fix it; you need an inspection report to disclose to them
- asked Ms. Reyes to follow-up with a phone call in about a week

Mr. Singerhouse:

- informed Ms. Reyes that she can sell the house; she'll need either a Code Compliance inspection report or a Truth in Sale and Housing Report to sell a house (disclosure information)

- the buyer has to go through a sale review

Ms. Moermond:

- explained that the person who buys the house needs to show that they have the financial ability to fix it

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

Other

Staff Reports

Window Variances: No Hearing Necessary

- 31** [RLH WP
12-35](#) Appeal of Joe Urbanski, on behalf of J&D Builders Inc, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1954 BEECHWOOD AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Tolbert
- Grant a 4-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the 3rd floor bedroom.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
-
- 32** **RLH WP
12-36** Appeal of Justin Nelson to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 2101 BURNS AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Grant a 7-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 17 inches high by 37 inches wide.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
-
- 33** **RLH FOW
12-148** Appeal of Karry Moua to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 986 BURR STREET.
- Sponsors:** Brendmoen
- Grant a 5.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the 3rd floor bedroom.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
-
- 34** **RLH FOW
12-146** Appeal of Roger Peterson, on behalf of Land Investment Corporation, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 764 COTTAGE AVENUE EAST.
- Sponsors:** Bostrom
- Grant a 2.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in the first*

floor west and east bedroom.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**35 RLH FOW
12-149**

Appeal of Mark Syrstad to a Re-Inspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 1058 FIFTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Grant a 2-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the main floor northwest bedroom.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**36 RLH WP
12-37**

Appeal of Daniel Schmidt, on behalf of Ramsey County Public Health, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 301 GOODHUE STREET.

Sponsors: Thune

Grant a 2-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 22 inches high by 25 inches wide and 22 inches high by 23 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**37 RLH FOW
12-152**

Appeal of Tony Swanson, on behalf of Public Housing Agency of St. Paul, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 753 IGLEHART AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Grant a 4-inch variance on the openable width of the egress windows in 753 first floor bedroom, 753 second floor northeast, northwest, southeast, and southwest bedrooms, 755 first floor bedroom; 755 second floor northwest, northeast, southeast, and southwest bedrooms.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**38 RLH FOW
12-153**

Appeal of Tony Swanson, on behalf of Public Housing Agency of St. Paul, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1180 SUPORNICK LANE.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Grant a 6-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in Units A and B.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**39 RLH WP
12-39**

Appeal of Daniel Schmidt, on behalf of Ramsey County Public Health, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1688 HYACINTH AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Grant a 4.1-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 19.9 inches high by 25.3 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**40 RLH WP
12-40**

Appeal of Daniel Schmidt, on behalf of Ramsey County Public Health, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1131 JESSIE STREET #1.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Grant a 2.8-inch variance on the openable width of one double hung replacement egress bedroom window measuring 27.9 inches high by 17.2 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**41 RLH WP
12-41**

Appeal of Ramsey County Public Housing, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1178 JESSIE STREET, #2.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable width of one double hung replacement egress bedroom window measuring 26 inches high by 19.2 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**42 RLH WP
12-42**

Appeal of Ramsey County Public Health, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1298 SEMINARY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Grant a 4.1-inch variance on the openable height of three double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 19.9 inches high by 25.2 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**43 RLH WP
12-43**

Appeal of Ramsey County Public Health, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1081 STINSON STREET.

Sponsors: Carter III

Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung egress bedroom window measuring 21.9 inches high by 23.1 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

**44 RLH FOW
12-147**

Appeal of Gwynne Evans to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1625 SHERBURNE AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Grant a 1.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows in Units 1 thru 8; grant a 7-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom window and grant a 1-inch variance on the sill height of Unit 9; and a 6-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom window and a 1-inch variance on the sill height of Unit 10.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012