



# 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, March 4, 2025

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

---

#### 9:00 a.m. Hearings

##### Special Tax Assessments

- 1 [RLH TA 25-137](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 606 LAFOND AVENUE. (File No. VB2507, Assessment No. 258806)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Layover to LH March 18, 2025 at 9 am (unable to reach PO).*

*Voicemail left at 9:11 am on x3738: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about 606 LaFond on your Vacant Building assessment. We'll try you again in a little bit.*

*Voicemail left at 9:28 at x3738: trying to reach Inho Chang about a Vacant Building fee assessment. This is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council. We will try to reach you one more time this morning.*

*Voicemail left at 9:39 am at x3738: good morning again Mr. Chang, this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling. We'll try you again March 18th between 9 and 10:30 am. Talk to you then.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/18/2025**

- 2 [RLH TA 25-70](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 733 FAIRVIEW AVENUE NORTH. (File No. VB2506, Assessment No. 258805)

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*Reduce assessment from \$5,077 to \$2,538.*

*No one appeared*

*Tried calling at 9:12: connected but no one responded. Moermond spoke/left possible message indicating it would go to Council March 19 with a recommendation for approval.*

*Tried calling at 9:32 connected and then hung up.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 3 [RLH TA 25-136](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 900 THOMAS AVENUE. (File No. J2507B, Assessment No. 258106)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Layover to LH March 18, 2025 at 9 am (unable to reach PO).*

*Voicemail left at 9:18 am: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling you about an appealed tax assessment for 900 Thomas. We'll try you back in a little bit.*

*Voicemail left at 9:34 am on x0841: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council calling Mary Iverson about an appealed special assessment for a boarding at 900 Thomas. We'll try you back on Tuesday March 18th. Your Council Public Hearing isn't until April 9.*

*9:43 am tried calling again: Straight to Voicemail.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/18/2025**

- 4 **RLH TA 25-106** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 900 LAUREL AVENUE. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Continue CPH to October 1, 2025 and if no same or similar violations reduce assessment from \$440 to \$220; otherwise approve in full.*

*Josiah Overfors, owner, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we're connecting about that cleanup and photo you submitted. Unfortunately, that photo didn't do the trick.*

*Overfors: yeah, I did the best I could. I hope you can see I have cleaned up the alley in the past.*

*Moermond: what I'm thinking is if we can make it through October 1 with no same or similar violations, I'll reduce the assessment by half, down to \$220.*

*Overfors: I appreciate the consideration. What are the chances you could reduce it to \$0 with no further violations.*

*Moermond: the contractor needs to be paid, I don't feel I can go any further, but the Council may look at it differently.*

*Overfors: we'll keep it clean, thanks.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

- 5 **RLH TA 25-88** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 125 WINTER STREET. (File No. J2512R, Assessment No. 258522)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Approve the assessment.*

*Crystal McClure, realtor, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor James Hoffman: Summary Abatement Order sent October 25 to remove Bagster from boulevard. Compliance Date of November 1. Found work not done on recheck November 1. Contractor was out November 4, 2024 and picked up the Bagster as well as a couch and chair next to the house.*

*McClure: I wasn't aware the City did it. I ordered it to be picked up and have text communication with the inspector telling him so. It was only a couple days after my deadline. It is a rental property and because I don't live at the property I didn't receive the mail timely. Once I did get it, it was a couple days past the deadline, but I wasn't aware it was picked up by the City. I just now received this assessment notice.*

*Moermond: the address you gave when notifying Ramsey County was the Winter address. No business address or any other address. That's what was given to the County and registered July 7, 2023.*

*McClure: the plan was to live there and I guess I haven't updated the address since then.*

*Moermond: that's kind of on you. The City needs to notify the owner of record at the address the City has from Ramsey County. You said it is a rental now?*

*McClure: it is.*

*Moermond: you know you need to have a fire Certificate of Occupancy right?*

*McClure: yeah, I need to do that too. I rented to Section 8 and was inspected and approved by them.*

*Moermond: so, you're collecting money but don't have a Certificate of Occupancy. I'm confused you didn't get the notice and then did call the inspector? David Smith is the inspector, Mr. Hoffman are there notes?*

*Hoffman: no.*

*McClure: I'm trying to find my text messages. I'm a real estate agent so I have a gazillion text messages.*

*Moermond: I don't know a text would have gone through; I don't see his cell listed on the orders. It should have bounced back.*

*McClure: maybe it was an email. Or maybe a phone call and a Voicemail. It was a bad tenant and now I just have another eviction, and a tax assessment. I certainly didn't put the couch or chair out there. I was hoping for some leniency. I had the Bagster out there for a limited time, cleaning out from the tenant who was literally doing drugs there. Now I just recently had another eviction after a month, she was also doing drugs. I also paid Waste Management for the pickup.*

*Moermond: you'd have to work out payment with Waste Management. You're saying*

*you have had problems, but it sounds like it hasn't been too pleasant to live nearby either. I know that little area is already having a rough time, it is important to keep things maintained for all the neighbors.*

*McClure: I feel like I'm doing the best to maintain. A Bagster from cleaning up the property there for a couple of weeks—I'm trying to be a good neighbor and citizen. I have a receipt from Waste Management scheduling pickup for November 7.*

*Moermond: I'm not hearing a reason I can decrease or eliminate under the Code. The Council may, that would be your next step and they may look at it differently. I know it isn't the outcome you're looking for but it's the only choice I have right now.*

*McClure: yes.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

**6**      [RLH TA 25-141](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 776 DESOTO STREET. (File No. J2504R, Assessment No. 258504)

**Sponsors:**      Noecker

*Layover to LH March 18, 2025 at 9 am (unable to reach PO).*

*Tried calling at 9:26 am: voicemail box full.*

*Moermond: they indicated they would be coming in person; it went straight to Voicemail which was full. We'll try them back in a little bit, or maybe they will be walking in the door.*

*Tried calling at 9:59 am: mailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Moermond: let's send an email layover to March 18.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/18/2025**

**7**      **RLH TA 25-149**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 718 LAFOND AVENUE. (File No. J2504T, Assessment No. 258507)

**Sponsors:**      Bowie

*Delete the assessment.*

*Caty Royce, Frogtown Neighborhood Association, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: in studying these photos, I see a letter goes out that is automatic for tall grass and weeds. They send an inspector out, June 28th. It was really tall. Sends a work order and then the crew showed up July 9, it was chopped down. It was messy but appears to be under 8". Is that where you coming from?*

*Royce: yes. We had to get someone to do it free, so we did minimal. We did pay someone to go out later and do a better job.*

*Moermond: it wasn't the best job but it meets the requirements so I'll recommend this is deleted.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/26/2025**

- 8      **RLH TA 25-138**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 193 ROBERT STREET SOUTH. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

Sponsors:      Noecker

*Approve the assessment (noting it has already been paid).*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: the owner reviewed the materials sent out and decided he agrees and paid the assessment. Recommend approval.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

- 9      **RLH TA 25-100**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 2177 LINCOLN AVENUE. (File No. J2506T1, Assessment No. 2585) (Amend to delete)

Sponsors:      Jalali

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: recommend deletion; we saw contractor photos that made it appear it was addressed at the time they showed up but it did appear it was taken care of when they got there. We also received photos taken on the cell from his son who did the work and does show progression of his work. Dad was keeping tabs on this one. Recommend deletion.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 10     **RLH TA 25-123**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 42 ST ALBANS STREET SOUTH, UNIT 2B. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

Sponsors:      Noecker

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: this is a group of condos and notice went to 42 St Albans with no unit specification. So, no real notification to owner to address the issue. Then real estate divided the assessment over the six units, but we can't assess for work if no notice was sent to the actual owners.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

- 11     **RLH TA 25-124**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 42 ST ALBANS STREET SOUTH, UNIT 3B. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

Sponsors:      Noecker

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: this is a group of condos and notice went to 42 St Albans with no unit specification. So, no real notification to owner to address the issue. Then real estate divided the assessment over the six units, but we can't assess for work if no notice was sent to the actual owners.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

- 12 RLH TA 25-125** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 42 ST ALBANS STREET SOUTH, UNIT 4B. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: this is a group of condos and notice went to 42 St Albans with no unit specification. So, no real notification to owner to address the issue. Then real estate divided the assessment over the six units, but we can't assess for work if no notice was sent to the actual owners.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

- 13 RLH TA 25-126** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 42 ST ALBANS STREET SOUTH, UNIT 5B. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: this is a group of condos and notice went to 42 St Albans with no unit specification. So, no real notification to owner to address the issue. Then real estate divided the assessment over the six units, but we can't assess for work if no notice was sent to the actual owners.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

- 14 RLH TA 25-127** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 42 ST ALBANS STREET SOUTH, UNIT 6B. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Delete the assessment.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: this is a group of condos and notice went to 42 St Albans with no unit*

*specification. So, no real notification to owner to address the issue. Then real estate divided the assessment over the six units, but we can't assess for work if no notice was sent to the actual owners.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/2/2025**

## 10:00 a.m. Hearings

### Special Tax Assessments

- 15 RLH TA 25-71** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 89 ATWATER STREET (File No. CRT2506, Assessment No. 258205)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Approve the assessment.*

*Michael Buelow, BB Housing, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we discussed three properties about a month ago, 89 Atwater, 49 Manitoba and 754 Payne for Fire Certificate of Occupancy bills. A Substantial amount of info was sent to you for each of these properties. You have all of that now?*

*Buelow: I do.*

*Moermond: questions or comments on 89 Atwater?*

*Buelow: the previous management company I had, which I fired, was negligent in responding to the Fire Marshall. The properties are in excellent condition. These fees are just killing me. This is affordable housing. I don't make a profit month to month off these properties. I guess I'm just appealing to the situation.*

*Moermond: for each of the properties? Any property specific comments?*

*Buelow: same for all 3.*

*Moermond: you hired the management company that created this situation and managing that contract is your responsibility. The City incurred the expense of dispatching the inspector. Giving back that money would be a subsidy to your endeavor, this isn't a way we can provide that assistance, laudable as your goals may be. I'm stuck recommending these are approved. Your next step would be to go to Council.*

*Buelow: when do these go to Council?*

*Moermond: all three are March 19th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 16 RLH TA 25-73** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 49 MANITOBA AVENUE. (File No. CRT2506, Assessment No. 258205)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Approve the assessment.*

*Michael Buelow, BB Housing, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we discussed three properties about a month ago, 89 Atwater, 49 Manitoba and 754 Payne for Fire Certificate of Occupancy bills. A Substantial amount of info was sent to you for each of these properties. You have all of that now?*

*Buelow: I do.*

*Moermond: questions or comments on 89 Atwater?*

*Buelow: the previous management company I had, which I fired, was negligent in responding to the Fire Marshall. The properties are in excellent condition. These fees are just killing me. This is affordable housing. I don't make a profit month to month off these properties. I guess I'm just appealing to the situation.*

*Moermond: for each of the properties? Any property specific comments?*

*Buelow: same for all 3.*

*Moermond: you hired the management company that created this situation and managing that contract is your responsibility. The City incurred the expense of dispatching the inspector. Giving back that money would be a subsidy to your endeavor, this isn't a way we can provide that assistance, laudable as your goals may be. I'm stuck recommending these are approved. Your next step would be to go to Council.*

*Buelow: when do these go to Council?*

*Moermond: all three are March 19th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

**17**     [RLH TA 25-74](#)

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 754 PAYNE AVENUE. (File No. CRT2506, Assessment No. 258205)**

**Sponsors:**     Yang

*Approve the assessment.*

*Michael Buelow, BB Housing, appeared via phone*

*Moermond: we discussed three properties about a month ago, 89 Atwater, 49 Manitoba and 754 Payne for Fire Certificate of Occupancy bills. A Substantial amount of info was sent to you for each of these properties. You have all of that now?*

*Buelow: I do.*

*Moermond: questions or comments on 89 Atwater?*

*Buelow: the previous management company I had, which I fired, was negligent in responding to the Fire Marshall. The properties are in excellent condition. These fees are just killing me. This is affordable housing. I don't make a profit month to month off these properties. I guess I'm just appealing to the situation.*



*Moermond: for each of the properties? Any property specific comments?*

*Buelow: same for all 3.*

*Moermond: you hired the management company that created this situation and managing that contract is your responsibility. The City incurred the expense of dispatching the inspector. Giving back that money would be a subsidy to your endeavor, this isn't a way we can provide that assistance, laudable as your goals may be. I'm stuck recommending these are approved. Your next step would be to go to Council.*

*Buelow: when do these go to Council?*

*Moermond: all three are March 19th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 18     [RLH TA 25-140](#)     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 810 BUFFALO STREET. (File No. J2511R, Assessment No. 258519)

**Sponsors:**     Bowie

*Rescheduled to March 18, 2025 at 10 am (requested by PO).*

*Moermond: they appealed after the original Legislative Hearing date in February, it was put on the agenda today and they've asked to be rescheduled. We'll do that March 18th, Council Public Hearing April 2.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/18/2025**

- 19     **RLH TA 25-129**     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 435 VAN BUREN AVENUE. (File No. J2504E, Assessment No. 258303)

**Sponsors:**     Bowie

*Layover to LH March 18, 2025 at 10 am (unable to reach PO). CPH March 19.*

*Called at 10:45 am: voicemailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Called at 11:16 am: voicemailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Moermond: we'll deal with this again in a couple of weeks. Layover to March 18th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 20     **RLH TA 25-130**     Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 435 VAN BUREN AVENUE. (File No. J2505E, Assessment No. 258304)

**Sponsors:**     Bowie

*Layover to LH March 18, 2025 at 10 am (unable to reach PO). CPH March 19.*

*Called at 10:45 am: voicemailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Called at 11:16 am: voicemailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Moermond: we'll deal with this again in a couple of weeks. Layover to March 18th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 21 RLH TA 25-131** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 435 VAN BUREN AVENUE. (File No. J2506E, Assessment No. 258305) (March 18, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Layover to LH March 18, 2025 at 10 am (unable to reach PO). CPH March 19.*

*Called at 10:45 am: voicemailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Called at 11:16 am: voicemailbox full; unable to leave Voicemail.*

*Moermond: we'll deal with this again in a couple of weeks. Layover to March 18th.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 22 RLH TA 25-34** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2501E1, Assessment No. 258309)

**Sponsors:** Kim

*Approve the assessment.*

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

*J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.*

*J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.*

*J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance*

*J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue*

ongoing for six months at this point. A month

J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.

J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders. Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

**23 RLH TA 25-30**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2502E2, Assessment No. 258317)

Sponsors: Kim

Approve the assessment.

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

*J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.*

*J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.*

*J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance*

*J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue ongoing for six months at this point. A month*

*J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.*

*J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders.*

*Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 24 RLH TA 25-31** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2503E, Assessment No. 258302) (March 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

**Sponsors:** Kim

*Approve the assessment.*

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

*J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.*

*J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.*

*J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance*

*J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue ongoing for six months at this point. A month*

*J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.*

*J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders. Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 25 RLH TA 25-32** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2504E, Assessment No. 258303) (Refer to

March 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Kim

Approve the assessment.

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

*J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.*

*J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.*

*J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance*

*J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue ongoing for six months at this point. A month*

*J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.*

*J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders. Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

26 RLH TA 25-33

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2505E, Assessment No. 258304) (Refer to March 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Kim

Approve the assessment.

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of*

*appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

*J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.*

*J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.*

*J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance*

*J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue ongoing for six months at this point. A month*

*J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.*

*J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders. Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

**27 RLH TA 25-64**

**Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2506E, Assessment No. 258305)**

**Sponsors:** Kim

*Approve the assessment.*

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.

J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.

J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance

J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue ongoing for six months at this point. A month

J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.

J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders. Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

**28 RLH TA 25-128** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 104 IVY AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2507E, Assessment No. 258306)

Sponsors: Kim

Approve the assessment.

*Voicemail left at 11:18 am: I'm trying to reach Trieu Tran calling you about a number of appealed tax assessments for 104 Ivy. Our front desk indicated you were coming in person, we haven't seen you so we are trying to call you. Hopefully we can connect.*

*Moermond: for the first assessment J2501E we are looking at 2 orders one issued January 4, one January 18 both related to parking. He was not in compliance on deadline. When inspector revisited February 27 and March 12 Excessive Consumption bills were issued for a total of \$303. I will recommend approval*

J2502E: follow up on the January 18th order which included 2 violations for parking. Come March 29 and April 12 reinspections there was no compliance. That is another \$303. Recommend approval.

J2503E: again, following up on January 18th orders. Recheck April 29. Past the 3-month park and no compliance. \$169 assessment. Recommend approval.

J2504E: this is Excessive Consumption for 2 different orders. Correction Notice with a

quite a few items on it for the exterior of the house, building and the premise. Also, a Vehicle Abatement Order issued May 30. Inspector converted the January 18th Correction Notice on parking into a Vehicle Abatement Order in which the surface problems are listed. The reinspections occurred for the Vehicle Abatement Order on June 10 and Correction Notice June 13. No compliance. 4 months into the Vehicle Abatement Order issue with no compliance

J2505E: again, following up on the Correction Notice again following up on the May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order and June 13 orders. July 14 and June 15 reinspections. Those two revisits and the work not done results in a \$303 assessment. Parking issue ongoing for six months at this point. A month

J2506E: two inspections billed, the orders were May 13 Correction Notice on exterior and May 30th Vehicle Abatement Order. Inspections done July 9 and August 15. Total assessment is \$303 and represent 90 days noncompliance with CN and 7 months with the Vehicle Abatement Order.

J2507E: again, reinspections at the property for the May 13 and May 30th orders. Reinspections done September 16 (CN) and August 29 (VAO). Noncompliance. Another month with noncompliance. \$303 assessment, recommend approval.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 4/9/2025**

## 11:00 a.m. Hearings

### Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

- 29 RLH SAO 25-18** Making finding on the appealed of JoAnn Lorvig Tsoumanis to a nuisance abatement ordered for 1400 CHARLES AVENUE in Council File RLH SAO 25-2.

**Sponsors:** Jalali

*The nuisance is abated as it relates to first deadline given by Council.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: the first step in abatement plan was to remove quite a bit from the boulevard. We have a photograph from March 3 indicating those are gone. Step one is resolved.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

- 30 RLH SAO 25-22** Making finding on the appealed of Jason Syverson to a nuisance abatement ordered for 1004 FULLER AVENUE in Council File RLH SAO 25-11.

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.*

*No one appeared*

*Moermond: we had a pretty straightforward conversation of expectations. Ms. Martin?*



*Supervisor Martin: in compliance, we are closing the file.*

*Moermond: nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

## 1:00 p.m. Hearings

### Vacant Building Registrations

- 31 RLH VBR** Appeal of Jaswant Teekasingh to a Vacant Building Registration Notice  
**25-10** at 159 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE WEST.

**Sponsors:** Bowie

*Deny the appeal. Property remains a Cat 2 VB but doesn't require a CCI and waive the VB fee for 90 days (to May 11, 2025) and allow permits.*

*Jaswant Teekasingh, owner, appeared  
Gus Nicklow, attorney, appeared via phone*

*[Moermond gives background of appeals process]*

*Staff report by Supervisor Brian Schmidt: I did go out on the reinspection date, the Monday following after the Friday deadline. That was January 3, I went out the 6th. I met Mr. Teekasingh out there. Still no electrical permit. He said he was still opening things up for the electrical inspection. He did tell me applied for a grant for upgrade the electrical lighting in the building. I questioned why he didn't contact me ahead of time about the conflicts in meeting the deadlines set here. I advised he should call here at that point. He did not have a copy of the grant at that time nor the contract information for the contractor doing the work. I did receive that later on. That is now in the file.*

*When the deadline was not met I had to speak to Mr. Dornfeld about the permits and his next intentions. Took about a week, and then we referred it to the Vacant Building program.*

*Moermond: it is now in the Vacant Building program and that is under appeal. That is for revoking the Certificate for blowing the deadline established by Council.*

*Nicklow: I'd like Mr. Teekasingh to speak to the facts and background having been there. Then I can speak about what we'd like to see moving forward.*

*Teekasingh: my sticking point is the contractor to do the electrical work. He isn't giving me a definite timeline for doing the work. That's been going on since the end of November. He said he couldn't start until after January 15. They never scheduled me. Currently I'm trying to figure out what is the deficiency in the work that needs to be done. Just the permit? Water standing in the ceiling it has been repaired, but still shows on the list. Marcia (Building inspector) said I just need to close the building permit. I can't bring another electrical contractor in since I have the contractor to do the grant.*

*I'm in limbo trying to figure out where I go from here to get this resolved. The Vacant Building certification Brian told me it could be appealed, I came here and they said no.*

*Gus and I spoke to Adrian.*

*Moermond: to be clear, the Vacant Building registration hadn't yet been mailed so it was just a matter of waiting until the orders were issued so it could be appealed. A question of timing. You came in before it was issued; we can't accept an appeal of something that hadn't been issued yet.*

*Nicklow: Jas, you received a letter saying it could be appealed within 10 days, right? Maybe we're talking about something different.*

*Moermond: no, it is the same letter and a question of timing. He came both before and after the letter.*

*Nicklow: I know he came after he received the letter.*

*Teekasingh: I came on the initial appeal of the revocation; first the office said I could, and then they said I couldn't. Then the decision was made it had to go to the Vacant Building status first before I can appeal. Last week I was waiting for your phone call, I got a phone call with no call back number or message and no access code.*

*Moermond: there is no call back number or access code. We call you into the hearing. We called twice, at 2:32 and 2:25. We also called your attorney unsuccessfully. I'm sorry we didn't connect, and I hear you have a complaint about that as well as the Vacant Building registration component. Why don't we bring ourselves to today. It was determined to be a Vacant Building on January 6, and the deadline was blown but they didn't send it to the Vacant Building program until February 12.*

*Schmidt: there was a disconnect in information coming from Mr. Teekasingh, Matt, and I, all waiting for information. Yes, it was a considerable time. After the Vacant Building registration Mr. Teekasingh came to talk to me.*

*Moermond: and we only look at your orders which follow up on previous orders and was subject to an appeal and Council determination. You can appeal the next order forthcoming which is the Vacant Building registration. All of that being said can you be more specific about your ask.*

*Teekasingh: waiting for the electrical work to be done and I haven't been given a timeline from the contractor. I'm trying to find another contractor to close out the office permit in the meantime. I'm just sitting waiting at his mercy. Everything else is coming along. I'm trying to get taxes done. Next week I'm gone for spring break. The contractor hasn't given me a timeline for the work. I'm in limbo due to that.*

*Moermond: so, you're looking for what?*

*Teekasingh: I need time to get it done, the work will done I'm just not sure when. What do I need to be compliant? Just the electrical permit? What is on Brian's letter that has been satisfied.*

*Moermond: Mr. Schmidt, can you talk about the electrical violations?*

*Schmidt: there are some fixtures that were changed and moved and when the building inspector went out---*

*Teekasingh: they didn't come out, I sent photos.*

*Schmidt: yes, he sent photos and Inspector H noticed the electrical work done and requested an electrical permit. Mine started out as ceiling repairs to office remodeling, the work has constantly expanded from the original call. I need the building permit closed and to do that we need the electrical permit pulled and closed.*

*Moermond: I did get quite a few emails between you (Mr. Teekasingh) and Ms. Holliday.*

*Teekasingh: most recent was January 14.*

*Moermond: I have that in the record. I have February 24 which is an ongoing chain from October. Some expectations between Mr. Schmidt and Ms. Holliday, as well as you, Mr. Teekasingh, January 10 asking about expectations. The building inspector says "per our last conversation you were informed that an electrical permit would be needed per Minnesota Statute 13.01(2)(0). Electrical work is not on the list of work exempt from the permit. That needs to be done before you can get your building permit closed."*

*What I was getting from her, because I asked for those records when you indicated you were having trouble getting instructions. The communication I got back was that there had been a lot of emails and calls to you and I did see in a lot of these emails you reiterated the same question over and over again. It was being answered from the building inspector's perspective. Where we are at is a building permit was required part of the work. A building permit was pulled. Work was done. As part of doing the work electrical fixtures were installed that made it that an electrical permit needed to be pulled because of that installation. The building inspector wanted that electrical work concluded under permit before she would sign off on the building permit portion. That's how they related to each other. You got a grant to do the work that's required, electrically, the electrical contractor is telling you you're in line and not giving you any timeline. Are they giving you a range?*

*Teekasingh: they were supposed to do it last week and they cancelled. They're telling me sometime in March now. Until they give me a deadline I can't really say specifics. In the meantime, I'm trying to find another contractor to come and pull the permit and close the portion out for the office if I can get that. What I need from the Council is: is that all I need? According to the letters Inspector Schmidt has been sending me the citation deficiency is still the ceiling. Do I have to do more in there above and beyond the electrical permit?*

*Moermond: I think what happened before, the conditions changed between the issuance building permit and the Certificate of Occupancy orders and that change required the electrical permit.*

*Teekasingh: I don't want to cut you off. The whole process started when I spoke to the Building Inspector and she said she wanted one thing, and then another thing. Then she wanted another thing. Meaning, she wanted fire rated sheetrock. She asked for the screw patterns. Ok? She wanted to see photos. She hadn't visited the shop. She never made an inspection. She said she didn't need to come out and look at anything, just to send her photos.*

*Moermond: that sounds simpler for you.*

*Teekasingh: the electrical items she saw was where an existing outlet was. The wires*

were capped. When we did the ceiling, the drop ceiling outlets for the lights were all fluorescent tubes. They were replaced with cans. I didn't know I needed the permit; I would have done it at the time. My understanding from speaking to different contractors is everyone wants to see everything before they will pull a permit to make sure everything is within code when they pull it because the moment they sign their name on the permit they become responsible. That's been taking time. In addition to that, I had this other grant for the lighting in the shop to upgrade from tube lights to LEDs. I was trying to get one contract to do everything at once. His queue is so long I can't wait for him to do it. I have a couple others I've been trying to get ahold of, but no one is consistent or prompt. I'm just sitting here waiting. That's where I've been in limbo since October.

Moermond: yet we had a hearing—

Teekasingh: excuse me, at the last hearing I was told an electric permit was a separate issue. The building inspector included it as part of the permit.

Moermond: it sounds like that circumstance changed. I'd like to give you a window to get this done. It isn't an indefinite window. I understand you have a vacation planned and all this other stuff. You'll have to figure out how you meet your deadline. Did you get an extension? Yes you did. I do remember strictly hearing you talk about doing your electrical work when we had our hearing. Very specifically addressing it that you couldn't do your own electrical work when you had a Fire Certificate of Occupancy commercial building being inspected. It was covered November 19, and I do see your communication with Inspector Holliday followed that. Are you having a problem with using photographs with Ms. Holliday? I'm not seeing how it connects with this issue. Am I missing something?

Teekasingh: I brought it up because had I been told about the electrical on the onset I would have done it.

Moermond: I'm not accepting that. It was discussed and was a condition you changed. No, and I won't go down the path considering whether it was acceptable to look at photos in any way. It seems to me it is easier for you to provide photos in your own time and schedule for her review. Coming in and saying it is a problem, I don't think it is a problem. Should there be an inspection in the future? I'm not a building inspector but if I can do that for my customer I will do my best to do it.

We have your property going into the Vacant Building program February 11th. I will recommend the Council give you a 90-day waiver of the Vacant Building fee. That takes you to May 11th. You need to have your permit sign offs by then, then you aren't in the Vacant Building program and have no Vacant Building program fee. We have this listed as a Category 2, but I'm not sure we have conditions that make that necessary. We have a revoked certificate and minor building violations.

I'm going to recommend the Council make it not necessary to do a Team/Code Compliance Inspection. You just need to have your Fire Certificate of Occupancy reinstated. Mr. Schmidt is looking for closed permits.

Schmidt: as soon as those permits close I will call Mr. Teekasingh and say things are approved.

Moermond: so, you don't need to reinspect, those permits are evidence of corrections.

Schmidt: yes.

*[discussion about proration of fee and process if necessary]*

Nicklow: I know Mr. Teekasingh wants to comply and get it done and just needs to know what exactly needs to be done to satisfy the City. Do you think this 90 days is enough to get the electrical guy come in?

Teekasingh: I'm not holding my breath on the grant. I'm looking for another contractor to get the office stuff done sooner vs. later.

Moermond: when you say "just the office", I don't know what is required by the trades inspector.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

**32**     [RLH VBR 25-4](#)

Appeal of Ozzy Zachran, O.I.G. Holdings, to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 383 TORONTO STREET.

**Sponsors:**         Noecker

Layover to LH March 11, 2025 at 1 pm for discussion after reissued C of O orders.

Ozzy Zachran, OIG Holdings, appeared via phone

Moermond: we have two properties and we can address one right away, 383 Toronto. We were going to do a revision and the orders needed clarification. Where are things at?

Supervisor Der Vue: the orders you received from the office today; it isn't completed. My apologies, it shouldn't be a final. Since you need to put together a plan, we'll have a final revised order by May 10th, which would then have this continued to March 18th. That gives you time to revise the orders and you time to come up with a plan as requested.

Zachran: I think that may be overkill. This is similar to many orders we receive, things we typically address. Things we've already done under permit. The electricians are calling for their inspections already. Most of it wasn't anything requiring an action plan like it was a Category 2 Vacant Building.

Moermond: this is a Vacant Building registration appeal with quite a list. We're trying to monitor that boundary so you don't turn into a Category 2. I understood Ms. Shaff noticed they weren't consistent with the photos. Even though the initial orders were pretty standard, you wanted to make sure they were addressing the photos.

Vue: there are a few items that in our opinion weren't noted in the original orders.

Moermond: and we need staff to restate that for clearer expectations.

Vue: correct.

Moermond: knowing they're short staffed, we'd have orders to you by Monday and talk on the 18th to resolve this.

Zachran: we have a tenant from Section 8 who wants to move in on the 7th. We're in

*limbo so we haven't been able to give her a date. This went into the Vacant Building not because of deficiencies but because he couldn't get in due to the previous tenant. That said, this was never a problem property in the sense of an egregious amount of work orders. I just don't want to keep going back and forth with hearings. The property is in great shape, it should have never got this far. I'd like to close the chapter on this. It is safe, all permits are going to be closed.*

*Moermond: Mr. Zachran, the City didn't put you in the position. Someone not showing up for a long period of time. The fact you needed an inspection wasn't for you exclusively, I can't conclude this appeal until I have that inspection. While I appreciate you have a tenant lined up, I can't do my job yet. Please understand this didn't come out of nowhere. This is many months of attempt to get in. Not a problem they created. I'll do a one-week layover and we can plan a reinspect and put this on a faster tract but I can't say it can be reoccupied until I have a clean set of orders. We can talk March 11, but that's the best I can do.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/11/2025**

**33 RLH VBR  
25-12**

Appeal of Ozzy Zahran, O.I.G. Holdings LLC, to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 658 CONWAY STREET.

Sponsors: Johnson

*Deny the appeal. Property to remain a Cat 2 VB and requires CCI.*

*Ozzy Zachran, OIG Holdings, appeared via phone*

*Staff report by Supervisor Der Vue: two-unit dwelling. February 5, 2025 we received a complaint of no heat and electricity. Inspection done that day with inspector and St. Paul Police Department. Due to lack of heat and electric it was condemned with an immediate vacate. A secondary inspection was done that afternoon due to the immediate vacate orders, it was important all the occupants were notified and the inspector was out with the property owner and his attorney, St. Paul Police Department, and I vacated the property of 15 people. Gross unsanitary, lack of smoke and carbons, damage throughout property to doors, walls, windows, plumbing and water issues. Barred front entry with 2x4s and illegal locks on both entry doors and all sleeping rooms. High energy wires exposed. Excessive content throughout all rooms. Damage to siding, soffits, and fascia. This is a summary; the orders note every deficiency.*

*Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: we opened a Category 2 Vacant Building per that referral February 7. He issued a Summary Abatement Order for garbage throughout the property. AS of February 21, 2025 that was not in compliance and he issued a work order to have it cleaned via work order. Photos in the file of that. February 25 2025 St. Paul Police Department reported that the rear door to the home was open to trespass and asked for it to be secured, which we issued a work order to do.*

*Zachran: the report is accurate on this one. This is the last of the unfortunate sober home shenanigans in St. Paul. Similar to Toronto, we were actively trying to remove the occupants from the units with a lot of roadblocks. The condition of the home is grossly unsanitary. Occupants at 15 doesn't shock me. I brought my attorney that day to take note of everything going on, the immediate vacate trumped the court orders so we dodged a bullet there. We got this home back quicker than anticipated. We'd like the opportunity to get this cleaned out and the no heat related to no power, it is worth*

mentioning the power is fine. They were messing with the meter cover outside, which Xcel found out about and shut off the power. We left it off to deter any additional squatting, but our intent is to go back in and replace the cover under permit, remove the junk and put eyes on it and pull permits for repairs. We've also been going back and forth with the HPC on this to come up with a good plan for the exterior rehabilitation. We've agreed on a set of plans with them. Would you consider giving us a month to pull permits, start work and reinspect at a later date when permits are pulled?

Moermond: this is a worse property and a greater public nuisance than Toronto, which I need to take into account. I get you want to junk out and repaint. I'm very concerned about the depth of the problems with this building. The violations written cover a number of trades. I think we need a Code Compliance Inspection Report to articulate what needs to be done. There are enough significant problems I believe it is a legitimate Category 2. The Council may look at that differently. My recommendation is to deny your appeal, you need to be in the registered Vacant Building program.

[long discussion of the Vacant Building Categories and their definitions]

Zachran: we are arranging through the courts of personal items in about 30 days, then we can junk out the rest.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**

## 2:00 p.m. Hearings

### Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 34 RLH FCO 25-8** Appeal of Navid Amini to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 342 KELLOGG BOULEVARD WEST.

Sponsors: Bowie

Grant the appeal.

Navid Amini, tenant and business owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: we're following up on the orders and Department of Safety & Inspections' review of them with Zoning.

Vue: speaking and confirming with our Zoning and Licensing divisions as well as Fire Safety Manager over commercial space it was agreed upon the establishment falls into coffee shop / tea house, no alcoholic beverages with minimal snacks and no processing on the premises. It was determined and confirmed it would continue under the mercantile classification as it is currently. No need for change of use.

Moermond: no zoning or licensing problems. I'll recommend the Council grants the appeal.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 3/19/2025**