



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, November 4, 2025

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 [RLH TA 25-363](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1578 BURG AVENUE. (File No. J2513TW, Assessment No. 258571) (To refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Johnson

Rescheduled to March 24, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/24/2026

- 2 [RLH TA 25-364](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 762 CAPITOL HEIGHTS. (File No. J2526R, Assessment No. 258570) (Refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Bowie

Rescheduled to March 24, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/24/2026

- 3 [RLH TA 25-357](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 724 CASE AVENUE. (File No. J2512E, Assessment No. 258322) (To refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing; Public hearing continued to January 14, 2026)

Sponsors: Yang

Rescheduled to March 3, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/3/2026

- 4 [RLH TA 25-375](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 828 ENGLEWOOD AVENUE. (File No. J2526R, Assessment No. 258570) (Refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Bowie

Rescheduled to April 21, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/21/2026

- 5 [RLH TA 25-372](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 947 FREMONT AVENUE. (File No. J2513TW, Assessment No. 258571) (To refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Johnson

Rescheduled to March 24, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/24/2026

- 6 [RLH TA 25-373](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 120 LAWSON AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2513TW, Assessment No. 258571) (To refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Kim

Rescheduled to March 24, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 3/24/2026

- 7 [RLH TA 25-376](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 583 MARSHALL AVENUE. (File No. J2526R, Assessment No. 258570) (Refer to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Bowie

Rescheduled to April 7, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/7/2026

- 8 [RLH TA 25-414](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 580 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST. (File No. J2527R1, Assessment No. 258601)

Sponsors: Johnson

Rescheduled to April 7, 2026 at 9 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/7/2026

10:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 9 [RLH TA 25-422](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 2170 HIGHWOOD AVENUE. (File No. J2511E1, Assessment No. 258325)

Sponsors: Johnson

Layover to LH April 7, 2026 at 10 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/7/2026

- 10 [RLH TA 25-404](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 2170 HIGHWOOD AVENUE. (File No. J2512E1, Assessment No. 258326)

Sponsors: Johnson

Layover to LH April 7, 2026 at 10 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 4/7/2026

- 11 [RLH TA 25-358](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1760 WILSON AVENUE. (File No. J2525R1, Assessment No. 258589) (To refer back to November 4, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Johnson

Layover to LH February 3, 2026 at 10 am (due to Paulie transition).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/3/2026

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

- 12 [RLH SAO 25-52](#) Making finding on the appealed nuisance abatement ordered for 2198 TILSEN AVENUE in Council File RLH SAO 25-49.

Sponsors: Yang

The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.

No one appeared

Moermond: this is now below 36”?

Supervisor Lisa Martin: that is correct.

Moermond: property is now in compliance and the matter resolved.

Referred to the City Council due back on 11/12/2025

Correction Orders

- 13 **RLH CO 25-12** Appeal of Patrick O'Neill, Jr. Attorney for Alford S. Karayusuf, to a Correction Order at 1164 SUMMIT AVENUE.

Sponsors: Noecker

Grant the appeal.

*Patrick O'Neill, attorney at Larson King, appeared
Mohamed Ibrahim, attorney with Larson King, appeared
Alford Karayusuf, owner, appeared*

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: correction notice was issued regarding a drainage issue, to immediately disconnect the drainage tube in the retaining wall as water cannot be discharged onto the sidewalk.

O'Neill: the property owner does have a statement. He feels strongly about the issue. When he bought the house it was hooked up to the sanitary sewer, and the City had an effort to stop that. He was forced to change something that existed when he bought the house. We submitted a couple City Council letters, he felt he had to do it, they broke the pipe and filled it with cement. He complied and feels strongly, and we have the certification from the City on City letterhead. The theme is he'd never have done anything unless it was approved, since he was forced to do something in the first place. The City was told about his design to dig a trench with PVC pipe to his property line and out the retaining wall. The City personnel approved before, during construction in which he spent significant money, and then after. City says yes you can. He's getting answers saying as long as you don't go to the sanitary sewer.

We have attachments to the first letter I wrote, asking them to tear up the notice, which they declared. And then I sent Ms. Vang a letter and a couple more exhibits. We had some questions about what precipitated this, why now, why this address? But the exhibits should have by email. We did also ask for a data practices request in a letter and we haven't received an answer to that.

Moermond: may be a while.

O'Neill: can we even have a hearing without that information? When the sanitary sewer was changed. The sidewalk has an 8" trough next to the sidewalk. It drains to that, not onto the right-of-way and across the sidewalk. It looks to me like that was done later in time when perhaps the storm sewer was put in on the corner. It isn't sitting well with a homeowner who has paid over \$600,000 in taxes over the last 40 years. If it is changed on his dime again and floods his basement, can he go after the City for forcing him to change what they approved 30 years and has worked for 30 years?

Moermond: I'll jump in here. The 6 – 8" trough abutting the retaining wall is private property. A lot of property owners choose to do that so it doesn't abut the property line and isn't affected by sidewalk replacement and things like that. The City does get a fair number of complaints about runoff into the public right-of-way. Typically, it happens in the winter. With respect to the Certificate you have indicating you did the rain leader disconnect correctly, my understanding of this is you'd have someone go apply for a permit with a designed solution of how to disconnect your rain leader and re-engineer the flow. Someone had a permit to do that, it was signed off on, and a certificate was issued saying you're in compliance. The same law exists now as existed then. Whatever determination they made they made, I assume, taking all of these things into account. There's no way for me to look at that and say this old certificate wasn't correct. I also assume the inspector didn't have access to this. Why this address? It is typically a complaint. It also happens that if a neighbor gets a complaint

about something but also treat neighboring properties with similar violations in a similar violation. It isn't just neighbor A who may or may not be targeted for whatever reason, but everyone is treated the same. Whether that's parking or garbage can placement.

You have a certificate of compliance with the rain leader disconnect program. I'll recommend Council grant the appeal. If you want to wait for that additional information--?

O'Neill: no, we don't.

Martin: just make sure it is salted and sanded.

Karayusuf: I do, we have a service plus I keep salt on hand.

O'Neill: thank you. I learned a long time ago to be quiet and get on the elevator.

Referred to the City Council due back on 11/19/2025

14 RLH CO 25-14 Appeal of William Acree to a Correction Order at 610 WESTERN AVENUE NORTH.

Sponsors: Bowie

Grant to December 1, 2025 for compliance.

William Acree, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: a Correction Notice was issued October 13, 2025 saying that all vehicles must be correctly licensed, operable, secured from unlawful entry, and parked on an approved surface. Store in a garage, correct violations, or remove. It also states that all vehicles, boats, and trailers on the property must have current tabs, be registered to the property, fully operational, cannot be missing vital parts or open to entry and be parked on an approved surface. Compliance date of October 22.

Acree: I'm not asking for sympathy but I've had a lot of health issues going on with my family so I haven't been in town a lot. I've been traveling to Chicago to my sister on hospice, I try to go every weekend. When I came back that weekend I drove back to check on the property and I met Mr. Allen Vang there and we talked about what I needed to do. I agree there were some without tabs. He called Richard Kedrowski, and he said no the plan was not submitted in order to do that. That's where the issue came from. I know that I did that, and I tried to convey that to him as well and apparently it didn't do any good. I said I'd go down and resubmit it. I went to planning on Friday to submit another plan. I tried to convey again to Richard that I had a parking plan for that—

Moermond: I have that site plan in front of me.

Acree: that's been in place over 20 years. And not only that I have two plans. Again he called me that afternoon and said not only did he find an approved plan, he found two. One twenty years ago. I did that. That's kind of where I end up being with that situation. Allen said Richard wanted to take over, I said that's fine. In the meantime I

checked everything and I did have some cabs that were open and some tires that were flat. I do have two boats there that I don't use so I ended up putting them on Craigslist. It was bad timing because of the weather, they don't want boats in the winter. I did get someone to take it away on Saturday. On Sunday he said he was coming back the next day to get the other boat and he called and said someone broke into his truck he used to tow the boat. I called him yesterday and didn't get an answer. Hopefully that will be fixed and gone soon. I'm also a veteran so I called them in the last couple days doing the paperwork and finding titles so they would be gone. That's more or less it.

Moermond: it looks like you have vehicles stored throughout the yard, to be quite honest. I see the plans and the driveway was approved to be 10' x 30'. I see parking allowed between the garages and abutting the alley.

Martin: 10 x 30 ' with asphalt was what he was approved, and he installed 12' x 77'. And the class 5 from 2023 that was approved hasn't been maintained at all.

Moermond: I see vehicles that do need to be moved, some brought into compliance. What I'd like to see are some specifics on what violations the vehicles have. A silver Chevy and a plate number lacking tabs.

Martin: because there were so many vehicles we didn't do it logistically. To be honest they've all been sitting here for so long I'm sure they're not operable.

Moermond: I do have information saying they're registered to you to a Maplewood address, but they're being stored at Western. If they were your tenant's vehicles we may be having a slightly different conversation. This is a CN which means you get a deadline for compliance and if that deadline is blown the Department of Safety & Inspections would come forward with a stronger order. I agree on its face that there are violations there, I just want greater detail. That would give clear parameters about each of the vehicles and what isn't ok. I'll be honest if they aren't registered there they shouldn't be there. That needs to be addressed.

I think we can give a deadline of December 1. Everything has to be done. If they end up being towed the cost of the towing end up being billed to the property and that's not cheap. We'll try to get that list before our letter goes out to you on Friday.

I can easily see the class 5 hasn't been maintained. It has to be mowed. As soon as you have to mow class 5 it is lawn, not class 5. You have some work to do. You're using it as a parking lot, and it isn't zoned as a parking lot.

Acree: I'd like to take it to Council. I've owned that property over 20 years and I've never had a problem. Anytime you have class 5 I do cut the grass that grows up. I disagree with that. I would like the Council meeting to deal with that.

Second, I have a boat in the garage. I have that much property there and a boat and trailer is what I use for maintenance on the property. I haven't had a problem with that for 20 years, now all of a sudden it is an issue. I think it's a more complicated problem than that. No one can even see it, there's a 6-foot fence around the property. Now I'm dealing with something where it was okay and dealt with people way before Department of Safety & Inspections and it wasn't an issue. The first inspector it wasn't an issue, it came after he called whatever his name is, Richard Kedrowski, and Richard took over. I'm kind of feeling it is a vendetta because there's no reason for this.

Referred to the City Council due back on 11/19/2025

2:00 p.m. Hearings**Fire Certificates of Occupancy**

- 15 **RLH FCO** Appeal of Pat Ware to a Fire Inspection Report at 673 CHARLES
 25-54 AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bowie

Grant to December 5, 2025 for compliance.

Pat Ware, property manager, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Der Vue: this is a duplex, upper and lower. August 20, 2025 our office received a complaint of water damage in upper unit along wall and ceiling. Inspector Standish confirmed the water damage with visible mold among other hazards including missing smoke alarms, deteriorated siding and missing door frame on front entry door. Correction orders issued. When an inspector responds to complaint and other deficiencies are observed they are able to issue other orders under chapter 34 to protect public safety and welfare and established minimum maintenance standards for buildings, both interior and exterior.

Moermond: this appeal came in a long time ago, appeal came in September 2nd.

Ware: first, I've been doing this for a while but my experience with the fire inspections is when a complaint is called the inspection is limited to the complaint with a possible call to owner or myself to talk about things. This complaint was about one item. Now, to address that the damage was no longer wet. It was repaired in June. Hole was fixed from inside the attic. That was old damage but no current leak. Number 1 and 3 were not issues that day. Smoke alarm, tenant had removed. It wasn't there again today and we had to replace it today. The other things, if he'd called, everything on the list was in process painting done and siding and trim being replaced. I feel like they should be taken off the record and the only legitimate thing was the inspection for the water damage, it was previous damage that hadn't yet been repaired. All of them have since been repaired as they were normally scheduled repairs, not in response to this complaint. My concern is that a small item that is a complaint causes an almost Certificate of Occupancy inspection and if that's the case and these repairs cause us to not have an inspection for 3 years that's great, but we're getting excessive request for repairs and although I agree, I don't see them as hazards.

Moermond: why do you bring up hazard?

Ware: because she said anything that appears to be a hazard.

Moermond: I guess I'm confused, at all times the building should be in proper repair. The photos show evidence of water damage. You are saying the source was addressed, but there clearly hadn't been abatement measures for the damage in the property and they were legitimate. They also don't come with a date stamp of when the leaking occurred. A phone call is always nice. I would say also it isn't always possible. I'm not thinking that's a reason to grant the appeal. In terms of what is part of the

record, it already is part of the public record. What we can do here is discuss whether it was a valid complaint and call and whether it is or isn't justified. We can't change the record. I look at the scope of this, and I see things that are issues but I don't see them as property wide, they're relatively confined. I'm not concurring on that count, though I understand where you're coming from. As far as the smoke alarm, even if the alarm is removed by the tenant, responsibility does ultimately lie with the property owner, as you know. It sounds like it is just a matter of getting a reinspection done.

Ware: if you look at the list you'll see everything marked with the exception of the water damage and missing smoke alarm all has to do with work on the property. He did call me that day from the field and said nothing about anything but water damage and I told him it had been repaired, but the cosmetic piece hadn't been done yet. I don't feel it was fair to not have a conversation about why these things were happening. It is a huge list for someone to bother writing by hand especially.

Moermond: your concerns are of record. Ms. Vue, how do you want to handle the inspection?

Vue: the inspector can complete that inspection himself. I do have his schedule up if Ms. Ware would like to coordinate a date and time, we can do that.

Ware: Thursday the 13th would work. 10:30 works with respect to the tenant.

Vue: perfect.

Moermond: I'll send this to the Council with a deadline of December 5 in case something should come up you have time to address it.

Referred to the City Council due back on 11/19/2025