

1027 McLean Ave (single family)

William Harris, owner, appeared.

Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- Background Notes: performed a building deficiency inspection in 2010 and a LH was scheduled. In Apr or May 2010, DSI was notified that the property had been conveyed to HUD. Per DSI policy due to prior litigation, the City held up the legislative hearings and waited for this property to no longer be HUD's. In May, DSI received notification that the property had been sold; and a LH was scheduled.

- Noted: Mr. Magner received a phone call yesterday from Mr. Harris' employer, Jeff Holgren, who wanted to have a conversation about the building. He was calling on behalf of Mr. Harris because he was concerned about the situation. He was familiar with real estate, specifically, in Saint Paul. He was aware of VB statuses and requirements. Mr. Magner suggested that someone be at this hearing today. This property has been a Vacant Building for more than 2 yrs; it's a Category 3 (nuisance property- the chimney fell off this house and landed on the neighbor's property). Mr. Harris is the new owner and he hasn't gone through sale review. Doesn't think a Code Compliance has been applied for.

-Summary:

- one-story wood frame single-family dwelling on lot of 5,227 sq ft
- vacant since Nov 6, 2009
- Nov 17, 2009, an inspection was conducted, list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance was developed/photos were taken
- Order to Abate Nuisance Building was posted Feb 10, 2010; compliance date Mar 15, 2010
- as of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code.
- taxation's estimated market value of the land is \$20,500; \$10,000 on the building
- taxes are current
- VB registration fees were sent to assessment on Nov 18, 2010
- Code Compliance has not been completed
- \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted
- 5 Summary Abatement Notices since 2009
- 4 Work Orders: 1) boarding/securing; 2) garbage/rubbish; 3) tall grass/weeds
- Code Enforcement officers estimated cost to repair: exceeding \$40,000; to demolish: exceeding \$12,000
- DSI recommends removing the building within 15 days
- there are numerous violations throughout: heating plant, chimney, electrical; no code compliance; no permits have been pulled
- the City is unaware of available resources to rehabilitate the structure and unaware of the buyer's intent
- seems as though Mr. Harris was unaware of the City's actions prior to the purchase of this property
- all necessary original placards had been placed inside the porch on the front door
- need to get a Code Compliance inspection to establish a base line; then can re-photo

Christine Boulware, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC):

- constructed in 1887

- small porch in front has been altered/enclosed
- several additions and alterations to the building between 1916 and 1935
- located in Mounds Park Neighborhood; adjacent to Dayton's Bluff Historic District
- has not been surveyed
- staff would allow for demolition; no adverse effect

Mr. Harris:

- this information would have been great to have before he purchased the house
- HUD sold it for \$14,000-\$15,000
- no Truth in Sale and Housing; his realtor told him it was a great idea to buy it (Steve Hill, MK Real Estate)
- when Mr. Harris contacted Mr. Hill, Mr. Hill said, "You own the house; HUD does not need to conform to these ordinances; HUD operates under federal law." (forward email to Ms. Moermond)
- Mr. Holgren had been in real estate business for 26-27 yrs and advised Mr. Harris to contact the state attorney general or the state dept of commerce
- doesn't have \$5,000 for the performance deposit
- used money from his personal injury settlement to buy the house

Ms. Moermond:

- all photos are from 2010
- she needs to see the performance deposit and have confirmation of financial ability to rehab before she can go to bat for Mr. Harris
- the City Council needs to see that Mr. Harris has the ability to get the rehab done within 6 months (which he was unaware of)
- thinks it's a good idea to contact the attorney general's office; a package of this information will be provided to take with; suggested Mr. Harris top the package with a letter and fill out a complaint form with the attorney general's office
- suggested that he also contact either a representative in Congress or a U.S. senator and provide them with all this information, as well, about what HUD did
- let them know that HUD did not disclose that a move had already been made to initiate demo proceedings
- advised Mr. Harris to go to the City Council's public hearing on this Aug 3, 2011 at 5:30 pm to explain his situation
- City Council may have some ideas as to how Mr. Harris should proceed
- staff would be willing to make phone calls and/or write letters

7-12-11