

Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)

From: Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 9:40 PM
To: Martin, Lisa (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Jacobs, Rick (CI-StPaul); Owens, Phil (CI-StPaul); Ubl, Stephen (CI-StPaul); Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul); Neis, Adrian (CI-StPaul)
Subject: RE: 1126 Charles

Lisa,

The appeal was limited to the bathroom, so I have no expectation that the rest of the orders are in question. With respect to the bathroom, my recommendation is that the Council grant the appeal on the condition that the plumbing lines connected to the 2nd floor bathroom are all capped and not being used. Given that there were no photos in the file or hearing, it was impossible to craft the recommendation more narrowly. I have to say also, that I specifically asked for photos to be put in the file.

What's left is enforcing that recommendation, with any insight AJ or Phil may have. Here's the link for their review: <http://stpaul.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=1451877&GUID=00485202-0482-4162-A7A2-0495EE3A4D59>

With the question of enforcement, you could try to review of the situation and determine if there are specific measures which would make the room "more code compliant?" .. along the lines of capping the lines? You may want to sort out some wording on what that would look like. By the by, I'm not implying in any way that work requiring permits can be done without permits. But we need to problem-solve this, as the bathroom rehab will not be completed, and the space needs to be made safe with that circumstance in mind.

Lastly, it's very awkward to go back to appellants and tell them I'm re-examining their appeal because enforcement provided more information after the fact. They would definitely need a chance to respond to the department's "refined" position. I'm asking Mai to put this on my Tuesday afternoon agenda to get a simple staff report, so I can get a status report on the enforcement activities – we'll see where we go from there as to any additional hearing and notices. This is on for public hearing on Wednesday night. I hate to tell the Council they need to lay it over in these circumstances, but I want to hear the department's position, too.

Marcia

From: Martin, Lisa (CI-StPaul)
Sent: Tuesday, July 02, 2013 2:47 PM
To: Neis, Adrian (CI-StPaul); Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)
Cc: Jacobs, Rick (CI-StPaul)
Subject: 1126 Charles

I was unable to squeeze myself any closer to the toilet. I was unable to see if capped. I could not move the toilet, and the owner kept saying it's ok!!! He has not had the dryer vent replaced under permit. The fire place has not been inspected or made inoperable by securing, and the stove still has a build up of grease.

The plumbing permit was never approved for the work done at that time. In 2008 the permit was automatically closed in the system due to no activity.

My understanding of the plumbing code section 326.B 46 Sub 1 (A) is that the owner can not due the work himself and a permit is required.

Please advise.....

