

## Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)

---

**From:** Ross, Dale <dross@websense.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 4:26 PM  
**To:** Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)  
**Cc:** Singerhouse, Rich (CI-StPaul); Seeger, Jim (CI-StPaul); Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)  
**Subject:** RE: 992 Hatch Ave.  
**Attachments:** Report (165).pdf; 992 Hatch Ave.pdf; 992 Hatch Ave Fuel Safety Test.pdf; RE: 992 Hatch Ave City Inspection ; RE: [##19015##] 992 Hatch Ave City Inspection Results

**Importance:** High

Please provide this documentation to the council and see attached email. I clearly ask to have the Fire Inspection completed on time and told it was not needed if we are selling the house.

Again, I am asking to reconsider your decision or let me speak with your higher ups on this matter. We have someone who is buying the house this Friday.

Previous Email to you below with attachments -

Hi Marcia,

I just reviewed the report for the code compliance. We have no financial ability to even begin to pay for the number of repairs in that Report. My brother purchased the house for ~\$147,000 in 2005. We are selling the house at 99k. This is already a significant loss that is being covered by very little money we have in an estate account and most of closing cost I am covering from my own savings. My brother passed away 2 years ago from Pancreatic Cancer. After he passed we tried to rent the house in order not to take a loss on the property. Unfortunately, one bad renter left us to repair a significant number of items. That cost of the repair was already over 2k.

We complied with all the initial requirements from Lisa Martin and after our first hearing meeting decided to sell the house rather than rent. I have attached the email where I notified the City. Told no inspection were necessary.

We are closing on the house on the 30<sup>th</sup> of Oct, the person buying the house has cancelled their lease and are expecting to move into the house upon closing. We would request the house not be categorized a vacant 2 building. I would also request a refund of \$447 for inspection that were necessary. However, I complied in order to sell the property.

Thanks for your help on this matter - dale

---

**From:** Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul) [mailto:marcia.moermond@ci.stpaul.mn.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:46 PM  
**To:** Ross, Dale  
**Cc:** Singerhouse, Rich (CI-StPaul); Seeger, Jim (CI-StPaul); Vang, Mai (CI-StPaul)  
**Subject:** EXTERNAL: RE: 992 Hatch Ave.

Dale,

I have looked into this matter carefully and have come to a few conclusions. The house was condemned for lack of water servicer in March of this year. It was then sent to the vacant building program. You appealed this and were given a 90-day fee waiver if you could get your certificate of occupancy reinstated. You did not do that. The vacant building fee was billed in late May and sent to assessment after that because it was unpaid. This is the assessment under appeal. The requirement for a code compliance inspection has been outlined in all correspondence from the time this entered the vacant building program. My recommendation to get your Fire C of O reinstated was a way to get out from underneath that requirement. At this juncture, I will recommend to the Council that your appeal is denied.

Sincerely, Marcia Moermond

---

**From:** Ross, Dale [<mailto:dross@websense.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2015 2:15 PM  
**To:** Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul)  
**Subject:** RE: 992 Hatch Ave.  
**Importance:** High

Hi Marcia,

I just reviewed the report for the code compliance. We have no financial ability to even begin to pay for the number of repairs in that Report. My brother purchased the house for ~\$147,000 in 2005. We are selling the house at 99k. This is already a significant loss that is being covered by very little money we have in an estate account and most of closing cost I am covering from my own savings. My brother passed away 2 years ago from Pancreatic Cancer. After he passed we tried to rent the house in order not to take a loss on the property. Unfortunately, one bad renter left us to repair a significant number of items. That cost of the repair was already over 2k.

We complied with all the initial requirements from Lisa Martin and after our first hearing meeting decided to sell the house rather than rent. I have attached the email where I notified the City. Told no inspection were necessary.

We are closing on the house on the 30<sup>th</sup> of Oct, the person buying the house has cancelled their lease and are expecting to move into the house upon closing. We would request the house not be categorized a vacant 2 building. I would also request a refund of \$447 for inspection that were necessary. However, I complied in order to sell the property.

Thanks for your help on this matter - dale

---

**From:** Seeger, Jim (CI-StPaul) [<mailto:jim.seeger@ci.stpaul.mn.us>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 20, 2015 9:44 AM  
**To:** Moermond, Marcia (CI-StPaul); Ross, Dale  
**Subject:** EXTERNAL: 992 Hatch Ave.

Scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway  
Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

Scanned by Websense Email Security Gateway  
Click [here](#) to report this email as spam