



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final - Final Legislative Hearings

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer
Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator
Jean Birkholz, Hearing Secretary
Mary Erickson, Hearing Secretary
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8560

Tuesday, May 8, 2012

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 1186
[12-18](#) SEVENTH STREET EAST within fifteen (15) days after the June 6, 2012,
City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Bostrom

LO to May 22 LH

RE: 1186-1188 Seventh St E (single family)

Kevin L. Menard, owner, appeared.

Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- 2-story brick and wood frame mixed-use commercial/residential building with a 2-stall detached garage and an accessory storage shed on lot 5,663 sq ft
- been a Vacant Building since Nov 14, 2006
- current property owner is Kevin L. Menard per Ramsey County
- Feb 8, 2012 inspection conducted; list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed; photos taken
- Order to Abate Nuisance Building posted Feb 14, 2012; compliance date Mar 15, 2012
- as of this date, property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code
- estimated market value \$58,500 on land; \$46,900 on building
- real estate taxes are current
- Vacant Building registration fees were paid by assessment Dec 2, 2011
- Mar 9, 2012 Code Compliance inspection for building only was completed
- \$5,000 Performance Deposit posted Mar 12, 2012
- 7 Summary Abatement Notices since 2006; no Work Orders issued
- estimated cost to repair exceeds \$75,000
- estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$15,000

Ms. Moermond:

- photos show discoloration on insulation; asked staff to check what that's about

Amy Spong, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC):

- 1912 structure; commercial / flat: store front on first level and either storage, office or apartment use on 2nd floor
- original owner was Henry House
- did not have time to pull up original building permit application (Ramsey County Historical Society)
- has not been surveyed recently; this neighborhood hasn't yet been targeted for historic survey
- didn't end up on the 1983 survey; however, some other buildings nearby were noted
- a brick building across the street at the corner that's been identified on this commercial corridor
- the two buildings near the next corner have both been razed by Ramsey County
- didn't look at interior photos but there are a lot of photos of the exterior because staff has been to this intersection at lot recently
- has a lot of historic integrity: 3 sides of it have really great "ghost signs" (now faded) - painted onto the brick of early uses of the building
- very little alteration; some infill in the store front level - might just be covering up something
- her recommendation: there is potential for this building to be an historic resource; forward it to the Heritage Preservation Commission for a more thorough review
- got a call from Brad Griffith, a member of the Vacant Building Committee with Dayton's Bluff District Council; they are worried that this particular building may be demoed (they are also worried about 1210 Seventh St E and 721 Wilson Ave on today's LH agenda being demoed)
- Sanborn Insurance maps - updated up to 1925 - front part of building is solid masonry (not veneer); additions were wood frame: 1) 1 1/2 story; and 2) 1 story; plus some out buildings
- kiddy corner across the block was a Twin City Rapid Transit Company Car Barn
- industry was also along this corridor, historically
- index card gives: 1) the number of the permit; 2) a phone number; 3) date; 4) size of building; and 5) contractor
- the front windows are early and may have correlated with the use of the building; potentially could be part of what is kept in the building (Mr. Menard added that the Dayton's Bluff paper ran an historical photo of this building about 1 year ago; it looked like the windows in the front were full glass with a screen door in between---however, it isn't a very good photo)
- their office received an email from Brad Griffith, Dayton's Bluff Community Council's Vacant Building Committee, who said that the majority of the committee thought that 1186 7th St E and 721 Wilson Ave were worth rehabilitation and deserved additional study prior to any remove Orders

Mr. Menard:

- owns the building outright; originally, his dad bought it in the 70s; he had a stroke in 2005 and died about 1 1/2 yrs ago
- in the meantime, Mr. Menard didn't have money to do any of the Code Compliance work but since then, he has sold some of his property so, now, he can afford to fix up the building
- has pulled permits
- electrical is done; he put in 200 amp service - waiting for Xcel Energy to switch from old to new
- hired a plumber one month ago; he says the plumbing is ready for a rough-in inspection
- just pulled a heating permit so, he will do that while he is waiting for Xcel to switch over; then, he will finish the electrical
- he is also working on some building items which he expects will be done in about 30 days

- talked to someone (probably Becca) at Historic St. Paul and they want to be involved with the rehab of the front part of the building - doesn't know how long that will take

Mr. Magner:

- regarding the insulation question: said it was water damaged and had to be removed (Mr. Menard stated that for some reason, insulation had been put in the wall between the bathroom and the bedroom; he pulled the fiberglass part out, so what the photo shows is the backing of the sheet of insulation, which is black in color (it's not mold or water damaged); he took the sheet rock off the wall to do the ventilation for the plumbing system
- the Code Compliance Inspection was completed Mar 9, 2012
- Mar 12, 2012, Mr. Menard posted a bond
- issue: there still is no Work Plan for the rehabilitation; no estimates; no timelines; etc., which needs to be vetted out in this process
- one building permit is pulled for \$1,500
- the Department of Safety and Inspections (DSI) needs to see a site plan, as well - how the site will be done; Code Compliance Certificate requires paving the parking area; DSI also needs to know what Mr. Menard will be doing with the barn/shed structure, which appears to be unfinished construction

Mr. Menard:

- he has a building permit, electrical permit and a heating permit
- he couldn't pull the plumbing permit - on the contract, the plumber is responsible for any plumber permits
- he is doing all the work himself except the plumbing
- his brother is an electrician and he directed Mr. Menard's work with the wiring
- a friend of his is doing the warm air work - re-doing the whole duct system
- he intends to homestead the building, live upstairs and have the first floor as a recreation room (single family residential)
- has no written overall plan with timelines
- a lot of the building items are small things
- the biggest thing is the tuckpointing on the exterior (doesn't know how much that will be; must talk with the historic people)
- spoke with someone who can repaint the "ghost signs" back to their original character; however, he hasn't come back with an estimate - thinks the historic society wants to make a recommendation (Ms. Spong, HPC, said that she would probably not encourage repainting those signs because the deterioration of the old lead paint is finally allowing the masonry to breathe, which is a good thing; may want to leave it in its' current state but do the masonry repair; the signs give the building some character, show some patina and age.)
- he works on the building 6-8 hours a day, 7 days a week; expects to have everything except the front part done within 30 days
- he has a lot of the materials already
- he talked with Xcel this morning; they said it may be 3-4 weeks before they switch over because it's not a high priority
- the barn/shed has been on the property about 20 yrs; he got a permit for that; now, he just put on new lap siding and he just needs to paint it (the photos in the file are 1-2 yrs old)

Ms. Moermond:

- would like to see a Work Plan with the rehab to be completed in 6 months (needs to be well over 50% done by then); she provided a sample Work Plan
- would like to see bids from those doing the work (needs to see the value of the work)
- she needs to see proof of his financial ability to complete the work and how much

money he has set aside to work on this project

- asked whether his family and friends working on the property could come down and discuss this in a couple weeks (Mr. Menard said that maybe the heating guy could come; his brother would probably not be able to take off work)

Mr. Magner:

- the storage in the yard needs to be addressed; vehicles parked in back yard needs to be addressed; have a deteriorated fence
- you can't store things, longterm, on the exterior of the property; must store inside a building

Mr. Menard:

- has taken most of the fence down but since he has done that, he's had people come into the yard and steal everything he had out there
- is planning to have everything finished in 2 months (not sure how long the outside will taken, however; probably 6 months)
- building was tuckpointed about 115 yrs ago, shouldn't be too bad; need to talk with the historical people about (Ms. Spong noted not to put too strong of mortar in there because it could add more damaging affects to the brick; when an historic masonry building is re-pointed, you'll need mortar that's softer than the brick (mix sand, cement and lime in with it to match strength of the old mortar); and, no sandblasting, high pressure washing, etc.; HPC does have a "brief" which tells what to do and not to do when re-pointing historic masonry)
- he has already spent nearly \$10,000 on the project; estimates perhaps \$10,000 more will be needed

Ms. Moermond:

- will lay this over for 2 weeks to May 22, 2012 LH in order for Mr. Menard to develop a Work Plan and provide proof of financial ability to fund the project
- the Work Plan will be due either the Fri before or the day before May 22, 2012

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/22/2012

2 [RLH RR
12-19](#)

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 1210 SEVENTH STREET EAST within fifteen (15) days after the June 6, 2012, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Remove within 15 days with no option for rehilitation. (No show)

RE: 1210 Seventh St E (single family)

Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- 1-story wood frame brick front single family dwelling with an oversized 1-stall detached garage on lot 4,792 sq. ft.
- been a Vacant Building since Dec 15, 2009
- current property owner is Robert H. Kemptner per Ramsey County
- Jan 26, 2012 inspection of building conducted; list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition developed; photos taken
- Order to Abate Nuisance Building posted Feb 14, 2012; compliance date Mar 15, 2012
- as of this date, property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by legislative code
- estimated market value \$14,500 on land; \$4,300 on building
- real estate taxes are delinquent for 2010 in the amount of \$957.86 and 2011 in the

amount of \$843.34 plus penalty and interest. (Note: Real Estate taxes payable for 2012 are due on May 15)

- Vacant Building registration fees were paid by assessment Jan 6, 2012
- As of May 7, 2012, Code Compliance Inspection has not been done; \$5,000 Performance Deposit has not been posted
- 3 Summary Abatement Notices since 2009
- 5 Work Orders issued for: 1) garbage/rubbish; 2) snow/ice; 3) remove exterior structures; and 4) remove cats from interior of structure
- estimated cost to repair structure exceeds \$80,000
- estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$12,000
- recommend removing the structure within 15 days
- publication was published; posted Order to Abate on the building and also posted the public hearings on the building
- there was communication with the property owner in 2010
- night inspection was conducted Jan 12, 2012 - no one was at the property but a lot of activity going in and out of the property
- there have been no permits issued or rehab done

Ms. Moermond:

- noticed that the Notifications went to Robert Kemptner at 2 addresses, on Hyacinth, St. Paul; the other in South St. Paul and the mail was returned for both addresses; perhaps, this person is deceased; however, it seems that someone is taking a little bit of care of the property
- in the Order to Abate, it looks like the items listed could have been from a Condemnation that had previously occurred (Mr. Magner confirmed that they are)
- gross unsanitary, electrical, plumbing and fire problems that present hazards listed; roof is bad, excessive accumulation

Amy Spong, Heritage Preservation (HPC):

- conflicting sources on date of construction: 1) Ramsey County says 1922; 2) building permit index card says 1900
- 1-story commercial store front building
- formerly farm land
- have an historic photo from Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) showing the farm house, which is still there
- Sanborn Insurance map shows that it's a solid wood construction; not a brick veneer (should be considered)
- area has not recently been surveyed; wasn't part of 2011 survey work
- not any inventory forms
- we would want to do some more analysis of this particular building so see if there was any potential for historic designation
- right now, the boards are covering up the store front
- couldn't find the historic type of store usage
- index card said original owner was Anna Wright; there was also an Ormann
- not sure if there was another building prior to this building
- got a phone call from Brad Griffith, the realtor, who expressed concern about the potential demolition (Dayton's Bluff)
- Christine Boulware just submitted an email from Brad Griffith: the majority on the Dayton's Bluff Community Council Vacant Building Committee felt that it was probably not economically feasible to repair 1210 7th St E
- recommended to strongly encourage rehab but not to forward this to the HPC or to consider it as a potential historic resource; she sees there's a lot of damage; a lot of work would be required (hole in roof); don't have a lot of information

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend that the City Council order the building removed within 15 days with no option for rehabilitation

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

3 [RLH RR](#)
[12-20](#)

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 721 WILSON AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the June 6, 2012, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Lantry

Referred back to June 19, 2012 Legislative Hearing and July 3, 2012 City Council Public Hearing. (Laid over for HPC review)

RE: 721 Wilson Ave (multi-unit)

No one appeared.

Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- 2-story wood frame multi-unit dwelling on lot of 9,583 sq. ft.
- has been a Vacant Building since Oct 4, 2001
- current property owner is Keith J. Pederson (deceased) and Bryan Pederson, son, per Ramsey County
- Feb 1, 2012 inspection was conducted; list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed; photos taken
- Order to Abate a Nuisance Building posted Feb 14, 2012; compliance date Mar 15, 2012
- as of this date, property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code
- estimated market value of \$13,400 on land; \$9,400 on building
- real estate taxes are delinquent in the amount of \$5,923.81 plus penalty and interest and the property is currently in forfeiture proceedings (Must be redeemed by Jul 31, 2012)
- Vacant Building registration fees were paid by assessment Feb 29, 2012
- as of May 7, 2012, Code Compliance inspection has not been done; \$5,000 Performance Deposit has not been posted
- 9 Summary Abatement Notices since 2001
- 3 Work Orders for: 1) garbage/rubbish; 2) boarding/securing; 3) snow/ice
- estimated cost to repair this structure exceeds \$100,000; estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$10,000
- recommended removing the building within 15 days

Amy Spong, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC):

- property was designated as a contributing historic structure in the Dayton's Bluff Historic District in 1992 by the City Council and approved by the Mayor
- built in 1884; garage was built in 1917
- frame house and there's been stucco either on the clapboard or stucco in place of the clapboard and some brick veneer
- referred to as the Frederick Albeck House, original owner
- use in 1989: duplex
- permits pulled in 1891 for \$500 for repair/alteration; 1895 for \$200
- front window and rear wing may be early remodelings
- the neo-classical porch and brick stucco veneer appear to have gone on circa 1920
- Frederick Albeck is listed as the foreman for a crimping company as a truck manufacturer and his grown son boarded with him
- because this has been designated as a contributing structure, it requires review by the HPC for demolition under Ordinance 73.06
- their office received an email from Brad Griffith, Dayton's Bluff Community Council's

Vacant Building Committee, who said that the majority of the committee thought that 1186 7th St E and 721 Wilson Ave were worth rehabilitation and deserved additional study prior to any remove Orders
- this address has an inventory form

Ms. Moermond:

- the City Council would be happy to accept the input and advice of the HPC but it will not put the HPC in a decision making role, which would override or supercede in any way, their authority to make a call on whether this is a nuisance and needs to be removed for those purposes
- at least 75% of the time, this body sends it to the HPC for review when asked to do so; in some cases, it doesn't happen
- the HPC is advisory to the City Council
- she is happy to send this particular address to the HPC for review
- will lay this over for 6 weeks (Jun 19, 2012 LH)
- we will send it to the HPC for their review
- also send notification to Patricia Whitney

Ms. Vang f/u:

-sent Ms. Whitney an email regarding the property. She responded that she is not involved in this property but will make the PR of Keith's estate knows what is up. She knows the following:

-there should be no mortgage on the property, so there should be no bank involvement.

-Bryan Pederson should now be the record owner

-Ms. Whitney's address has changed to 2197 Silver Lake Road, New Brighton, MN 55112, Phone No. 651-766-8034 or patricia@pwhitneylaw.com

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

4 [SR 12-21](#)

Reviewing progress of rehabilitation for 937 IGLEHART AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Provide a work plan May 22, 2012; laid over to May 22, 2012 Legislative Hearing.

RE: 937 Iglehart Ave (duplex)

Hans Peter Fuchs, owner, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

- catch-up situation because the work wasn't done by deadline

Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- 2-story wood frame duplex that's been vacant since Aug 8, 2007
- Aug 23, 2011 we had a legislative hearing and at that time, Mr. Fuchs said he was planning to rehab the structure and submitted a Work Plan
- Mr. Fuchs posted a Performance Deposit Aug 19, 2011
- they have worked with him on the Code Compliance
- read letter dated Aug 29, 2011 from Ms. Vang into the record (attached)
- since then, property went to City Council where they passed a resolution saying that the structure shall be rehabbed or razed within 180 days
- 180 days have come and gone and the project is not completed
- subsequently, the Department of Safety and Inspections (DSI), under the resolution, look to fulfill the resolution by removing the structure; a contractor has been hired and

he has done some preliminary work

- then, Mr. Fuchs contacted DSI and said he was under the impression that he had more than 180 days; DSI informed him that he did not and if he did not want DSI to move forward with the demolition, he would need to appear again at a legislative hearing

- since that time, the demo contractor has been stopped

- Apr 24, 2012, another letter was sent to Mr. Fuchs by Mai Vang (attached) requesting him to attend the LH May 8, 2012 at 9 am

- anniversary date of the Performance Bond is Aug 19, 2012

- permits are still active

Ms. Moermond:

- asked if at 180 days, there was a determination by the building official that this wasn't 50% complete and that he wouldn't be extending the bond (Mr. Magner said that determination was made and no extension was given; if the applicant goes over 180 days, he needs to ask the building official to extend that bond application. In this case, that application was not made. Mr. Fuchs has continued to work on his property. As a representative of DSI, he said they are not opposed to extend this out to the 365th day, which is Aug 19, 2012; however, he does not know that Mr. Fuchs can complete the project within that time frame.)

- asked if there have been any subsequent trades inspections

- asked if a letter revoking bond had been sent out

Mr. Fuchs:

- entered photos taken Sat, May 5, 2012

- re: photo of exterior new siding, they are waiting for scallops to be made (if they cannot be made, they will use cedar shakes to cover the uncovered area)

- all the rest of the siding is complete

- has treated this project very carefully and is very involved with rehabbing it correctly (more than minimum standards); he is not trying to skimp on the rehab

- he fired 2 contractors before he got the current contractor to install the windows (took 90 days)

- Jim Seeger has been "heaven sent" in this situation; has given good input

- he built out the 3rd floor to make a beautiful loft

- he is still trying to understand what it means to "sign-off" on a permit (as far as he knows, the electrical is completed, signed-off and ready for sheet rocking)

- Jim Seeger and he went through the framing about 1 1/2 months ago and Mr. Fuchs doesn't know if he needs them to give him a receipt for signing-off or what

- the work is done on the plumbing, heating and air conditioning

- the electrical company installed all the meters and they would not do it until the inspector OK'd the inspection (about 1 1/2 weeks ago; inspector was out about 1 1/2 weeks before that)

- in rehabbing this building, he wants to put a product out there that is way beyond what the city requires but that would definitely satisfy him and would also stay around for, at least, the rest of his life

Mr. Magner:

- re the plumbing permit: it looks finalized; they can move ahead with the insulation, etc.

- the mechanical permit has not been finalized but it will be very shortly

- the building permit has been OK

- the electrical permit - it's not clear

- Xcel approved service as of Apr 25, 2012

- ready to start insulation; then, have the inspection; sheet rock it, then finish

Ms. Moermond:

- a Work Plan was provided last Sep, 2011
- would like to see a Work Plan that goes from now until the project completed Sep 1, 2012; then, if not completed, Mr. Fuchs will lose his bond (Mr. Fuchs, in good conscience, doesn't know if he can commit to having the project 100% done by that time; although, he will do everything in his power to get there.)

Mr. Magner:

- understands that things take longer than expected
- a new resolution will come out of this hearing today
- asked Ms. Moermond what the absolute "drop dead" day would be for completion
- the City Council could extend the date past the deadline, if they chose (if they believe that Mr. Fuchs was going to complete this project)
- DSI is really looking for some resolve; they have to respond to neighborhood complaints (which are common when projects get dragged out)

Ms. Moermond:

- she doesn't see the city knocking this building down but she can see the city taking Mr. Fuchs' \$5,000 Performance Deposit and requiring that a new \$10,000 Performance Deposit be posted if he doesn't make the deadlines this time.
- if Mr. Fuchs can't make the Sep 1, 2012 deadline, he must commit to a deadline no later than Oct 1, 2012 to get this signed-off by the city
- Jim Seeger will be able to tell Mr. Fuchs, explicitly, what he needs to see
- DSI is more than happy to work with Mr. Fuchs to complete the project; their goal is rehabilitation, not demolition

Mr. Fuchs:

- wonders how genuine the complaints are because he believes the complaints are coming from people he has fired from the project because they swore up and down that this building was going to come down and they will see to it; they'll be standing there bidding for the lot (they had done shoddy work and he told them to leave)
- when he looks at the neighborhood and how other properties there look, he thinks, "Who is complaining?"

Ms. Moermond:

- the code compliance needs to be signed-off by Oct 1, 2012
- if it can't be signed-off then, she will have a hearing set up 2 weeks later, the \$5,000 Performance Deposit will be forfeited and a second deposit will be discussed (\$10,000)
- the Work Plan is due May 22, 2012 at legislative hearing (staff report)
- scheduled at City Council Public Hearing Jun 6, 2012
- a letter will be sent

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/22/2012

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary Abatement Orders

- 5 [RLH SAO](#) Appeal of Lonny Lindquist to a Summary Abatement Order at 243 FULLER
 [12-14](#) AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Forthcoming; Laid over to LH on June 5. City Council on June 6, 2012.

RE: 243 Fuller Ave (duplex)

Lonny Lindquist, owner, appeared.

Inspector Joel Essling:

- *Summary Abatement issued Apr 30, 2012; compliance May 7, 2012*
- *holes were dug in the rear near alley for installation of a fence and the plywood covering those hole*
- *permit pulled for the fence in 2010 (still open)*
- *Mr. Lindquist stated this morning that he has arranged to have a surveyor come in and as soon as the property has been surveyed, he will begin work on the fence installation*
- *he is recommending this be laid over to Jun 5, 2012 at which time the fence will have begun*

Ms. Moermond:

- *will lay this over to Jun 5, 2012 LH*
- *will recommend that this go forward to the City Council Public Hearing Jun 6, 2012*
- *recommendation at that time forthcoming*

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

6 [RLH SAO
12-11](#)

Appeal of William J. Kachel Sr. to a Summary Abatement Order at 884 JACKSON STREET.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

RE: 884 Jackson St (duplex)

No one appeared.

Inspector Joel Essling:

- *re: retaining wall, previously heard Apr 17, 2012*
- *unable to determine who actually owned the wall*
- *Summary Abatements were re-issued to both addresses adjacent to the wall: 1) 884 Jackson St; and 2) 112 York Ave*
- *compliance date on those SAs is May 16, 2012*
- *Inspector Meshuga has been in conversation with the property owner and it is his understanding that the 2 owners are working some kind of outcome to deal with the wall*
- *he is recommending laying this over to May 22, 2012 LH*

Ms. Moermond:

- *will lay this over to LH May 22, 2012*

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/22/2012

11:30 a.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

7 [RLH VO
12-31](#)

Appeal of Joan B. Markgraf to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 2084 ARLINGTON AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Grant the appeal.

RE: 2084 Arlington Ave E (single family)

Joan B Markgraf, owner, and her attorney, Diana Longrie, appeared.

Fire Inspector Mike Urmann:

- Revocation and Order to Vacate conducted Apr 24, 2012 by Inspector James Thomas
- this is a single family non-owner occupied structure that's been inspected in the past for Certificate of Occupancy
- it was due for another inspection so the inspector scheduled it
- last time it came through the system, it was graded as a Class C building, which makes it due for C of O inspection in a year
- it appears that the inspector was refused access to do the inspection; (emails)
- in the meantime, they received a referral so, the inspector responded to that referral and gained access from the tenants
- did the referral inspection, not the full C of O inspection of the building
- again, tried to access building for the re-inspection and full C of O and was refused access again
- due to noncompliance and failure to allow access to the property, it was necessary to Revoke the C of O
- at the time of inspection, the building was occupied
- nature of referral: leaks, mold issue in the bathroom, bathroom water running brown, mice and pests throughout the building

Ms. Moermond:

- Appellant states she does not need a C of O any more

Ms. Longrie:

- in listening to the report, it sounds as though there may have been a couple of miscommunications; she would like to clear up some of the issues
- her client was in the process of evicting these tenants because they were already breaching certain covenants within the lease: 1) had extra people living there; 2) they had a dog; 3) they accommodated their extra people by making bedrooms in the basement
- her client sent a letter by certified mail requesting the inspection be postponed so that the inspection could be done after the tenants had gone because obviously, there would not have been any bedrooms in the basement
- when her client went to her eviction proceedings, the tenant asked to have it set for a trial, which extended the timeline of the tenant remaining in the building
- now, the tenants are out
- it's not her intent to rent this property out again; she is not looking for a certification so that she can rent it again
- she plans to sell the property ASAP
- she would not classify the inspections not happening as a refusal on her part; it was a timing issue and she was trying to communicate that to the inspector
- Ms. Longrie had also spoken with the inspector explaining to him that they were trying to get the tenants out before inspection; it's a lot easier to do an inspection when no one is there
- referral: she thinks that the tenants were making a complaint because they were unhappy about being evicted; they knew for a while that they were going to be evicted; Ms. Markgraf gave them ample opportunity to get the extra people out of the house
- whether a Class C property vs a Class A : it's her understanding that originally, this

property was a Class A property; a number of repairs were done on it that were in compliance with previous requests; it's their belief that, for some reason, it wasn't being changed back to a Class A property - perhaps that's a holdover from another time and should be looked into

- deficiency list #1, #2 and #3 - her client never advertised this property as having basement bedrooms; she told her tenants that they were not to have bedrooms in the basement; currently, there are no bedrooms in the basement

- #4 and #5 - work has been done to the toilets; has photos; not clear on what inspector saw

(Ms. Moermond put all photos on the record - Ms. Longrei noted that all the photos were taken before the tenant moved in - they show no damage)

- her client did not have an opportunity to take a measure of the damage that the tenant did to the property

- after the tenant moved out, there were holes in the walls #6

- they brought a copy of the fuel burning equipment safety test report, dated Apr 16, 2012, and presented it to Mr. Urmann

- they completed and signed a smoke detector affidavit - entered May 5, 2012

- #9 - exterior walls - don't know what this refers to; need clarification (hasn't been warm enough to paint yet)

- #10 - water leaks in kitchen and dining area near rear exit door; (yes, the roof was repaired while the tenant was living there but there was not an opportunity to paint fresh in the inside)

- #11 - window screens - has been done; entered copy of purchase and receipt

- need to make sure they get things clarified so that the house remains a Class A property (need a clean bill of health)

Mr. Urmann:

- regarding certified letters sent to DSI office - the inspector never received certified mail; he can't find anyone on staff that signed for or received certified mail

- regarding class of the building - Class is determined at the first inspection of the property; when the repairs are completed, it doesn't change the class of the property; on this inspection, a new grade will be established once the inspection is done (note: we have yet to do a full inspection of the property)

- other issue - once the C of O is Revoked for any reason, the C of O drops to Class C and it can never be anything more than that for that inspection cycle

- repeated that only a referral inspection has been done; not a full C of O inspection

- during a referral inspection, the inspector looks at those items that were brought forth by the complainant and any life-safety issue that is detected

Ms. Longrie:

- they have online tracking of the certified mail, which shows that it was delivered; it reads:

- 1) accepted at USPS on Apr 19, 2012 at 2:12 p.m.

- 2) dispatched for the sort facility at USPS original sort facility on Apr 19, 2012 at 6:20 p.m.

- 3) accepted at the sort facility at USPS Apr 20, 2012 at 3:52 a.m.

- 4) departed from the sort facility at USPS

- 5) delivered Apr 20, 2012 at 11:22 a.m.

- her client has had a full inspection done by a private inspector, Richard Killian, Apr 3, 2012

- they feel that the C of O was Revoked improperly - simply because the inspector was refused access to the property, when in reality, they weren't refusing access, they were trying to re-schedule; she, personally, spoke with Inspector Thomas on the phone the day before and indicated that they had sent the request by certified mail and he said, "I haven't received it yet so, I'm still going out there." She and her client both made an effort to re-schedule the appointment - it wasn't a refusal, they were

just trying to re-schedule; they had also sent an email to that effect.

Mr. Urmann:

- they still have to do the inspection to close their Orders on this; they can't go on a separate entities' inspection as proof of compliance

Ms. Longrie:

*- the last time this inspector was at the property and her client was also there, her client felt intimidated and threatened by his demeanor towards her; so, she is asking for one of two options (understanding that the city has to do what it has to do, but):
1) either have an inspector from a different area to the inspection; or 2) if it's going to be the same inspector, that he have a police escort because her client would like to be there when the inspection is taking place, obviously, so that she can be aware of what they are referring to that needs fixing*

Ms. Moermond:

*- so much of this is moot right now
- points of education: selling the property - in order to sell the property, you need one of 3 documents and you have 1 (either a Truth in Sale and Housing Inspection Report, which you have so you're good); a Code Compliance Certificate (for houses that need complete rehabs); or a Certificate of Occupancy issued by the city
- Ms. Markgraf has the TISH Report; she doesn't need either of the other two to sell the house
- if she wants to re-rent the house, she will need a C of O
- without a C of O and without anyone living there, you have an empty building; if the building is empty for at least 1 year, it becomes a Registered Vacant Building
- it's a good time to sell the property
- regarding waiting for the inspection to happen after the eviction: without speaking to the communication, wanting to delay an inspection would not be a city's reason to delay it because the city considers the eviction a "private matter" between the owner and the tenant
- regarding building classification: if the building is purchased by someone who will be using it as an investment property, they will need to have a C of O to do that; and, there needs to be a full C of O inspection to get the classification - let's use that next inspection for the new owner as the basis for a classification; that would be a matter of disclosure for Ms. Markgraf during the sale process
- will recommend the City Council grant this appeal on the Revocation noting that Ms. Markgraf will disclose to a new owner that it needs to have a Certificate of Occupancy in order to be a rental property and they should do it before it becomes a rental*

Mr. Urmann:

*- what do we do with the open Orders?
- he needs some closure on the open Orders because of the legal issues; they have a liability if the Orders are outstanding
- he is asking that access be granted so that he can verify that the basement is no longer being used as bedrooms; he believes that the tenant has moved out but then, they can close out the Orders*

Ms. Moermond:

*-Ms. Moermond said the Fire C of O orders will come up with the C of O when when and if it's turned into a rental property; put a hold on it and close the file for the moment unless it becomes a rental again
-the critical issues have been identified and handled and there is nothing pressing at the building
- she will recommend that Council grant the appeal and she would consider the other matters "internal computer concerns"*

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Window Variances: Hearing Required

- 8 [RLH FOW](#)
 [12-139](#) Appeal of Kirk Anderson to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1419 ALASKA AVENUE.
- Sponsors: Tolbert
- Grant the appeal on the sill height provided that owner install one step to the non-vented side below each egress window; also install handholds.*
- RE: 1419 Alaska Ave
- No one appeared.*
- Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*
 - this sill height issue was laid over from Apr 24, 2012
- Ms. Moermond:*
 - Mr. Anderson entered photos and diagrams (scanned)
 - will recommend this appeal be granted provided the owner install one step to the non-vented side below each egress window; also install handholds.
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 9 [RLH FOW](#)
 [12-125](#) Appeal of Charles Belcher to a Re-Inspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 733 JENKS AVENUE.
- Sponsors: Bostrom
- 5/9/12 - Owner called and stated he got the wrong date of the hearing. Rescheduled to May 15. City Council on 5/16/12.*
- Minutes from LH May 15, 2012:*
- RE: 733 Jenks Ave (single family)
- Charles Belcher, owner, appeared.*
- Mr. Moermond:*
 - Mr. Belcher provided photographs of the windows and a diagram
 - windows were called out on the second floor: west, east and south bedroom are double hung (11h x 21w); 58 inches from floor
 - Mr. Belcher was to look into solutions
- Mr. Belcher:*
 - entered photos of roof line where it would be extremely difficult to lower the windows
 - an older couple lives in the house; there are no children
 - the west and east bedrooms are currently not being used as bedrooms (there are used as storage)
 - the south room is being used as a bedroom
 - he plans to change out the center window (11h x 21w); still need to do a variance

- he will built 2 steps under the middle window

Fire Inspector Mike Urmann:

- did not get a copy of the appeal
- spoke with Appellant prior to the hearing and handed him the Residential Egress Window handout so he can look at it
- Appellant is proposing installing a casement window vs. a double hung in the center amulion; the center window is actually larger and would fit the measurements; he told the Appellant that he would need to get a licensed contractor to install that egress window under permit and submit plans; so, the type of window that's there now will not be there in the future

Ms. Moermond:

- she can live with that solution but Appellant will probably need to seek a variance on the replacement window; she believes that the dimensions will still be a little short but she is willing to work with him on a variance at that time, if he is not automatically granted one by the department
- she will recommend the Council deny this appeal and grant a 90 day extension to come into compliance, provided that the other two rooms are not used for sleeping purposes

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/16/2012

10 [RLH FOW](#)
[12-155](#)

Appeal of Bee Vue to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice -
Re-Inspection Complaint at 693 WESTERN AVENUE NORTH.

Sponsors: Carter III

Deny the appeal and grant an extension for 60 days to remove the porch windows and screens.

RE: 693 Western Ave N (duplex)

Bee Vue, owner, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

- Appellant is appealing windows opening onto an enclosed front porch
- people take out the windows of the porch so that you exit directly outside
- this issue comes up about once a week

Mr. Vue:

- has photos on phone
- it's a huge porch
- one of the rooms has a door
- it's an older house (1922) built with bedrooms behind the porch
- he has been code compliant with the city before
- recently, he rehabbed and it was inspected twice already by the fire dept

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

- the code is specific about an escape and rescue opening doing directly outside; the only exceptions are fully sprinklered buildings or a door going directly outside. An enclosed porch with screens and windows is not acceptable.

Mr. Vue:

- asked if it would be alright if he just take out the side windows instead of taking out all the windows; it would help to keep rain, snow and wind out

Ms. Shaff:

- perhaps, windows could be installed in the sides of the buildings so that the Appellant can keep the porch (Mr. Vue, it may not be possible because of a stairway on one side and there's a closet; on the other side, it may be possible)

Mr. Vue:

- if he must, he will open up the porch because he needs the bedrooms more than he needs the porch

Ms. Moermond:

- opening up the side windows alone isn't sufficient; Appellant needs to open up the whole porch on the upper level
- will recommend denying the appeal and grant 60 days to open up the porch

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

11

[RLH FCO
12-239](#)

Appeal of TAB Properties to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection Rescheduled Appointment at 930 LAUREL AVENUE.

Sponsors: Carter III

Deny the appeal and grant an extension to September 1, 2012 to come into compliance.

RE: 930 Laurel Ave (three-four family)

No one appeared.

Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:

- the railing and decking are in pretty bad shape

Ms. Moermond:

*- grading the site is a big problem
- Christine Boulware, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC), went to look at it; and when she looks at railings like this in situations like this - instead of doing something with the railing, people move the grading upward so that the elevation makes more sense, which is completely possible on the western side but it slopes downward on the eastern side and into the neighbor's yard
- Ms. Boulware was surprised to see the Order on the railing but the decking was so bad
- this is 28 inches above the decking; the requirement is 36 inches; historically, you'd have 26-30 inches when you have a limestone column like that, so this isn't totally out of line with what you'd see, historically
- it could be moved upwards, though or you don't need a railing if you can increase elevation of the land around it
- Ms. Boulware had no comments about the condition of the railing during their conversation
- viewed the photos with Ms. Shaff, who pointed out soft areas and bowing
- the balustrade is 28 inches above the decking (requirement is 36 inches)
- the west side of the porch is 36 inches above grade; the front is 39-40 inches above grade
- the east side is 42 inches above grade
- the west side of the house - the walk-way and back yard is settled; the east side goes down to the neighbor's yard, which make re-grading the site very difficult*

- essentially, they need to get another 6 inches, which will be hard to find
- if the decking were less than 30 inches, there wouldn't be a handrail requirement but they can't seem to get that height
- if the decking can get to 32 inches, then, a letter could be sent to Jim Bloom asking for a variance and Christine Boulware would write a letter of support
- taking all of this into account, she will recommend this appeal be denied by the Council with a compliance date of Sep 1, 2012
- note: the Orders call out the decking in the back but not the decking in the front (Ms. Shaff: they will amend their Orders)

Ms. Shaff:

- how far apart are those houses because we don't measure right up next to the porch or right next to the structure; you measure out

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

12 [RLH FCO](#)
[12-258](#)

Appeal of Karla Osterkamp (on behalf of Connie Osterkamp, deceased) to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 561 CALIFORNIA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Grant the appeal.

RE: 561 California Ave (single family)

Karla Osterkamp, homesteader, on behalf of Connie Osterkamp, deceased, appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

- Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection conducted Apr 18, 2012 by Inspector Mike Cassidy
- 10 items on list
- #7 egress window opening is being appealed (Ms. Moermond has recommended granting a variance)
- also appealing being in the Fire C of O Program

Ms. Osterkamp:

- her mom, Connie Osterkamp owned the home and she lived there
- when her mom became severely ill, her dad asked Karla to move into the home immediately
- she, her son and daughter have been living there since 2005
- she didn't understand the Notices she was getting in the mail regarding a Fire Certificate of Occupancy
- when the inspector came, he said it was because the house was a rental property; Ms. Osterkamp told him that it has never been a rental property
- her parents paid off the mortgage a long time ago
- there was supposed to be a will; however, she and her sister have been having a hard time trying to find it
- just got probate paperwork (Jun)

Ms. Moermond:

- no question that this should be out of the C of O Program
- will recommend the appeal be granted

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

-
- 13** [RLH FCO
12-260](#) Appeal of Jennifer Vietmeier to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 1865 COTTAGE AVENUE EAST.
- Sponsors:** Bostrom
- 5/10/12 - PO never received notice of hearing. Rescheduled to May 15.*
- 5/8/12- No show; deny the appeal.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 14** [RLH FCO
12-259](#) Appeal of Jeff Lemke to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 234 CLERMONT STREET.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- 5/10/12 - owner called and stated he never got notice. Rescheduled to May 15, 2012.*
- 5/8/12- No show; deny the appeal.*
- Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/15/2012**
- 15** [RLH FCO
12-263](#) Appeal of Alex Goldfarb to a Fire Correction Notice - Re-Inspection Complaint at 217 GRIGGS STREET NORTH.
- Sponsors:** Carter III
- Deny the appeal and grant an extension to August 1, 2012 for the tenant to vacate the illegal unit.*
- RE: 217 Griggs St N (duplex) or (triplex)*
- Alex Goldfarb, Certificate of Occupancy Responsible Party, appeared.*
- Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*
- Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice: inspector noted that this was zoned for 2 units; currently, has 3*
 - zoning is RT1*
- Mr. Goldfarb:*
- purchase property approximately Nov 2005 as a triplex (as far as he knew)*
 - it was not only listed as a triplex but it was previously sold as a triplex*
 - the appraisal came back as a triplex; the appraiser said that he had been confused but he talked to someone at the city who said it was a triplex*
 - he wouldn't have purchased it had he known*
 - now he is trying to refinance because the property has lost approx \$100,000 in value; he wants to be able to keep up repairs and not lose it to foreclosure*
 - in the process he got an appraisal and the appraiser was again, confused; and he contacted the zoning department; then, Mr. Goldfarb got a call from Rick Gavin, fire inspector*
 - he spoke with someone in zoning who told him that there was a complaint, which makes it more difficult (complaint was filed a day before or after he got the call from Rick Gavin)*
 - if it needs to be re-zoned, he'd like to know if that's even possible*
 - it's been a triplex for at least, 10 years, maybe 20*
 - asked if he can use it as a 2-unit, just with more space*
 - he'd be glad to sell the property today but he can't so, he's trying to make it work*
-

Ms. Shaff:

- looking at STAMP activities:
- Jun 24, 1998 - Truth in Sale and Housing inspection: duplex
- Jun 23, 2003 - Truth in Sale and Housing inspection: duplex
- Jan 15, 2004 - Rental Registration: duplex
- May 16, 2005 - Truth in Sale and Housing inspection: duplex
- STAMP shows it's a legal non-conforming duplex/lot

Mr. Goldfarb:

- it's been a triplex for at least 10 years: he can prove that through MLS listings and leases
- the lot is very small

Ms. Moermond:

- this lot size is too small for a duplex, let alone for a triplex
- will recommend the Council deny this appeal; but, ultimately, the enforcement needs to do through zoning staff: you would need to appeal this determination by the zoning staff, which is a separate route than this. Contact Karen Zachow- 266-9084

Ms. Shaff:

- when it came into the complaint line is the same date as when the zoning folder was opened (notes: MLS lists as a triplex; no Certificate of Occupancy)
- it did have a provisional C of O; it was inspected in Mar 2008 by Inspector Sean Westenhofer

Mr. Goldfarb:

- has already told the tenant in the 3rd unit that she needs to move; the lease is through Jul or Aug
- will try to get a variance or rezone

Ms. Moermond:

- let's give the tenant to Aug 1, 2012
- this property is safe as a duplex

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

16 [RLH FCO](#)
[12-202](#)

Appeal of Laura Goodman, St. Catherine University, to a Re-Inspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 2004 RANDOLPH AVENUE (O'SHAUGHNESSY THEATER).

Sponsors: Tolbert

Grant the appeal on conditions with extension to September 1, 2012.

RE: 2004 Randolph Ave (O'Shaughnessy Theater)

Laura Goodman, Director of Public Safety and Jim Manship, Director of Facilities, St. Catherine University, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

- Appellant was going to make plans

Ms. Goodman:

- went back and examined this again and asked for a copy of the Fire Code
- at the last hearing, she heard repeatedly that there was only one way in and one way out of the tunnel; she didn't believe that was true, so, they went back into the

tunnels to check it out; and, there is another way out: you do have to climb up and over the old tunnel, which is very doable via a ship's ladder. Her boss, who is 6' 5", climbed up and stood with his hands in the air. She showed Ms. Moermond and staff on the plan; so, they continue to dispute that they are in violation. Based on the 2 violations of how much storage is from the ceiling in a non-sprinklered area, they are not in violation; then, the fact that it's not one way in and one way out and the egress is clear and not a public egress. It's a tunnel space and the equipment room for the air exchangers; it's not a fuel burning equipment room.

Fire Inspector:

- asked the travel distance once you climb over the cement wall (Ms. Goodman showed her on the floor plan); this area goes all the way around the sprinkled area behind the stage so, both doors are fire doors; the walls, ceiling, everything is concrete. If the fire came to outside those doors, it would come to a sprinkled area.

Ms. Goodman:

- a compromise position: if they already have heat detectors and smoke detectors in the areas, smoke would be seen before heat and it would create an additional safety mechanism
- the tunnel system is very wide; not a public space; not fuel burning
- besides, this is an incredible hardship and it could mean shutting down a theater program, etc.
- another thing they want to do is develop a pre-plan with the Saint Paul Fire Fighters, who would actually come to fight the fire on their campus; she has contacted the captain of one of the shifts that would respond to fires but he hasn't gotten back to her yet

Mr. Manship:

- he did a quick inventory of the amount of storage materials in that space; they take up about 1,800 sq. ft. an equivalent of about 80% of their theater space or it would be 100% of their rehearsal hall (a substantial loss of use if they would be required to move that to another location. Building equivalents of that 1,800 sq. ft. are a 30 x 60 building or a 45 x 45 building.

Ms. Goodman:

- moving that storage off site or off campus would create more risk to the people who'd be lifting, hauling and lugging furniture; right now, they have a stage elevator to bring those items easily up to the theater

Fire Inspector:

- commented that the code section specifically states that is need not be fuel fired equipment; it is a substantial space: the space they're using is 1,800 sq. ft; the space, itself, is much, much larger. The stairs that they are discussing are not shown on the drawing - she doesn't remember the clear ceiling height there, once you stand on top of that landing. (Ms. Goodman showed photo of her 6' 6" boss standing on the landing, lifting his arms to the ceiling.)

Mr. Manship:

- there are fire dampers according to the drawing notes

Ms. Moermond:

- thinks that it would be useful for the Appellant and inspectors to discuss those ideas in a conference room and come back to discussion

BREAK TO DISCUSS

Inspector Skow-Fiske and Inspector Wiese:

- they have arrived at a compromise:

- 1) add smoke detectors in the area where they are holding storage in the tunnel*
- 2) the storage is not to expand*
- 3) they will do a pre-plan with the responding fire department, routinely; suggests every 2 years (inspection cycle for this building)*
- 4) remove mattresses and couches and put into either the adjacent sprinkled area or another space*
- 5) re-arrange the rest of the storage to prevent aisle jumping*
- 6) co-ordinating the preventative maintenance on the belts, etc., in that handling area with the safety checks that they have*
- 7) adding exit signage / emergency light packs both at the existing exit sign and at that ship's ladder to platform*

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend that the City Council grant this appeal based on the aforementioned conditions being met by September 1, 2012

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

17 [RLH FCO](#)
[12-290](#)

Appeal of Wayne A. Olson to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 953 FOREST STREET. (Adopted by Council on October 19, 2011)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Grant the appeal for owner to be out of the Fire Certificate of Occupancy Program.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

18 [RLH VBR](#)
[12-30](#)

Appeal of Lawford Baxter to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 1411 ALBEMARLE STREET.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

This file was opened in error. Appeal withdrawn.

Withdrawn

Window Variances: No Hearing Necessary

19 [RLH FOW](#)
[12-151](#)

Appeal of James Swartwood to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection Correction Notice at 904 BEECH STREET.

Sponsors: Lantry

Grant a 5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom window in Unit 904.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

-
- 20 [RLH FCO](#) Appeal of Nao Thai Yang to a Fire Correction Notice - Complaint Inspection
 [12-265](#) at 1249 COOK AVENUE EAST.
- Sponsors:** Bostrom
- Grant a variance on the ceiling height.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 21 [RLH FOW](#) Appeal of Ray Simpson to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 330
 [12-158](#) MAGNOLIA AVENUE EAST.
- Sponsors:** Brendmoen
- Grant a 4-inch variance on the openable height of the egress bedroom windows throughout 7 units.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 22 [RLH FOW](#) Appeal of Angela Goss, on behalf of DB1, LLC, to a Fire Inspection
 [12-156](#) Correction Notice at 1127 MARGARET STREET.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Grant a 3.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the upper floor northwest bedroom and grant a variance on the sill height issue provided that property owner install standard steps below the egress window.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 23 [RLH FOW](#) Appeal of Ray Harris, on behalf of R. David Reynolds, to a Re-Inspection Fire
 [12-160](#) Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 921 MOUND STREET.
- Sponsors:** Lantry
- Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable width of the egress windows in the upper floor northwest and south bedrooms. (Variance was granted on main floor northeast bedroom and upper floor landing bedroom on March 20, 2012).*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 24 [RLH FOW](#) Appeal of Charles Maguire to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection
 [12-150](#) Correction Notice at 1808 PORTLAND AVENUE.
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Grant a 2-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in East Unit, third floor south bedroom; grant a 2-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the second floor southwest bedroom; grant a 4-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the second floor southwest porch room; and grant a 3.5-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the third floor bedroom.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012**
- 25 [RLH FOW](#) Appeal of Holly Mullaney to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection
 [12-159](#) Correction Notice at 971 ROSE AVENUE EAST.
-

Sponsors: Bostrom

Grant a 1-inch variance on the openable egress bedroom window in the first floor bedroom.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

26 [RLH FOW](#)
[12-154](#)

Appeal of Allison Schmitt to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1717 ROSS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Lantry

Grant a 4-inch variance on the openable height of the egress windows in all bedrooms.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

27 [RLH WP](#)
[12-44](#)

Appeal of The Window Store Home Improvements, on behalf of Brandon Imsdahl, to an Egress Window Non-Compliance Determination at 1386 SCHLETTI STREET.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Grant a 5-inch variance on the openable height of two double hung replacement egress bedroom windows measuring 19 inches high by 27 inches wide.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012

28 [RLH FOW](#)
[12-157](#)

Appeal of Al Nadimi to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1744 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST.

Sponsors: Stark

Grant a 3-inch variance on the openable height of the egress window in the second floor middle room.

Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2012