



# 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, September 4, 2012

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

---

### 9:00 a.m. Hearings

#### Special Tax Assessments

- 1      **RLH TA**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.  
         **12-481**      J1213A, Assessment No. 128524 at 512 BLAIR AVENUE.

Sponsors:      Carter III

Attachments:      512 BLAIR AVE. TGW LETTERS.pdf  
                                 512 BLAIR AVE. PHOTO. 6-6-12.DOC

*No show; approve the assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

- 2      **RLH TA**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.  
         **12-483**      J1208E, Assessment No. 128311 at 824 CARROLL AVENUE.

Sponsors:      Carter III

Attachments:      824 CARROLL AVE. SUMMARY ABATEMENT.4-26-12.DOC  
                                 824 CARROLL AVE. PHOTO.5-2-12.DOC  
                                 824 CARROLL AVE. EC BILL.5-2-12.DOC

*No show; approve the assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 3      **RLH TA**      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No.  
         **12-480**      CRT1211, Assessment No. 128214 at 971 CASE AVENUE.

Sponsors:      Bostrom

Attachments:      971 Case Ave First.pdf  
                                 971 Case Ave Final.pdf  
                                 971 Case Ave.LHO Review of Fees.9-2-12.pdf

*Reduce the assessment from \$1,302.00 to \$662.00.*

RE: 971 Case Ave (duplex)

Hillary Hujanen, owner, appeared.

Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:

- Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection cost \$1,152 + \$150 service charge = \$1,302
- dates of Orders: 8/18/09; 9/14/09; 8/10/10; 8/22/10; 11/12/10; 12/22/10; 1/12/11; 2/1/11; 2/24/11; 3/18/11; 3/31/11; 10/31/11; 11/29/11; 12/9/11; 12/28/11; 1/27/12; 2/27/12
- approved 3/28/12
- bills sent: 3/29/12 and 4/30/12
- bills were sent to 920 Lincoln Ave, St. Paul
- some of the Orders were sent to Ahti Hujanen, 43rd St N in Oakdale; and some went to Mary Kay on Clark St, St. Paul
- lots of inspections; lots of Orders; lots of different mailing addresses

Ms. Hujanen:

- nothing goes to Mary Kay any more
- she is not appealing; she has problems with some of these inspections: they are being charged twice for the Dec 9, 2011 inspection, where he never did an inspection; he just drove by the property; if he didn't do the inspection, they shouldn't be charged for an inspection (he was also supposed to be checking the basement - he wanted them to paint the basement - 2011)
- another inspection back in Apr 2011 - we were granted that appeal and then, there was a series of inspections after that on issues that they won on the appeal; at least 2 of those inspections came back with reports that were false: 1) we had rodent infestation in the stairwells (never the case; the code was improperly ordered so they had to appeal); 2) the most recent inspection where the inspector just submitted pictures from the previous year and didn't actually do an inspection of the property
- she feels that at least 6 of the re-inspection fees are unreasonable

Ms. Moermond:

- because this is complicated, she went through the records, copiously - every single appeal and every single bill
- she feels confident that she can recommend some of these fees be deleted; not necessarily the ones Ms. Hujanen just listed
- she found 4 appeals total, including today's
- she looked into the Dec 9 and Dec 19 fees and thinks that one of them was mislabeled (the one for Dec 19 should have actually been listed for Dec 9)
- she knows that no one showed up on Dec 9, 2011 for an inspection

Ms. Shaff:

- Inspector Thomas' notes: regarding Dec 9, he called you in the morning and you stated that you can't make the appointment today because you didn't have a car (Ms. Hujanen: she never said that - she and Ahti have each had a car consistently for the last 5 years)

Ms. Moermond:

- Dec 9 fee goes
- will recommend approval for a grand total of \$662.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

- 
- 4      [RLH TA  
12-343](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1208, Assessment No. 128810 at 1093 EDGERTON STREET. (To be referred back to September 4, 2012 Legislative Hearing and September 19, 2012 City Council Public Hearing)
- Sponsors:      Brendmoen
- No certificate of code compliance; approve the assessment.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/19/2012**
- 5      RLH TA      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411 at 581 FOREST STREET.
- 12-484
- Sponsors:      Lantry
- Delete the assessment; waiver on file.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**
- 6      RLH TA      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No.128311 at 659-661 GERANIUM AVENUE EAST.
- 12-486
- Sponsors:      Bostrom
- Attachments:      659-661 GERANIUM AVE E. ORDERS. 5-1-12.DOC
- Delete the assessment; new owner was never notified of orders.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**
- 7      [RLH TA  
12-407](#)      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212A, Assessment No. 128521 at 701 HAMLIN AVENUE.
- Sponsors:      Tolbert
- Attachments:      [701 Hamline.PA recs](#)
- Forthcoming. LHO to review file.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/19/2012**
- 8      RLH TA      Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No. 128311 at 1845 HAWTHORNE AVENUE EAST.
- 12-494
- Sponsors:      Bostrom
- Attachments:
- 1845 HAWTHORN AVE E. EC. 4-11-12.DOC
- 1845 HAWTHORN AVE E. SUMMARY ABATEMENT. 5-2-12.DOC
- 1845 HAWTHORNE AVE E. EC.5-2-12.DOC
- 1845 HAWTHORNE AVE E. PHOTO.5-2-12.DOC
- 1845 HAWTHORNE AVE E. SUMMARY ABATEMENT. 4-2-12.DOC

Approve the assessment.

RE: 1845 Hawthorne Ave E (single family)

Jonas Stomberg, a friend representing Ryan and Laura Aylesworth, owners, currently living in Lee, MA, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- there are 2 Excessive Consumption fees for a total of \$135
- the first one is for non-compliance on Apr 2, 2012
- the other one is a \$50 multiple on May 1, 2012
- Apr 2, 2012, Orders were sent to Ryan Aylesworth, 1845 Hawthorne Ave E; and to Ryan and Laura Aylesworth, Lee, MA
- no returned mail
- has photos
- had another complaint May 2, 2012
- Orders sent to same (4th violation)
- no returned mail
- on-going problems

Mr. Stomberg:

- he has seen the photos and some of them were for a different house
- Mr. Aylesworth wants Mr. Stomberg to make sure he is being assessed for the right house
- he's here to clarify if the fees are for the owners' property
- and the Notices were sent somewhere else, so the owners weren't receiving them
- the owners also have had mail issues because they have re-located

Ms. Seeley:

- the first set of Orders was when the clean-up was done (this has already been levied)
- that did get sent to Keller Williams and to the owner at Hawthorne Ave E because that's where Ramsey County had them listed (Ms. Moermond explained that Ramsey County has a record where they list the address of the Aylesworths at Hawthorne and until the county changes it, the City's reference point hasn't changed; so, when they changed it at the county to Lee, MA, the city also had the address of record; the 2 Excessive fees talked about today were sent to the Lee, MA address)
- now, the addresses listed in Ramsey County are correct

Mr. Stomberg:

- viewed the photos for these assessments and they are photos of the Aylesworth's house

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend this assessment be approved
- the City Council will consider this at public hearing Oct 17, 2012
- if this assessment is ratified, the owners will receive a bill in the mail, at which point they can choose to pay the bill or allow it to go onto their property taxes (interest rate 4.5%)

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**9 RLH TA  
12-436**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No. 218311 at 301 HOYT AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

**Attachments:** 301 Hoyt Ave E Summary abatement orde 4.18.12.DOC  
 301 Hoyt Ave E EC letter 4.24.12.DOC  
 301 Hoyt Ave E Summary abatement orde 4.24.12.DOC  
 301 Hoyt Ave E EC letter 5.9.12.DOC  
 301 Hoyt Avenue East photo 4.24.12.DOC  
 301 Hoyt Avenue East photo 5.9.12.DOC

*No show; approve the assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**10 RLH TA  
12-487**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No.128311 at 873 JENKS AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

**Attachments:** 873 JENKS AVE. ORDERS. 4-30-12.DOC  
 873 Jenks Ave..Photos.5-4-12.DOC  
 873 Jenks Ave.EC Letter. 5-4-12.DOC

*Approve the assessment.*

*873 Jenks Ave (single family)*

*Alan Hupp, owner, appeared.*

*Inspector Paula Seeley:*

- Excessive Consumption charge for \$85
- Orders issued Apr 30 with compliance May 3;
- re-checked May 5 and found noncompliant
- no returned mail
- re: litter and broken wooden fence near garage; also, vehicle inoperable with flat tires
- Order sent to owner at 10431 homeward Hills Rd, Eden Prairie

*Mr. Hupp:*

- applauds the city of Saint Paul for making this a priority; they own several properties in different locations
- the tenant is a thoughtful young woman with a couple kids
- re: the garbage - Highland Sanitation missed her pick up that week (they can confirm it and they apologized)
- re: the car - it took her just a few days to figure out what she was going to do with this car that had flat tires and was inoperable; ultimately, she was able to get it into the single car garage to get it off the alley
- she didn't have enough time; she was working
- the turn around time is not very much time to take care of a situation - things take a while to get sorted out
- having more time to deal with this situation would have been more helpful
- he had to call Highland Sanitation directly so that they'd make a special run to get the garbage cleaned-up
- having more time would be very helpful
- when he went out there to check on the fence, it wasn't there anymore

*Ms. Moermond:*

- according to the notes, there were 2 other dates of garbage complaints

Ms. Seeley:

- on May 27, Viola container had overflowing garbage
- again on Apr 11, there's an overflowing Highland container
- since Jan 12, 2012, they have been out there 5 times on complaints and had to issue Orders on the garbage, etc.

Mr. Hupp:

- they switched from Viola to Highland and during that switch, Highland missed a pick-up
- she's a good tenant; is working hard; it's a Section 8 house - it's all working out but this was frustrating for her
- he's owned the property for 2 years; completely rehabbed it
- is asking for some consideration
- there's also a lot of dumping in that area
- thinks that the amount of time given to take care of things is too short

Ms. Moermond:

- there have quite a few inspector call-outs

Ms. Seeley:

- the City Council wants garbage issues addressed in 4 days

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend approval of this assessment

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**11 RLH TA  
12-488**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1213A, Assessment No. 128524 at 864-866 JESSIE STREET.

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Attachments:** 866 JESSIE ST. TGW. 6-21-12.pdf  
866 JESSIE.PHOTO.6-25-12.DOC

*No show; approve the assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**12 RLH TA  
12-474**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1213A, Assessment No. 128524 at 1000 MARGARET STREET.

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** 1000 Margaret St.Summary Abatement. 5-31-12.DOC  
1000 Margaret St.Photos. 6-6-12.DOC

*Reduce the assessment from \$471.00 to \$200.00.*

*RE: 1000 Margaret St (single family)*

*Heather Gruber, owner, appeared.*

*Inspector Paula Seeley:*

- Summary Abatement for failure to maintain exterior property were issued May 31 with a compliance date of June 6, 2012
- Re-checked Jun 6 and found to be noncompliant
- Parks cleaned-up Jun 7, 2012 for a cost of \$316 plus a service charge of \$155 = \$471
- no returned mail
- sent to Richard Gruber, Stillwater; Occupant at 1000 Margaret; and Daniel and Heather Gruber, 1000 Margaret

Ms. Gruber:

- they are the Occupants, her and Daniel; have a Contract for Deed
- she paid the garbage bill on Jun 6, 2012
- she called and told the city that she had paid the bill
- the city came anyway and brought a city garbage container; they took it back the very next day
- a mattress was outside for 2 days

Ms. Seeley:

- Inspector Smith said the Orders were for a clean-up on May 31st and a hauler

Viewed VIDEO

Ms. Gruber:

- before the City came, I called the city and told them that the garbage service had been restored and they come on Tue to pick-up

Ms. Essling:

- there was a city container in the VIDEO

Ms. Moermond:

- but, this is not about the garbage container at all; this is about the clean-up; no charge for a city container

Ms. Gruber:

- she had already set up the mattress removal with the garbage company so, it would have been taken care of immediately

Ms. Moermond:

- wondering whether there was a miscommunication
- looking at stacked up bags stacked up against the garage
- will recognize the Gruber's good faith effort

Ms. Gruber:

- normally, there no trash in their yard

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend reducing the assessment to \$200

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**13 RLH TA  
12-479**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No. 128311 at 1032 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

**Attachments:** 1032 MINNEHAHA AVE E. SUMMARY ABATEMENT. 4-5-12.DOC  
1032 MINNEHAHA AVE E. PHOTO.4-11-12.DOC  
1032 MINNEHAHA AVE E. EC BILL.4-12-12.DOC

*Approve the assessment.*

*RE: 1032 Minnehaha Ave (single family)*

*Kent LeFevre, Capital Investment Group, appeared.*

*Inspector Paula Seeley:*

- Excessive Consumption fee for \$85*
- Summary Abatement sent Apr 5 with compliance Apr 11 to clean up, including removing refuse; plastic containers; tires; containers of used motor oil; trash bags in rear yard*
- re-checked Apr 12 and found to be in noncompliance; issued EC*
- SA Orders were again issued Apr 20 on motor oil and various other items; compliance date Apr 26; issued EC*
- orders were again sent Jun 25, Aug 2 and Aug 21, 2012*
- sent to 271 LLC, Brooklyn Park*
- no returned mail*
- have a pending assessment for \$75 (may have been cancelled by the inspector)*

*Mr. LeFevre:*

- is appealing because he never received those notices in Apr or May 2012; didn't have an opportunity to address it*
- his property manager's office at the time was in Golden Valley; when they get a Notice, they scan it and email it to him (Renters Warehouse)*
- the mailing address that was read is correct but they didn't received any Notices*
- he did receive the Notice for the one in Jun and it was taken care of right away*
- college students rented this house*
- they do interior inspections every quarter; they do drivebys once a month; they also have a property manager who is also supposed to be doing that, as well*
- he called in last week and spoke with the Inspector and gave her the correct address; also asked her to fax these Notices*
- the college students did really well the first 9 months of the lease and then, apparently, started having some parties*
- the tenants broke their lease; they took off and left a bunch of junk; he went over there and cleaned-up everything that was visible in the yard but some things were still in the garage*
- he notified them to get their things out of the garage; they spent a week cleaning up and getting their personal property out; a tenant's mother said she would come and pick up the tires and he believed her; he got another Order for tires*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- she is on the fence with this one*
- the city sent Orders and there was no returned mail*
- the Orders were addressed correctly; although Mr. LeFevre says he didn't get it*
- the city's obligation is to get it into first class mail*
- looking a history of the city having to write Orders on this property instead of Mr. LeFevre's people taking care of it*
- will recommend approval of this assessment (Apr 12, 2012)*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**



14 RLH TA  
12-463

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1210B, Assessment No. 128111 at 1202 PACIFIC STREET.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: 1202 Pacific Street. Boarding invoice 5.11.12.pdf

*Forthcoming; LHO to talk to commander at SPPD.*

*RE: 1202 Pacific St (duplex)*

*Jinsil Hwang, daughter of owner, Kumok Hwang, who's in Australia, appeared.*

*Inspector Paula Seeley:*

- *Emergency Boarding requested by the Saint Paul Police Dept to secure the building form illegal entry on May 10, 2012 at 3 am*
- *cost: \$281 plus service charge of \$155 = \$436*
- *one door was secured with screws*
- *police report*

*Ms. Hwang:*

- *owned property since 2009*
- *SPPD had called them but it was hard to get a hold of them because it was so early*
- *when they got there the next morning to look at the door; they hadn't gotten our authorization*
- *we saw they had put 6 screws in - they didn't put the door knob back in*
- *there was just a little board put in where the door had been kicked in*
- *she should have brought some pictures*
- *when she spoke with SPPD the next morning, they said they never heard of anyone coming out in the middle of the night to fix doors*
- *someone told her that if they called the police again, they would begin charging \$50 per call because he place has been broken into 6 times since Feb of this year*
- *she has tried to find out what's going on from the police; no one will call her back*
- *she has over 50 pages of police reports*
- *she is asking for some help - even a reduced fine*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *explained that this isn't a fine; it's a charge for service*

*Ms. Seeley:*

- *RESPRO charged \$11.95 for securing the door; misc labor: \$19.90; trip charge for them getting called out in the middle of the night: \$250; plus an assessment fee of \$150 for a total of \$436*
- *apparently, there still is an open file on the electrical work (Ms. Hwang said that they had everything done and approved by 2010)*

*Ms. Hwang:*

- *she moved back into the property in Feb, 2012*
- *after she was robbed, she moved out because of security reasons*
- *recently, she moved back in after she installed a security system*
- *she doesn't know why the property was being victimized and the police haven't gotten back to her about it*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *read some of the police report*
- *provided her with East Team Commander Joe McCrea's contact information 266*

*Ms. Hwang:*

- she told the police that every time they rummage through her house, they rummage exactly the same way every time; she is sure they are the same people over and over again; they go through the same drawers; they open up the same doors; they even go through hidden spots in her house
- she hasn't had any trouble since she installed the security system
- she has talked with the neighbors every time someone breaks in but no one has ever seen or heard anything
- currently, her boy friend and dog live with her, also
- her insurance dropped them because of all the break-ins and claims to fix the door

*Ms. Moermond:*

- explained that the SPPD cannot leave the scene without the property being secured (Ms. Hwang said that the door knob wasn't even put on, so, the door could be just pushed open)
- she will talk to the East Commander
- will provide Ms. Hwang with her recommendation before the City Council Public Hearing

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**15 RLH TA  
12-478**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1213A, Assessment No. 128524 at 448 PAGE STREET EAST.

**Sponsors:** Thune

**Attachments:** 448 Page St E.Grass Letter.pdf  
448 Page St.Photos.6-18-12.pdf

*No show; approve the assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**16 RLH TA  
12-472**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411at 754 PAYNE AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

*Delete the assessment; waiver on file.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**17 RLH TA  
12-466**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411 at 899 PAYNE AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

**Attachments:** 899 PAYNE AVE. GRAFFITI ORDER.pdf

*Delete the assessment; waiver on file since 2008.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**18 RLH TA  
12-451**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1210 Assessment No. 128816 at 1311 REANEY AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Lantry

*Delete the assessment; VB staff closed their file.*

*RE:1311 Reaney Ave (duplex)*

*Inspector Joe Yannarely:*

*- follow-up*

*- spoke with Inspector Singerhouse, who got a referral from Inspector James Thomas, who said the place was unoccupied and vacant*

*- based on the testimony from Mr. Fischer that the upstairs has always been occupied, Mr. Singerhouse recommends that they close the Vacant Building file and delete the assessment*

*- it will go back to the Certificate of Occupancy Program; Inspector Singerhouse will email Inspector Thomas*

*Ms. Moermond:*

*- based on Mr. Singerhouse' recommendation, she will recommend the assessment be deleted and the VB file closed*

*Mr. Fischer:*

*- something has expired; not sure what*

*Mr. Yannarely:*

*- it might be the C of O from the Fire Marshal's Office*

*- James Thomas is the C of O Inspector for that area*

*Ms. Moermond:*

*- Mr. Fischer will then be contacted with a time and date of an inspection*

*- suggested he look at the check list of things the inspector will look at so that he can address them beforehand*

*- assessment is deleted; VB file is closed*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**19 RLH TA  
12-490**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No. 128311 at 842 RICE STREET.

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Attachments:** 842 Rice St.Summary Abatement Order.4-20-12

*No show; approve the assessment.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**20 RLH TA  
12-473**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411 at 929 RUSSELL STREET.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

*Delete the assessment; waiver on file.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 
- 21      **RLH TA**  
          **12-471**
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No. 128311 at 746 SEVENTH STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:**      Lantry
- Attachments:**    746 7th St E.EC bill  
                          746 7th St E.Summary Abatement.4-26-12  
                          746 7th St E.Photos.4-26-12
- No show; approve the assessment.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**
- 22      **RLH TA**  
          **12-493**
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411 at 839 SEVENTH STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:**      Lantry
- Attachments:**    839 7th St E.Graffiti Order
- Delete the assessment; waiver sent in.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**
- 23      [RLH TA](#)  
          [12-482](#)
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1211P, Assessment No.128410 at 1899-1905 STILLWATER AVENUE.
- Sponsors:**      Lantry
- Delete the assessment; waiver on file.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 9/19/2012**
- 24      **RLH TA**  
          **12-492**
- Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. VB1210, Assessment No. 128816 at 926 THIRD STREET EAST.
- Sponsors:**      Lantry
- No show; approve the assessment.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**
- 25      **RLH TA**  
          **12-489**
- Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411 at 824 WHITE BEAR AVENUE.
- Sponsors:**      Lantry
- Delete the assessment.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**
- 26      **RLH TA**  
          **12-497**
- Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1208E, Assessment No.128311 at 594 LAFOND AVENUE.
- Sponsors:**      Carter III

**Attachments:** 594 LAFONE AVE. SUMMARY ABATEMENT. 5-10-12.DOC  
 594 LAFOND AVE. PHOTO.5-18-12.DOC  
 594 LAFOND AVE. PAEC BILL. 5-22-12.pdf

*Delete the assessment.*

*RE: 594 Lafond Ave (duplex)*

*Wameng Yang appeared, on behalf of owner, Nu Moua.*

*Inspector Joel Essling:*

- \$85 PAEC Excessive Consumption fee
- Summary Abatement issued May 10, 2012; compliance date May 17
- re-checked May 18 and found to be in noncompliance; 7 bags of garbage on the ground near alley and no container
- on the same day Parks came to clean it up and found that the owner had cleaned it up
- there have been 5 Orders in 2012 and 3 Work Orders in 2012

*Mr. Yang:*

- wants to know what address is on the record because they never get the first Notice; it's always the 2nd or 3rd
- bought property 8-19-11 (HUD statement)
- not sure who the in-town contact is

*Mr. Essling:*

- when the Orders were issued, the listed owner of the property was Yung Nhia Vu, 594 Lafond Ave
- Orders were also sent to August Waage, Roseville
- since then, the tax records have changed
- now the listed owner of the property is Nu Moua, Goleta CA
- apparently, the new owner did not register this property with the city as rental property

*Ms. Moermond:*

- will recommend this assessment be deleted based on Mr. Yang taking care of things in the future; if she gets another Excessive Consumption on this property, she will recommend that it get approved (she was looking at the very tight turn around between the compliance date and the crew showing up taken together with the significant time delay on the HUD transfer of title )

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**27 RLH TA  
12-498**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1202V, Assessment No. 128002 at 1163 KENNARD STREET.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

**Attachments:** 1163 Kennard St.Vehicle Abatement Order.3-7-12.pdf  
 1163 Kennard St.Photos.3-15-12.pdf  
 1163 Kennard St.Summary Abatement.3-7-12.pdf

*Forthcoming. LHO needs to review police reports.*

*RE: 1163 Kennard St (single family)*

*Rich Vang, owner, appeared.*

*Inspector Joel Essling:*

- \$489.50 assessment for towing an abandoned vehicle
- Vehicle Abatement was issued Mar 7, 2012 with compliance on Mar 14, 2012
- re-inspected May 19, 2012 and found noncompliance
- Work Order sent to Police Dept
- vehicle is a maroon Toyota with expired tabs
- sent to Pakou Vang, Rich Vang and Chia Lor, all at 1163 Kennard St
- Orders were actually issued on 2 vehicles: 1) had been removed or found to be in compliance; 2) the Toyota was still in violation with expired tabs and parked on the grass

*Mr. Vang:*

- inspector came over and told him to fix the garage, clean-up the back yard and also on the phone said, "Move the vehicle"
- his brother moved the vehicle
- the car belonged to him but his brother wanted to use it in 2009 so, he transferred the title to his brother; then, his brother bought a new car for himself and brought the other one back to Mr. Vang
- they did exactly what the inspector told them to do: they moved the vehicle (it had been parked between the house and the garage in the back yard); so, they moved the vehicle onto the driveway
- then, someone came over and ticketed it and towed it (they don't know why - it just had expired tabs)
- has a garage but a boat is stored in it
- the vehicle that was towed is in his brother's name; the impound lot won't talk to him because the title is not in his name

*Ms. Moermond:*

- doesn't have any paperwork on this because no one knew the appellant was coming
- she will need to find out more and get some photos
- she will review the police report
- will give Appellant a call or email him with her recommendation

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

**28 RLH TA  
12-499**

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1202V, Assessment No. 128002 at 858 JESSAMINE AVENUE EAST.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

**Attachments:** 858 Jessamine Ave E.Summary Abatement.1-27-12.pdf  
858 Jessamine Ave E.Vehicle Abatement.1-27-12.pdf  
858 Jessamine Ave E.Photos.2-17-12.pdf

*Approve the assessment and spread the payments over 5 years.*

*RE: 858 Jessamine Ave E (single family)*

*Steven Vue, son of owners, who lives there, appeared; it's his vehicle.*

*Inspector Joel Essling:*

- assessment for towing an abandoned vehicle - \$439.50

- Vehicle Abatement mailed Jan 27, 2012 with a compliance date of Feb 6, 2012
- there were some other notices mailed on Jan 27, 2012 also for some other re-inspections
- the vehicle was re-inspected Feb 24, 2012 and found to be in noncompliance
- Work Order was sent to police for a black Acura with no plates (expired tabs and inoperable)
- in the Summary Abatement, inspector marked "unknown"
- there were 2 Acuras; one black; one white; both problematic
- notice sent to Cher Vue and Blia Vue at 858 Jessamine Ave E

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Cynthia Skalley sent the Order Jan 27, 2012
- Ms. Seeley went out there to follow-up on this file
- there were current plates but the car was up on jacks with front end damage, and was still inoperable
- she spoke with Steven, who said that the car had been that way for quite a while and he didn't have the money to fix it (Mr. Vue disputed that; he said that he spoke with Ms. Seeley and to Ms. Moermond last time about the car getting towed and the garbage in the yard; both said the car was abandoned and so the city towed it; the city charged for taking away the garbage and said I should come back about the car, so, he is here about the car; at that time, Ms. Seeley said it had no plates, now, she says it had plates; first you say it's black, then, white.....)
- Mr. Vang called her and was upset when the car was towed
- their standard is to give someone 30 days to work on a car

Mr. Vang:

- he wants to know why the care was labeled "abandoned" when it was in his driveway
- when he was here last, he hadn't received any Notice about his car; it was about the garbage
- if he would have received a Notice about his care, he would have done something about it
- insurance takes a long time to take care of accidents (but he didn't make a claim)
- he didn't get the car back again; the city took it; they can have it
- if I take it back again and try to fix it, the city will tow it again and charge me again
- feels that the city is taking advantage of poor people and he's among the poor
- there's garbage all over and the city doesn't do anything about yet you come to my house and charge me
- there's people fixing cars on the street - stolen cars on the street and the city does nothing - but you come to inspect my house
- he called the impound lot who said that if he didn't want the car, he could bring them his title

Ms. Moermond:

- asked who opens the mail at their house (Mr. Vang: his parents don't read or write English; other siblings open and read the mail)
- looked at photos of the cars: 1) black Acura; and 2) white Acura
- the black Acura doesn't have any tires on the front; it has license plates
- will recommend this assessment be approved payable over 5 years

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

29      **RLH AR**  
**12-105**

Ratifying Demolition services from May to June 2012 (NON-C.D.B.G. Funds). (File No. J1215C, Assessment No. 122016)

Sponsors:      Lantry

**Attachments:** Assessment Roll

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 30 RLH AR 12-106** Ratifying Graffiti Removal services during May 16 to June 19, 2012. (File No. J1212P, Assessment No. 128411)

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** Assessment Roll

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 31 RLH AR 12-107** Ratifying Demolition services from June 2012 at 488 Robert St S. (File No. J1216C, Assessment No. 122017)

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** Assessment Roll

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 32 RLH AR 12-108** Ratifying Excessive Use of Inspectio Services billed from April 6 to May 24, 2012 (File No. J1208E, Assessment No. 128311).

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** Assessment Roll

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 33 RLH AR 12-109** Ratifying Towing of Abandoned Vehicle Services from February to March 2012 (File No. J1202V, Assessment No. 128002).

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** Assessment Roll

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**

- 34 RLH AR 12-110** Ratifying Tree Removal services from May 2012. (File No. 1210T, Assessment No. 129012)

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** Assessment Roll

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/17/2012**



**11:00 a.m. Hearings****Summary Abatement Orders**

35      [RLH SAO  
12-26](#)      Appeal of Brent Adams to a Summary Abatement Order at 635 CANTON STREET.

**Sponsors:**      Thune

**Attachments:**      [635 Canton.appeal.8-29-12.pdf](#)

*Laid over for staff report.*

*RE: 635 Canton St (single family)*

*Brent Adams, owner, appeared.*

*Inspector Joel Essling:*

- *Summary Abatement issued Aug 27; compliance date Sep 4, 2012*
- *at the rear of this house, remove the entire car port and remove all vehicles from this parking place; this is state land*
- *complaint came in Aug 9 and says - rear of the house, nailed 2x4s to the exterior stretched around tarp out and made a lean-to storage area; is this OK*
- *Inspector Schiller went out to look at that and then he entered a complaint (car port on a thin section of state owned land)*

*Mr. Adams:*

- *showed Ms. Moermond an aerial photo, printed by zoning, of his property showing a fence*
- *when he purchased the property, he assumed that the property within the fence line was his property*
- *when he went to zoning, they said that 641 Canton (which is not in existence as far as he's concerned) was part state owned land (8 feet wide strip)*
- *he thought he had one off-street parking space to park his car that he doesn't want to park on the street*
- *he called his title insurance company and they haven't even responded*
- *has talked with Colette, 90 Plato, who said it would take a while to go through the system in order for him to purchase it*
- *is asking for more time to figure this out and to keep his parking spot during that time, an approved spot*
- *aerial view from GISMO attached*
- *he took the top off the carport*
- *he would like to claim adverse possession \_\_\_\_\_*

*Mr. Essling:*

- *appears that the parcel in question (641 Canton) has gone tax forfeit; listed owner is State MN Trust Exempt*
- *this is close to 35E; he suspects that at some time, it was part of 35E construction*

*Mr. Adams:*

- *it was privately owned*
- *has the original 1900's plat map*
- *he would just like to set this straight; hoped that his title insurance would help him but they are not*

- the process of purchasing that parcel and adding it to his lot has already begun

Mr. Essling:

- once that parcel has been added, the issue is having an approved parking spot

Mr. Adams:

- Chap 34.08 (07) Properly Stored Vehicles reads: spaces shall be paved with asphalt, concrete or other suitable durable dustless surface  
- this is an approved concrete surface (zoning didn't see any problem with this)  
- entered a letter he received

Mr. Essling:

- Correction Notice says: vehicles, boats, trailers parked on an unapproved surface. Remove and file site plan with zoning for parking spaces in the yard. See attached flyer, which is the Site Plan Approval Form, that will be approved by zoning to establish an approved parking surface (Ms. Moermond explained that the inspector was enforcing under the zoning code, not under Chap. 34)

Mr. Adams:

- Mr. Schiller did everything he was told to do and Mary in zoning said she didn't see the problem

Ms. Moermond:

- asked if the carport structure itself was sound; the description doesn't tell her that (Mr. Adams: the structure is made out of wood- 2x4s and the roof is wood; he was trying to follow the code about if it costs less than \$500 you don't need a permit - size is roughly 10 x 20)  
- explained that you can have an exterior structure without a building permit if it's not larger than 8 x 10  
- whether or not you heed a permit, you would need to meet the setback requirements from the adjacent property line

Mr. Essling:

- even though you don't have a permit, you need to meet the requirements of the bldg code  
- since Mr. Adams seems to be so well organized, it would probably be to his benefit to get that parcel attached to his property to avoid future problems and  
- get the site plan approved

Ms. Moermond:

- feels that she does not have good information about the stability of that as a structure  
- wants to give the Appellant a good length of time to deal with zoning so, she will restrict her immediate concerns with soundness of structure

Mr. Adams:

- he found out there had been a complaint by checking the city website; Mr. Schiller had told him that they had a process of driving by properties checking for parking spaces  
- could he apply for a zoning variance so that the structure could be allowed?

Ms. Moermond:

- Appellant would need to go through the Board of Zoning Appeals, which cost a few hundred dollars  
- would wait for an assessment of the structural soundness of the car port; if the inspectors say they are not comfortable with that and it has to come down, she would

like to separate this into 2 pieces: 1) get the soundness taken care of first; and 2) provide a long time to sort through the parcel acquisition and the zoning issues unless he has to deal with zoning sooner  
- asked Mr. Essling and Mr. Ubl to go inspect within 2 weeks

Mr. Adams:

- said that he built the structure very strong (may need to pull a permit after the fact)

Ms. Moermond:

- will lay this over until Sep 25, 2012 at 11 a.m. legislative hearing to get an assessment of the soundness  
- then, she will give the Appellant more time, maybe 6 months, to deal with the rest of the steps  
- let's see if we can't get this taken care of by phone or email before Sep 25  
- if we need Sep 25 LH, it's there as a fail safe

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/25/2012**

36

[RLH SAO  
12-24](#)

Appeal of Roxanne Kay DeFlorin to a Summary Abatement Order at 762 THOMAS AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Carter III

**Attachments:** [762 Thomas.appeal.8-20-12.pdf](#)

[762 Thomas.Photos.8-17-12.pdf](#)

[762 Thomas Ave.Deflorin Ltr 9-12-12.doc](#)

Owner missed hearing; however, property owner was aware of hearing.  
Rescheduled to 9/11

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/11/2012**

## 1:30 p.m. Hearings

### Correction Orders

### Fire Certificates of Occupancy

37

[RLH FCO  
12-488](#)

Appeal of John Curtiss to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 265 SUMMIT AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Carter III

**Attachments:** [265 Summit Ave.appeal.7-20-12.pdf](#)

[265 Summit Ave.appeal photos.7-20-12.pdf](#)

[265 Summit Ave.Curtiss Ltr 9-6-12.doc](#)

Grant appeal on the railing height for the first three steps of the grand staircase and spiral staircase; grant appeal on the front porch; and deny the appeal and grant a 90-day extension to add simple, grippable pipe handrails to the exterior east and west side staircases.

RE: 265 Summit Ave (single family)

*Need Heritage Preservation Commission report.*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*

- *Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection approved with corrections*
- *had some handrail and guardrail height issues on the exterior*
- *since it resides in an historic district, the hearing officer wanted HPC staff to take a look at it and bring their recommendation to this hearing today*

*Amy Spong, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC):*

- *this building is classified as Pivotal to both the national register and the local historic districts (1976-1977)*
- *it has a high degree of integrity - there are very few changes that have been done to this property*
- *front porches have not been altered since the house was built circa 1885*
- *it's a Queen Anne design by architects Molden McNichol*
- *very important interior with remarkable handrails (not sure of what a solution would be to bring those into better compliance without really ruining and negatively impacting their historic character)*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *had already granted the appeal on the interior staircases at the previous LH*
- *Ms. Spong's assessment affirmed the granting of that appeal*

*Ms. Spong:*

- *regarding the exterior guardrails: responding to the porch, itself*
- *it's quite a unique design; it's a very low brick wall; it's not just a matter of adding a rail without really negatively impacting that original design*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *given the necessary design changes, the size, weight and massing of the existing low brick wall, and the historic consideration, she would recommend granting the appeal on the front porch*

*Ms. Spong:*

- *#3 exterior handrails on the east side stairs and the west side stairs*
- *recommended that the handrails added be simple, grippable handrails - like a painted pipe rail; those could be added without sensitively without having a negative impact to the historic and architectural character*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *will recommend that simple, grippable pipe handrails be added to the east and west side staircases*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 9/19/2012**

**38 RLH FCO  
12-503**

Appeal of Alan L. Peterson to a Correction Notice-Reinspection Complaint at 1010-1012 CASE AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

**Attachments:** 1010 Case Ave.appeal.7-27-12.pdf  
1010 Case.SAO.8-2-12.pdf

*Grant a 5-inch variance on the basement north and south bedrooms ceiling height of Unit 1012.*

*RE: 1010-1012 Case Ave (side by side duplex)*

*Alan L. Peterson, Responsible Party, appeared.*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*

- *re-inspection of a complaint*
- *Jul 13, 2012 re-inspection conducted by Inspector Wayne Spiering*
- *1012 has 2 items: 1) basement bedrooms' ceiling height; and 2) egress window (under suspension)*
- *ceiling height is 79-80 inches across the entire suspended ceiling (code requires minimum of 7 feet high over 50% of the habitable space)*
- *inspector noted that the ceiling height from the floor to the joist is 83 1/4 inches*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *if the egress window comes up again, she would recommend a variance*
- *is more touchy about the height of basement ceilings*

*Mr. Peterson:*

- *the basement had already been finished well before he began to be involved with this property 4-5 years ago*
- *it was passed at one time for occupancy*
- *they are just trying to clean up the place*

*Ms. Shaff:*

- *permit was issued Jul 23, 2010; technically, it's an expired permit but it looks as though Construction Services re-opened that permit*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *will recommend granting a 5-inch variance on the basement ceiling*
- *if Mr. Peterson can find a way to increase the height of the ceiling, she would be happier*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**39**      **RLH FCO**  
**12-527**

Appeal of Hong Yang to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice and Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 1711 FREMONT AVENUE.

**Sponsors:**      Lantry

**Attachments:**      1711 Fremont Ave.appeal.8-17-12.pdf  
1711 Fremont Ave.Yang Ltr 9-10-12.doc

*Grant a variance on the basement bedroom ceiling height. (No hearing is necessary)*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**40**      **RLH FCO**  
**12-549**

Appeal of Tim Skelly to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 830 LAUREL AVENUE.

**Sponsors:**      Carter III

**Attachments:**      [830 Laurel Ave.appeal.8-29-12.pdf](#)  
[830 Laurel Ave.Photos.8-28-12.pdf](#)  
[830 Laurel Ave.Skelly Ltr 9-6-12.doc](#)

*Deny the appeal and grant an extension to Oct 1, 2012 to come into compliance with*

the canopy.

RE: 830 Laurel Ave (apartments)

Tim Skelly, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

- Correction Notice due to a complaint inspection which was sent to their office Aug 27, 2012
- he personally conducted an inspection Aug 28, 2012 due to numerous neighborhood complaints about the property
- there's been 73 police calls for service since Jul 20, 2011 - many of the calls were nuisance calls, unfounded issues; nothing arose to cause it to be considered a problem property
- he has been in contact with the Force Unit regarding the list
- he noted there were broken windows in Unit #3 as well as torn screens in Unit #5
- exterior rear canopy was damaged, structurally
- Orders issued to owner with a re-inspection scheduled for Sep 10, 2012 at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Skelly:

- needs more time to hire a carpenter to do the work on the canopy; he's called 3 contractors who are all busy 5 weeks out
- just got the Orders last Fri right before the holiday weekend - it was hard to get a hold of anyone until today
- the windows will be done by the end of the week

Mr. Neis:

- the canopy serves 2 units to shed rain and snow away from the building and needs to be repaired or replaced
- there's a floor jack in the middle of the canopy

Mr. Skelly:

- noted that the canopy has 2 posts on the side that are structurally sound; it's just the middle post that needed the floor jack; it sits on concrete or asphalt

Ms. Shaff:

- explained that in a situation like this one would think that the load would spread evenly to each side but that's not how it works; 5/8 of each side is going to that center
- the outside posts are carrying less than half of the load; typically a footing requires 42 inches and the diameter depends on the dead load
- a contractor will know

Mr. Skelly:

- a couple of his tenants are a nuisance; one is a drunk lady and both are being evicted this week (has a hearing for that)
- mostly, the tenants were calling on each other; some calls are from a few neighbors
- he has had meetings with the tenants and the neighbors
- the apartment building with 7 tenants is between Victorian houses
- he does do tenant screening but some applicants come with a case worker and they promise to behave

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend the Council grant an extension to Oct 1, 2012 to come into compliance with the canopy
- City Council Public Hearing Sep 19, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/19/2012

41 [RLH FCO  
12-540](#)

Appeal of Mary Johnson, Shamrock Court Investors LP, to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 2196 LOWER AFTON ROAD.

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** [2196 Lower Afton Road.appeal.8-22-12.pdf](#)  
[2196 Lower Afton Rd.Photos.8-14-12.pdf](#)

*Per LHO request, reschedule to Sept. 25, 2012.*

*Forthcoming; need to discuss with City Attorney.*

*RE: 2196 Lower Afton Rd (multi-family)*

*Mary Johnson, Shamrock Court Apartments, appeared.*

*Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:*

- *Correction Notice for a complaint inspection Aug 14, 2012 in response to complaints in regards to a rear fence which runs along the property line*
- *inspection conducted by Inspector Bill Beumer*
- *this fence was actually required by a City Council Order adopted Jun 21, 1971*
- *in order for Shamrock Court to have their parking spaces approved, they had to provide this fence that runs along the rear of the property*
- *in the 1971 Order, specifics were laid out to include "paint and maintain the fence every other year, minimumly" which clearly has not been done because the fence has deteriorated to a state of decay (several sections have been removed because of rot)*

*Ms. Johnson:*

- *the same number of parking spaces remain as in 1971*
- *this property backs up against 3 lots*
- *there had been a previous complaint at the end of Jun 2012 about the fence being in poor repair; so, they removed the fence from that particular section because it was impossible to repair*
- *in doing so, the other 2 neighbors said that they would really like to keep the fence because one of the neighbors said it protected their garden from deer and the other neighbor said he needed the fence because he had a swimming pool and a dog*
- *they have contacted their lawyer; Shamrock Court Investors LP purchased that property in the 1980s and it's their contention that if the requirement is to run with the title to the property, then that should be embodied in a document which is recorded in Ramsey County Property Records and they have no knowledge of that being recorded any where*
- *if the 2 neighbors would like to have that fence, Shamrock Court Apts would have no problem with them keeping their fence and maintaining it*

*Mr. Neis:*

- *read the 1971 Order on record (attached)*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *concluded from that 1971 Order that a parking variance was granted because the fence was constructed*
- *she is concerned only with the variance, not the title; so, if they are not in compliance with the terms of the variance, the property needs to go back to the state of conditions before the variance was granted*
- *she is going to bring this to the attention of the City Attorney*

- she understands Shamrock Court Apts' attorney on this; however, that's not the city's concern (the city is talking about the parking lot and whether or not it could be there)
- Shamrock's complaint is with the previous owner, not with the city

Ms. Johnson:

- assumes that at the time this development took place, there was nothing there (no trees, foliage, bushes, etc.)
- introduced a photo of the back parking lot where the fence is, although, you can't see the fence for the trees
- the purpose of the fence may no longer be what it was in 1971
- Shamrock Apts would rather not be maintaining a fence for someone's swimming pool or another's garden
- the first inspector who came out on the complaint and Karen Zachow said that they were under no obligation to keep the fence in tact
- it was re-inspected Jul 20, 2012 by Mr. Mike Cassidy, who left her a message at 12:46 p.m. indicating that the inspection was complete and in his opinion, the case was closed
- the neighbor who wants the fence there for his swimming pool called his City Council person, Kathy Lantry, who located these minutes; Ms. Lantry then called Ms. Johnson and asked, "Now, what are you going to do?"
- the next day, another complaint came in; then, Ms. Johnson was told that "you can't tear down one part of your fence without tearing down the whole thing"

Ms. Moermond:

- will discuss this with the City Attorney's Office
- will get back to Ms. Johnson
- LH set up for Fri, Sep 14, 2012 for follow-up
- will make a recommendation at that time

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/25/2012**

**42**      **RLH FCO**  
**12-520**

Appeal of Brandon Folson to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 275 MCKNIGHT ROAD SOUTH.

**Sponsors:**      Lantry

**Attachments:**      275 Mcknight Rd S.appeal.8-14-12.pdf  
275 McKnight Rd S.Folson Ltr 8-27-12.doc

*No show; deny the appeal.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**43**      **RLH FCO**  
**12-541**

Appeal of Adam Smith to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice (electrical shutoff) at 1175 ROSS AVENUE, #2.

**Sponsors:**      Bostrom

**Attachments:**      [1175 Ross Ave.appeal.8-20-12](#)  
[1175 Ross Ave.Condemnation Placard.8-14-12.pdf](#)

*Power was restored.*

**Withdrawn**



44

[RLH OA  
12-63](#)

Appeal of Lisa Heikkila to a Code Compliance Report at 1805 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST.

**Sponsors:** Lantry

**Attachments:** [1805 Minnehaha Ave E.appeal.8-24-12.pdf](#)  
[1805 Minnehaha Ave E.Photos.3-11-12.pdf](#)

*Per LHO, rescheduled to September 25, 2012 LH.*

*Forthcoming (LH Fri Sep 14, 2012)*

*RE: 1805 Minnehaha Ave E (single family)*

*Lisa Heikkila, owner, appeared.*

*Ms. Heikkila:*

- *would like to see if she can pull a permit for work on the house without having to do the work on the garage right away; it's detached from the house and she is moving into the house*
- *the garage is not being used and there's no electricity in the garage*
- *she intends to do the work that's necessary on the garage; just not yet*
- *she doesn't want to be prevented from moving into the house before the work on the garage is done*
- *she is appealing a few items on the list*
- *screens: it says to provide screens for all door and window openings - she lived in her other home without screens and it's much better, much clearer*
- *if she puts screens on all her windows, she'll never be able to see outside clearly; it'll be all gray; now, it's clear and the light comes in*
- *if she is going to live there, she thinks she should have the right to not have screens*
- *some screens will remain but she doesn't want to have to purchase screens for all the windows before she moves in*
- *trees: the Order says that she needs to cut down her trees but she has only 4 trees (2 landscaped spruce trees in front of the house that are beautiful; one tree is on the blvd; and one in the back yard near the garage); they create great shade*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *the Order says that the trees are against the foundation of the home and garage (Ms. Heikkila said that they might be big weeds, not trees; she introduced photos of the trees)*
- *would have to ask the inspector what he saw*

*Ms. Heikkila:*

- *the Order wants hard-wired smoke alarms in the upper level (she has one in the hallway which is only 2 1/2 feet with 2 rooms close together; she thinks that smoke alarm is loud enough for everywhere in that small upper level; at least, she should be able to use only battery smoke alarms vs hard wired)*

*Ms. Shaff:*

- *regarding smoke detectors, state building code requires there be hard wired smoke detectors inside and outside of every room used for sleeping*
- *if a screen was originally on a window, it needs to go back there; if screens come with the window, there needs to be a screen*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- would like to talk with the building official about what he saw here to make these calls

*Ms. Heikkila:*

- she agrees that the garage will need work but her concern is since she is not going to move into the garage, can she get into the house and start doing the work; that and the screens are the most important to her  
 - she has tried to pull permits 3 times but the bids weren't good enough; they want more of a break down on the electrical work and he couldn't read the plumbing bid so that needs to be typed; her dad and brother are carpenters and can pull the building permit

*Ms. Moermond:*

- some of the minor work can be done without pulling a permit  
 - she can see ways to make the garage go separately but the whole idea of the VB Program is to make sure that all the rehab is done properly before it's re-occupied and "properly" includes getting the accessory structures taken care of as well; if one is making good progress on executing the rehab on the house, she can see the possibility that the Orders on the garage could be separated out, as long as the garage was safe (she has to have developed a high level of trust that the owner will be following through on the plans to rehab)  
 - she will get the building inspector out there to get his perspective; she will call his boss  
 - hopefully, she will be able to have a clearer picture of the Orders by Fri Sep 14, 2012

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/25/2012**

**45 RLH FCO  
12-543**

Appeal of Keary Maloney to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1098 MARION STREET.

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

**Attachments:** 1098 Marion St.appeal.8-20-12  
 1098 Marion.Letter from Maloney 083012.pdf  
 1098 Marion.Photos from Maloney 083012.pdf

*Owner sent in written statement. LHO to review.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/11/2012**

## 2:30 p.m. Hearings

### Vacant Building Registrations

**46 [RLH VBR](#)  
[12-62](#)**

Appeal of Kristina Beedle to a Vacant Building Registration Renewal Notice at 23 ISABEL STREET WEST.

**Sponsors:** Thune

**Attachments:** [23 Isabel St W.appeal.8-21-12.pdf](#)

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 12/18/2012**

47 RLH VBR  
12-61

Appeal of Rhett McSweeney, Traditions SP Land LLC, to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 1554 MIDWAY PARKWAY.

Sponsors: Stark

Attachments: 1554 Midway Pkwy.appeal.8-17-12.pdf  
1554 Midway Parkway.Photos.8-7-12.pdf  
1554 Midway Pkwy.McSweeney Ltr 9-10-12.doc

*Deny the appeal.*

*RE: 1554 Midway Parkway (nursing home / health care related - residential)*

*Rhett McSweeney, Traditions SP Land LLC, appeared.  
John Knox, chair, District 10 Como Community Council, appeared.  
Delores Rufenacht, Block Club leader for the area, appeared.*

*Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:*

- he opened up a Category 2 Vacant Building file per a Certificate of Occupancy Revocation by Fire Inspector Peruga
- was Revoked Aug 6, 2010
- at the time of Mr. Dornfeld's inspection, the building appeared to be occupied; there was a pick-up truck parked out front; there was a window air conditioning unit running; there were lights on in the building but no one answered the door so he could not confirm the occupancy
- he issued a Summary Abatement to secure a rear 4-season porch that had some alcohol bottles and drug paraphenelia lying around
- he had to issued a Work Order to have that secured
- posted several placards on the building
- during State Fair time, they received numerous complaints about loitering, parking, etc.

*Mr. McSweeney:*

- provided a letter
- summarized his position: Chap 43 of the code says that in order to be a vacant building, it has to meet a number of criteria
- Shalom Home was a senior housing development in 1927; they sold the property to them last year for a cash price of \$1.75M
- they developed their plan on how they were going to renovate the building to bring it up to senior housing standards of today
- they had their CUP approved by the city and in the course of demolition, one of their boiler pumps broke and the building was flooded; they had a major insurance claim which bogged down their progress considerably
- have invested about \$430,000 in upgrading the heating/cooling system and demolition
- to have the Vacant Building status applied to the building will slow down their rehab progress considerably and will vacate their CUP and slow down their ability to get to the finish line
- is asking to have the VB status be put off for 6 months to see where their progress is at that time
- admitted that the back porch is a problem but they now have it secured with plywood
- the building is occupied during the day; not occupied at night and vandals have broken in a number of times

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*

- the building was found unoccupied and the C of O Revoked on Oct 5, 2011
- they don't have verification that the building was unoccupied prior to that but they believe that it was
- the CUP was issued Jul 8, 2011 and offers 107 units - assisted living facility - expires 2 years from date of approval

Mr. McSweeney:

- will be finalizing their case with the insurance company (boiler pump went out - sprinkler filled and froze and flooded the bldg) soon
- as soon as insurance resolution is complete, they will go back to the lender and in 60-90 days, they will be fully funded (\$16M project)
- the work should be completed 10 months from when they get fully funded
- expects to be fully open the spring of 2014
- the building is extremely sound - people would rush to it if there were a tornado warning
- they continue to maintain the property on a daily basis
- they have a demo permit and are addressing the multiple code violations
- Chap 43.02, subsection 7: he doesn't think the building meets the definition of "unoccupied or unsecured by other than normal means"; other than the back porch which is secured with plywood; the building is definitely not "unoccupied and a dangerous structure"; the building is not "Condemned"; they haven't been put on Notice that the building is "unoccupied with multiple housing or building code violations" nor "Condemned and illegally occupied"

Ms. Moermond:

- the building is "unoccupied with multiple housing or building code violations" - (Mr. McSweeney said they were addressing those issues)
- asked why it was such a big deal about the building being in the VB Program? (Mr. McSweeney said that there are restrictions on the VB like if there's a sale of the property, they need to get city approval prior and some of their partners are being replaced by other partners and he doesn't want to be subject to come before the city to get approval for changing any ownership- the Chap is written pretty vaguely on what constitutes any sale or ownership change)
- she is not thrilled about the very large property

Mr. McSweeney:

- he needs 6 months to have all these issues resolve themselves

Mr. Dornfeld:

- explained that the city's commercial buildings are not required to go through Reid Soley's sale review so, if ownership did change, they would not need to go through that sale review process

Ms. Moermond:

- pulled up the file and noticed that there have quite a number of complaint calls on the property in 2012 starting with the sprinkler flooding, a very significant code call; other reports are for graffiti, tall grass and weeds, severe disrepair of exterior-mold present, obscene graffiti, more tall grass and weeds, etc., etc.

Mr. McSweeney:

- explained that the tall grass and weeds were a part of a back court yard area that they weren't mowing and maintaining; you would not have seen any tall grass and weeds from the Midway Parkway or from Snelling Ave; and when they got the graffiti notifications, they took care of it
- they seem to have run into the biggest problems with the neighborhood and the local neighborhood association when one of the partners thought it would be a good

*idea to park cars during the state fair*

*John Knox, chair, District 10 Como Community Council:*

- *introduced a letter from District 10*
- *since their ownership, there have been issues throughout*
- *during the winter, they provided no snow removal and the sidewalks were nearly impossible to navigate*
- *parking cars during the state fair seemed to just highlight all the other issues (didn't help to maintain the property)*
- *right now, that property is completely littered with trash*
- *the Vacant Building Ordinance, he believes is in place to help protect neighbors*
- *prior to the sale of the building to Traditions, when Shalom still owned the property but did not occupy it, they were there daily to maintain the property*
- *the property maintenance manger personally responded to every call*
- *during that time also, Shalom contracted with the Saint Paul Police Dept and it was used for canine training*
- *until District 10 is comfortable with the way the property is being taken care of, they would prefer that it not be taken off the VB list*

*Delores Rufenacht, Block Club leader for the area:*

- *when Shalom still owned the building and while it was vacant, the maintenance man gave her his phone number and she had contact with him on a regular basis; there was a good relationship with the neighbors*
- *since Traditions has owned it, they have had difficulty communicating with them; a year later she was able to get someone's phone number*
- *the graffiti was obscene and was not dealt with right away; she and another neighbor called it in and it took over a month to get rid of it; Traditions didn't remove it; the city did*
- *they do not maintain the property daily*

*Mr. McSweeney:*

- *seems clear that the neighbors' biggest issue is parking cars for the state fair and the complications that brought*
- *they have been doing their best to maintain the property until they are able to fully renovate it*
- *he was participating with District 10 and providing information for them; however, they have wanted information that he hasn't been able to provide and they found that frustrating*
- *he does not think that the building meets any of the definitions of a registered vacant building*
- *they would like 6 months and he thinks the neighbors and the district will be happy when this building is fully, in earnest, being renovated*

*Ms. Moermond:*

- *this building meets the multiple housing violations and is unoccupied, according to her understanding of the code*
- *additionally, she also believes that it meets the definition of a Category 1 VB*
- *based on that and the scale of the project, it seems to her that this should be a Registered Vacant Building*
- *asked Mr. McSweeney to get a maintenance crew out there right away*
- *get a business card / contact information out to the neighborhood; the need is there to develop a positive, cooperative relationship with the neighborhood*
- *the implication for becoming a VB is twofold: 1) annual VB fee; and 2) have a Team Inspection done prior to rehabilitation*
- *Mr. McSweeney is obligated to provide the city with all the information asked for on the Registered Vacant Building form*
- *at City Council Public Hearing Oct 3, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.*

Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012

48 RLH VBR  
12-64

Appeal of Barry Tanner to a Vacant Building Classification at 857 SIXTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Lantry

Attachments: 857 6th St.appeal.8-23-12  
857 6th St.appeal photos.8-23-12  
857 Sixth St E.Tanner Ltr 9-7-12.doc  
857 Sixth St E.Tanner Revised Ltr 9-7-12.doc  
857 Sixth St.Tanner Ltr 9-12-12.doc

RE: 857 Sixth St E (single family)

Barry Tanner, realtor for Deutsche Bank National Trust Company, owner, appeared.

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

- Condemned by Inspector Paula Seeley
- Category 2 Vacant Building file was opened by Inspector Tom Friel May 9, 2012
- Mr. Friel's notes: 1 1/2 story wood frame single family house; vacant; east side door to enclosed porch is open; rotted soffit-fascia; some peeling paint; cracks in foundation; missing handrail; retaining wall in back is in disrepair; large tree limb down in front yard; refuse inside porch and yard; old windows; tall grass and weeds; issued Summary Abatement on the yard
- currently, Mr. Friel listed building as vacant, secure; yard is OK; gas meter off but not locked
- Mr. Friel did not make reference to an electrical shut-off in his notes

Mr. Tanner:

- property was taken back by foreclosure through the eviction process Apr 23, 2012
- all utilities were kept on
- property was secured except for a storm door
- there was no access to the house that was unsecured
- by law, they cannot remove personal belongings for 28-30 days
- property should have been categorized as a Cat 1, not Cat 2
- submitted photos
- property is in good condition; very little peeling paint and rotted soffit-fascia
- mailed his appeal back in May and never heard a response back; he called the office; there was no record of his appeal and his check was never cashed
- they are at the property at least, every week
- contact information is posted at the front door of the property
- he believes the 3rd party servicing company has paid the VB fees
- mailed in copy of the TISH
- he called the inspector several times but never received a call back
- they would like to move forward as a Cat 1 VB so they can get the property sold and have it lived in again vs having to sell it at a discount to an investor
- the utilities were never shut-off on this property as far as he knows
- the seller wants to do what's correct here

Ms. Moermond:

- the TISH report reveals significant venting issues, hazardous conditions, and staff says there are some roof and soffit and fascia issues (Mr. Tanner said that the

venting issues can be taken care of very easily)  
- looking at photos, she's seeing broken boards but she doesn't think it's going to be an expensive repair but it needs to be fixed before the property is re-occupied  
- she will consider this for a week  
- will put her recommendation on the record next week and give Mr. Tanner a call

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/11/2012**

49

[RLH VBR  
12-54](#)

Appeal of Jon D. Nelson, TCF National Bank, to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement and Order to Vacate at 670 SMITH AVENUE SOUTH.

**Sponsors:** Thune

**Attachments:** [670 Smith Ave.S.appeal.8-8-12](#)  
[670 Smith Ave S.Photos.8-1-12.pdf](#)  
[670 Smith Ave S.Nelson Ltr 9-6-12.doc](#)

*Deny the appeal.*

*RE: 670 Smith Ave S (single family)*

*Jon Nelson, Vice President (manages real estate owned assets), TCF Bank, owner, appeared.*

*Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:*

*- Condemned by Fire Inspector Westenhofer on Jul 26, 2012  
- 11 code deficiencies  
- Inspector Senty followed up with a Category 2 Vacant Building file Aug 1, 2012; he noted the dwelling was vacant, secure and the property area was maintained at the time of inspection*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*

*- all the copper was stolen from this building; has a lot of water damage*

*Mr. Nelson:*

*- does not think this should be classified as a Category 2 Registered Vacant Building; he's fine with the Cat 1 VB  
- the Category 2 designation will severely limit their ability to market this property to whom they intend to market it (first time home buyer)  
- they had completed repairs to this property prior to the copper being stolen; they have attempted to get that replaced  
- TCF is prepared to do the repairs that were called for on the deficiency list but a full compliance will severely limits his ability and want to rehab this property*

*Ms. Moermond:*

*- she thinks this building should be a Cat 2 VB; although the City Council may look at it differently  
- there are so many attendant problems with copper theft*

*Ms. Shaff:*

*- an old gas permit is still open; no other permits have been pulled*

*Mr. Nelson:*

*- they have had some difficulty to do the repairs; they cannot get a permit (Mr. Dornfeld explained that they may be having problems getting permits just because of*

*the Cat 2 VB status - without a Code Compliance Inspection Report on file, the city won't issue permits)*

- they were trying to do some painting on the garage but were told that there were limitations as to what they could do because this was an historic district
- Cat 2 limits the pool of buyers

*Ms. Moermond:*

- there must have been some miscommunication; this property is not located in an historic district
- the city won't allow you to pull permits on a Cat 2 VB until a Code Compliance Inspection Report has been done
- this property should be a Cat 2 Registered VB - seeing significant problems with the copper that has been stolen
- the next stop for TCF is the City Council Public Hearing at 5:30 p.m. Sep 19, 2012
- will recommend the Council deny this appeal

**Referred to the City Council due back on 9/19/2012**

**50 RLH VBR  
12-60**

Appeal of Arjo Adams to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 676 WELLS STREET.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

**Attachments:** 676 Wells St.appeal.9-4-12.pdf  
676 Wells St.Adams Ltr 7-12-12.doc

*Waive the VB fee until January 1, 2013; obtain a code compliance inspection.*

*RE: 676 Wells St (single family)*

*Arjo Adams, brother of owner, Beth Woolsey, and occupant, appeared.*

*Mr. Adams:*

- before it became a Registered Vacant Building, he put in a new water heater but it never got inspected
- he has addressed all the interior work (except the crack in the foundation)
- he wants to get a Fire Inspector in the building, especially, to inspect the water heater - to make sure it's in right and that everything's done
- he went through Zoning and he has everything he needs

*Ms. Moermond:*

- she wants to first hear from Fire
- this was used as a triplex but was built as a duplex
- it was Condemned for multiple reasons

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*

- the foundation issue alone is not just a crack; it's a sizable floor to ceiling hole (that alone would be a Condemnation issue)
- there are multiple electrical issues that have not been addressed
- it is a very strong Category 2 Vacant Building
- without it getting it's Code Compliance Inspection and addressing all of those issues, she is reluctant to waste any more inspector's time on this building

*Mr. Adams:*

- he and the building inspector specifically looked at the foundation crack and it's doesn't have any bearing on the structural soundness
- he can fill it with rocks with mortar



- he believes that the electrical was signed-off

*Ms. Moermond:*

- will recommend that a Code Compliance Inspection is needed and those things need to be addressed before the house can be re-occupied
- will recommend delaying the VB fee until Jan 1, 2013
- City Council Public Hearing Oct 3, 2012 at 5:30 p.m.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**51 RLH VBR  
12-63**

Appeal of Jason MacDonald, Harvester Investors, to a Vacant Building Registration Notice & Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 100 WINIFRED STREET WEST.

**Sponsors:** Thune

**Attachments:** 100 Winifred St W.appeal.8-21-12.pdf  
100 Winifred St W.Photos.8-13-12.pdf  
100 Winifred St W.Macdonald Ltr 9-10-12.doc

Waive VB fee for 60 days.

RE: 100 Winifred St W (single family)

Jason MacDonald, Harvester Investors, Inc., owner, appeared.

*Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings*

- Revoked Certificate of Occupancy by Fire Inspector Bill Beumer on Aug 9, 2012
- 15 code violations
- Inspector Senty followed-up with a Category 2 Vacant Building file Aug 13, 2012
- Inspector Senty issued a Summary Abatement Order for a brush pile in front yard, which since has been removed
- re-inspection found the house to be vacant, secure and the property area maintained

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff:*

- received a complaint Aug 2, 2012 for property maintenance issues
- Inspector Beumer responded Aug 2 and notes that the property is vacant and has numerous issues: damaged grass line; window glass; sidewalks; deck structurally not sound; exterior guardrails; handrails; siding; soffit; windows; disconnected water meter

*Mr. MacDonald:*

- looking for a repeal of the Cat 2 VB status
- just acquired the property Jun 28, 2012
- he called Mr. Westenhofer when he got the Condemnation saying he didn't understand what had happened; he did some digging and found that the Correction Notice was sent to the previous owners - Mr. Westenhofer then, mailed a copy to him; apparently, the County updated that address very shortly after the letter had been sent out; Mr. MacDonald came down the very same day
- his intent is to rehab the property
- working with a Cat 2 is a whole different game than working with a Cat 1
- this went from not receiving Notice to a Cat 2 VB
- once he became aware of the items, he attended to many of them immediately and had the furnace tested

*Ms. Shaff:*

- noted that one of their clerical staff updated the responsible party on Aug 12, 2012 at 3:48 p.m.
- according to the Ordinance, it's up to the owner to notify the city of changes in addresses, etc.

*Ms. Moermond:*

- these Orders went out in early Aug 2012
- provide a copy of the furnace test

*Ms. Shaff:*

- this property had all the indications of a vacant building
- will provide documentation of connected water meter by the contractor

*Ms. Moermond:*

- if Mr. MacDonald can get the Code Compliance list taken care of in 60 days and get the Flre C of O signed off, he can stay out of the VB Program
- if things aren't done, Fire will re-open the file

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

#### Other

### 3:00 p.m. Hearings

#### Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

**52**      **RLH VO**      Appeal of Michael R. Hulke, on behalf of Agnes M. Hulke, to a Notice of  
**12-88**                      Condemnation as Unfit for Human Habitation and Order to Vacate plus  
Summary Abatement Order at 1915 IVY AVENUE EAST.

**Sponsors:**              Bostrom

**Attachments:**            1915 Ivy Ave E.appeal.8-30-12.pdf  
   1915 Ivy Ave E.City Photos.8-29-12.pdf  
   1915 Ivy Ave E.Hulke Ltr 9-10-12.doc

*Deny the appeal.*

*RE: 1915 Ivy Ave E (single family)*

*Michael Hulke, son, and Agnes M. Hulke, owner, appeared.*

*Inspector Paula Seeley:*

- received a cat urine smell complaint in Jun; unsanitary; exterior hoarding, and possible interior hoarding as well
- Inspector Reardon went out there but addressed only the exterior
- Inspector Seeley received a request to go out there to inspect the interior - had another complaint
- she took photos
- she looked inside the house and saw several cats and 5 feet of trash everywhere; she has not been inside the house
- in the meantime, she spoke with Mike, who said that most of the rooms are full of clutter and debris

- she issued an immediate Condemnation
- currently, Agnes is living with one of her daughters
- she will be going back into the house to do a thorough inspection

Mr. Hulke:

- his brother came and got the 10 cats
- the plan is to remove everything out of the house; clean it and paint it so that it's livable
- he apologized for letting things go this far
- he's been living with his mom to take care of her; she has many health issues
- he is asking for more time to get things cleaned up
- currently, has 2 dumpsters
- he will do whatever he can to address this issue
- the family has lived there for 53 years

Ms. Moermond:

- the photos show a lot of material; hoarding; garbage; and a lot of cats
- when there are animals involved, it can create a lot more problems

Ms. Hulke:

- does not want to stay with her daughter
- this is her home and she would like to go back there to live, if possible
- they haven't lived their entire life this way

Mr. Hulke:

- when his dad died in 2003, Ms. Hulke got depressed and so did he
- then her health problems began; she went to the hospital: water on her heart; gall bladder; kidney failure; diabetes
- Ms. Hulke didn't want to go on dialysis so, they found a medication that is working for her
- his mom will either live in an apartment or a senior building; he hopes that she goes to live with her daughter
- he would prefer to stay there because he noticed cars driving up and down the alley checking out the house; it looked suspicious
- when there's a Vacant sign on the house, it's a dead give away that no one can be there after 8 p.m. and it just invites trouble
- he saw one guy take a picture of the house
- his family will be helping do the clean-up and his neighbor volunteered to help with the clean-up, as well

Ms. Moermond:

- the state of the house can only make Ms. Hulke's health condition worse
- has no problem with Mr. Hulke and family cleaning out the house; her concern is that no one should live there while this is being taken care of
- asked Ms. Seeley to move the placard to the back of the house or inside the door
- her priorities are to get the house empty of people and animals so that a thorough clean-up can occur
- once the floors and walls are accessible, Inspector Seeley can do a walk-thru and make a determination about what more needs to be done
- Ms. Seeley may send this to a different inspector for a more in-depth review; it may need a Code Compliance Inspection Report and those repairs would need to be done before it can be re-occupied
- she will not let them back in the house to live until Ms. Seeley says it's OK
- provided contact for House Calls Program at Ramsey County Social Services: Kay Wittgenstein, 266-1285; she can provide dumpsters and support
- is important to use masks and gloves when getting rid of the cat urined materials

- can be at the house to work from 8 am - 8 pm  
- City Council Public Hearing Oct 3, 2012 at 5:30 pm

**Referred to the City Council due back on 10/3/2012**

**53**      [RLH VO  
12-87](#)      Appeal of Kishack Vang to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 871 JESSAMINE AVENUE EAST.

**Sponsors:**      Bostrom

**Attachments:**      [871 Jessamine Ave E.appeal.8-20-12.pdf](#)  
[871 Jessamine Ave E.Photos.5-17-12.pdf](#)  
[871 Jessamine Ave E.Photos.8-15-12.pdf](#)  
[871 Jessamine Ave E.Photos.8-16-12.pdf](#)

*Tenant filing the appeal stated she moved out of the property and don't need any more time.*

**Withdrawn**

**54**      [RLH VO  
12-89](#)      Appeal of Wendy and William Jansen to a Notice of Condemnation as Unfit for Human Habitation and Order to Vacate at 677 THOMAS AVENUE & Correction Notice at 610 SAINT ALBANS STREET.

**Sponsors:**      Carter III

**Attachments:**      [677 Thomas Ave & 610 St Albans N.appeal.8-30-12.pdf](#)  
[610 St. Albans St.Photo.7-26-12.pdf](#)

*Owner called; sick and can't make hearing.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 9/11/2012**

### Staff Reports