



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final Legislative Hearings

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer
Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator
Jean Birkholz, Hearing Secretary
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8585

Thursday, November 13, 2014

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR 14-20](#) Amending Council File RLH RR 14-5 and RLH RR 14-17 to grant Jose Amaya a final extension to complete the rehabilitation of property at 444 BEACON AVENUE.

Sponsors: Stark

Jose Amaya, owner, appeared.

Mr. Amaya:

- noted that all of the contractors that have been finalized, so far, have also been paid

Ms. Moermond:

- this property was ordered Removed and it was in private hands; then, it was HUD hands after the foreclosure completed and HUD did not take any action to rehabilitate; HUD does not observe local ordinances; HUD sold the property to you and you've been allowed to rehabilitate the property; initially, you thought that the rehab would take 90 days; you came back to City Council and asked for an additional 90 days, which was granted by Resolution
- today, we are here to grant your request of 30 days additional time

Mr. Amaya:

- Mr. Knutson is scheduled to inspect tomorrow; that inspection will then also be finalized; hopefully, he'll be able to contact Mr. Seeger early tomorrow and schedule an inspection for next week or the following week
- he believes that 30 days will be fine but all of this lies at the discretion of the inspectors

Inspector Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- City Council passed a Resolution granted a period of time to complete the project; the original completion time was within the scope that Mr. Amaya had presented to us at LH and so, our assumption was that the project would be completed at that time
- understand that things can happen but the city would prefer that the work is completed within that time frame
- review of permits: water permit issued but not inspected; warm air permit issued and inspected; mechanical permit finalized; plumbing permit finalized; electrical permit finalized; building permit inspected; warm air needs to be finalized; plumbing water permit issued by the Saint Paul Regional Water Services needs to be finalized; building

permit needs to be finalized (Mr. Seeger)

- needs to contact Frank Motzko Plumbing LLC to get the St. Paul Regional Water inspectors out to final the water permit
- if the work is completed, it's a matter of timing
- he thinks that there is no problem giving a short period of time for that extension based on the fact that the majority of the work has been completed - progress has been made; and most of the permits have been finalized

Ms. Moermond:

- sees the money in his bank account
- 2 permits are outstanding

Mr. Amaya:

- contractors have already been paid for all of the finalized work
- he was ignorant to the fact that he needed a Water Services inspector
- he will make a call to his plumber to contact Water Services

Mr. Magner:

- regarding the Performance Deposit, the building official will need to review the work; most likely, since there are 3 of 5 sign-offs, he would not forfeit the deposit; in this case, the Council would also need to approve the grant of time; so, it's in a "stay" status

Ms. Moermond:

- what that means is that you not only have to have a 'live' performance deposit; you also need a grant of time from the City Council in order to move forward
 - wants to see the bids that you've accepted and the payment records; if the contractors haven't been paid, she needs to know that these funds are sufficient to cover those costs (scan and email)
 - doesn't need a new work plan; you are on track with your previous work plan, just a little late
 - you still have a 'live' bond/deposit
 - permits have been finalized
 - will recommend that Council grants you another 30 days to complete the project
 - please get it signed off
- Grant additional 30 days for the rehabilitation of the building.

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/3/2014

Correction Orders

- 2 [RLH CO 14-16](#) Appeal of Melvin Welch for Ronald Adams to a Correction Order at 676 WELLS STREET.

Sponsors: Bostrom

*Melvin Welch, attorney, representing Mr. Adams, appeared.
Ronald Adams, owner, appeared.*

Inspector Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- provided background information relating to this appeal (attached)

Ms. Moermond:

- in the materials, there's an Appeal that the bond should not be forfeited; and at the same time, it appeared as if the company issuing the bond has cancelled it
- the city can't work with it because the company cancelled it

Mr. Magner:

- yes, they've notified the city that the bond has expired; so, the city has no recourse
- in the city's opinion, the project has not been completed in the time frame of the original bond and the city is owned that bond

Mr. Welch:

- is asking that Mr. Adams be given an additional 6 months
- he is uncertain where Mr. Magner is finding that the recommendation by Mr. Ubl was to not to provide another 6 months to complete the repairs
- looking at the Oct 10, 2014 Code Compliance Report by Mr. Ubl, page 4 or 5 at the bottom, it lists that a 6-month time extension that is requested will be considered if the code compliance report has been completed more than 50%
- his first contention is that there is more than 50% of the work done

Ms. Moermond:

- that 50% being done refers to the extension of the Performance Deposit and the Performance Deposit has been cancelled by the company, so, there is no Performance Deposit to be extended another 180 days

Mr. Welch:

- so, is the first thing that we need to provide the \$5,000 Performance Deposit?
- can that be renewed?

Ms. Moermond:

- not sure if that company would renew it or if the city would accept a renewal
- this is a 2-pronged situation; the bond needs to be in place and there also has to be a grant of time from the City Council; those 2 things have to work in tandem
- it has happened that a party in this situation would post the bond/performance deposit; and if the Council doesn't grant time, you could request in writing that it be returned and it will be returned
- the document that you appealed is the Correction Order dated Oct 24, 2014

Mr. Welch:

- understands that this house was scheduled to be demolished Nov 3, 2014; the Condemnation had been declared previously (in terms of public safety, not eminent domain); under Chap 34.23
- Jun 12, 2012: Inspection by Wayne Spiering; he determined the house was uninhabitable based on lack of electricity and the basement was being used as a sleeping area
- Jun 25, 2012: reinspection and 9 code violations grew to 46 violations; Condemnation based on life-safety issues, in particular, exposed electrical wiring, damaged foundation, improperly installed water heater, guardrails, and inoperable smoke detector and exiting components
- Aug 2012: determination that the house was unfit for human habitation
- sometime between Aug and Oct 2012, there was a meeting between Mr. Adams and Mr. Magner, whereby Mr. Magner indicated that Mr. Adams could continue to reside in the residence but DSI wanted to do a thorough inspection of all the potential code violations in order to give him direction by which to repair it
- to this day and after inspection by himself, there is no placard posted on the residence as articulated and required under the St. Paul Code report for uninhabitable houses
- Oct 29, 2012: new inspection report contains 96 code violations, up from the 46 previously identified a couple months earlier
- at this time, Mr. Adams had been working with Dayton's Bluff Neighborhood Housing Services and talking with Bruce Noyes, contact; it was determined by them

that they'd set aside \$40,000 in order to assist Mr. Adams with bringing the residence up to code compliance; apparently, this residence has a storied history in St. Paul, it's older and having been once owned by a Madam

- Mr. Adams and the Dayton's Bluff Neighborhood Housing Services came to an agreement; the housing service would provide \$40,000 for the rehab of this house
- Mar 2013: an issue arose with the neighboring eastern property; it had been previously Condemned and was the site of The People's Park; the City ordered the removal of items there; it was cited that the rear retaining wall and the path leading down back was not safe; it was ordered demolished; something was abutted to Mr. Adams' foundation; it was cleared up and The People's Park was removed
- Mar 2014: there was a determination by the City Council that Mr. Adams would be granted 180 days to correct the deficiencies on his property; Mr. Adams had been attempting to pull permits to begin work but was not able to obtain any permits; Dayton's Bluff Neighborhood Housing Services finally obtained permits in Jun 2014, approximately 2 1/2 - 3 months after 180 days grant had been provided
- Dayton's Bluff Nbhd Hsng Servs got a bid from Nilles for permits, engineer's report, structural reinforcement, access panel, siding, egress window, atrium door, front door, metal storm door - estimation of work: \$11,083 paid
- structural report prepared by Lindahl Companies, Dec 17: \$1,025 paid
- Dayton's Bluff Nbhd Hsng Servs invested \$12,000 - \$13,000 into the property at this time

Ms. Moermond:

- noted for the record that she will go through all of the exhibits and remove all personal information

Mr. Welch:

- on Oct 10, 2014, following the Search Warrant Execution Oct 1, 2014, for which there have been no charges made at this time, no one is residing at the house
- from speaking with the attorney, representing the individual who lived upstairs, there was a substantial amount of meth found upstairs; the upstairs of this residence is separately kept; there are 2 electrical meters on the outside of the house; the house had previously been a duplex and the upstairs residence has a separately ingress in the front and in the rear of the residence; there is no access to that upstairs residence except for through the split level entry in the front and through a stairway in the back
- Mr. Ubl did the 2nd inspection; noted that Exhibit 8 includes the name of James Seeger but he did not conduct the inspection on Oct 10, 2014 (that's incorrect; it was done by Mr. Stephen Ubl on that date and time)
- out of the 96 previously identified code violations, Mr. Ubl identified only 15 of the 96 items having been completed or updated; there was an additional 49 items that they identified that had not been commented upon
- Page 3: under plumbing - basement water piping, improper fittings or usage; (all of the plumbing had been removed and entire new plumbing had been installed; all copper was taken out and new plastic piping had been put in); all the fixtures that had been in there for a bathroom, etc., were completely removed; laundry tub removed, etc.) ## 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
- he will submit an affidavit from Mr. Adams that he had prepared in response to the code compliance report
- Page 2 example: building exterior: install ladder in window well (there is a ladder in the window well)
- another example: door to attic way was not weather tight (a 3/4 inch strip of velvet strip which had been introduced; Mr. Ubl did not check)
- their position is that Mr. Adams had been doing a substantial amount of work on this residence as had Dayton's Bluff Nbhd Hsng Servs
- not been identified as corrected: window treatments and doorway weather-proofing

(new doors had just been installed 10 days before the search warrant execution); Mr. Adams met SPPD and told them the door is unlocked; here are the keys - they were able to gain entrance; after the search, the place was boarded-up; nails were put into all the window treatments and all the doorways; one of the items on the list is that they need to fix the front door; the metal front door had been ripped off; not done by law enforcement; all that new repair and new money put in had been damaged subsequently

- Mr. Adams has done a substantial amount of work

- Aug 2014, Beth Woosley, Mr. Adams sister, sent a letter identifying their belief that 50% had been done or was going to be done and asked for an additional time extension at the time; she made that representation after speaking with Bruce Noyes

- Ultimately, Mr. Adams is trying to get this into a position where he can correct all these codes; this is an old house - an imperfect work in progress; this house is by no means, uninhabitable; it's a beautiful home with old woodwork built into it; a substantial amount of work had been redone in the upstairs unit after it had been cleaned up; it looked very nice - he had a chance to look at it; it certainly doesn't appear to be a place where you would not want to live; Mr. and his sister have owned this house for decades and have cared for it; it's a place that the community enjoys; he would like to help Mr. Adams obtain more time to make those repairs

- Section 34.23, when it looks at issues related to Condemnation, the key factors are endangerment violations; a lot of the identified items in this code compliance inspection report are not uninhabitability issues; first, it was determined that there was no electricity to the residence; however, later it was determined that there was electricity; Jun 25, 2012 report - he identifies the basement, in particular, someone had been using it for sleeping; there was no ladder in the egress window; (it has a ladder now but it's not used as a residence - no bed, no bathroom, no shower, etc.); these are the determinations upon which that "uninhabitability" were made; after that determination, the code compliance inspection took place, identifying 96 items (50 over and above the previous 46 over and above the initial 9)

- had a MN certified building official, Don Hedquist, go through the residence Sep 5, 2012; he went through it again recently; still don't have that report

- when looking at issues of "safety" - so dangerous to the safety and health of the occupants to justify Condemnation (34.23.7g), there was some exposed wiring in the plug-ins, light in the back; too low of a fence - egress on 2nd floor - a lot of these issues have been abated

- how do we help Mr. Adams get past this determination that the residence is uninhabitable? A lot of these code issues don't relate to the safety of the occupants - at one time this house had been identified as a duplex; understands that at this time there was a very unpleasant interaction between Mr. Adams and Mr. Spiering; insults were directed toward Mr. Spiering; he does not know to what extent that motivated the determination of using the house as a duplex, if at all

- the basement use was abated

Ms. Moermond:

- this house has never been identified as a duplex

- the house, having been used as a duplex introduces "life-safety" issues of separation between units, furnace systems, etc.

- you either must de-convert to a single family house and observe the codes attendant to that or you put systems in place and get the zoning changed so that it can be safely used as a duplex

Mr. Welch:

- Oct 1, 2014 Search Warrant issue was that another individual was staying upstairs; Mr. Adams had provided a home for this person in his juvenile days when he needed a home; he has known this person all of his life

- does not know if there was rent being provided; does not know if the residence was

being used as a duplex; the upstairs could certainly operate as a separate unit
- when they went through the code compliance report, they identified 49 items that had been abated or corrected (not included as the damaged items due to boarding)
- Dayton's Bluff Nbhhd Hsng Servs has been put on hold until this has been cleared up; they had only 3 months to work on it, as it were; not the 6 months that they had hoped for
- he is here to articulate for Mr. Adams; this is a very emotional process for Mr. Adams
- what else can we do? how can we satisfy the needs so he can keep his home?

Ms. Moermond:

- in her file, she has the VB Performance Bond posting; the bond was given to Beth Woolsey; it expired Sep 30, 2014

Mr. Magner:

- would like to discuss a couple of things that were stated by Mr. Welch
- today's appeal is an appeal of an Order that Inspector Yannarely sent to Vacate the structure and move personal belongings because the city is intending on enforcing it's resolution as written; that's what the city will be doing; and they wanted to make sure that Mr. Adams had a period of time to move his belongings because it became very clear to the city, after the Execution of the Search Warrant, that Mr. Adams is living in the building, which is an illegal occupancy of a Registered Vacant Building under Chapters 43 and 33
- Mr. Welch indicated that the building was never placarded; that is an incorrect statement based on a photograph that they have of the property at 676 Wells, which clearly indicates that there is a Certificate of Occupancy Condemnation placard on it, a Registered Vacant Building placard and a Keep Out placard (photo dated 8-7-2012); they have a record of 3 photos, at least of placarded doors

Ms. Moermond:

- in the documents and photos provided by Mr. Adams, she sees a photo of the back door placarded with the Revocation

Mr. Magner:

- Mr. Welch indicated that Mr. Adams didn't know what was going on upstairs but later indicated that Mr. Adams stated that the door was unlocked and he even had the keys to get upstairs (Mr. Welch said that he never stated that); Mr. Adams, obviously has control of the property and was allowing these people to be in the residence conducting this business
- issue about occupancy: the dwelling was Condemned by Fire C of O Program and was subsequently, transferred to the VB Program, and they opened a file Aug 7, 20212, at which time a letter was sent to the owners of the property indicating that occupancy was not allowed at the property until such time when a Code Compliance Certificate was issued; the property was placarded, notification was sent out to the owners that the dwelling was not allowed occupancy; during the process, the property was declared to be a nuisance by DSI; subsequently, a LH was held Aug 27, 2013, at which time, we discussed the fact that the building was declared a nuisance under the Order to Abate and the Order to Abate, which was sent to Mr. Adams Jun 19, 2013, clearly identifies all the violations that were established by the Code Compliance Inspection that was performed by DSI
- the issue here is that the dwelling is a Registered Vacant Building; that it's had an Order to Abate issued under Chap 45 of Legislative Code; that the violations were called under the Legislative Code and were identified in the Code Compliance Inspection Report; those items were called out and the City Council decided to take action and issued an Order to Remove or Repair the property within 180 days; that time frame has come and gone; the city plans to move forward, hire a contractor,

send the Notice to Proceed and remove the dwelling; that is why Mr. Yannarely issued those Orders to Mr. Adams after it was made clear to us that the dwelling is illegally occupied by Mr. Adams and multiple others, and that they need to remove personal belongings; otherwise, they would become the property of the demolition contractor, who would dispose of them

Ms. Moermond:

- stated that she will keep the record open and Mr. Welch can continue to submit any documents/information all the way until the City Council has made its determination

Mr. Welch:

- would like to note in response to Mr. Magner's statements that Mr. Magner incorrectly stated that Mr. Welch had stated that Mr. Adams had keys to the upstairs in his attempts to link Mr. Adams to the illicit behavior occurring upstairs; he never stated that; he had stated that he, Mr. Welch, had accessed the upstairs area to document the state of the residence; at no point, did he state that Mr. Adams has the keys; he stated nothing to that extent, at all

- noted that there was no response by Mr. Magner to his earlier assertion that there had been a meeting between him and Mr. Adams between Aug 2012 and Oct 2012 when there was a re-inspection done; Mr. Welch had articulated that, at one point, Mr. Magner met with Mr. Adams and indicated that he could continue to reside in the residence as long as they could go through and make a thorough annotation of the different code violations

- it is his understanding, that the city's position articulated by Mr. Magner, that on Aug 27, 2013, there was a determination that the residence was declared a nuisance by code violations (on the one hand, the city is Condemning the residence for lack of electricity, which was not the case; for unsafe habitation in the basement, which had been abated; but then, there's a new assertion after that new inspection in Oct 2012 following the meeting between Mr. Magner and Mr. Adams, that it was no longer about issues related to material unsafety; now, it was issues related to code violations; so, this is part of where the confusion comes in.... for legal purposes, there may be an issue between whether or not there's a material safety to life within, for example, exposed wiring; or if it's issues like there's not a rubber stopper in the tub, not necessarily a safety issue but may be a code violation

- what are we addressing? the safety of the residence or all these codes making it a nuisance property? Under Mr. Magner's dept, we are getting mixed messages and are not certain as to what we need to abate

- Mr. Adams has been working with Dayton's Bluff Nbhd Hsng Services, which has contracted out for these repairs and they have made a substantial number of these, which have not been identified/articulated in the Oct 10, 2014 re-inspection conducted by Mr. Ubl

- 1. he did not articulate that Mr. Adams had the key to the upstairs; 2. there's an issue about some agreement between Mr. Adams and Mr. Magner which caused the re-inspection and allowed for continued occupancy of the residence; and 3. what exactly is the basis behind the Condemnation of the residence, unsafety or a nuisance because of code violations?

- he is trying to work with Mr. Adams to keep his residence; he has been living here and working on and beautifying it for decades; both he and Mr. Adams are operating with a lack of full understanding; he would like to be able to have full knowledge so that he could help Mr. Adams to get where he needs to be

Mr. Magner:

- it was clear to him that Mr. Welch stated that his client said at the time of the warrant that he had keys and that the door was unlocked; whether those were to the 2nd floor or 1st floor, he doesn't know but he said there were keys

- in regards to a clandestine meeting that he had with Mr. Adams in regards to

allowing occupancy; at no point in time, did he say that Mr. Adams could stay there; Mr. Adams has a long history with DSI; this isn't the first VB that he has been living in illegally, so he is aware that if a property is a Registered VB, he is not allowed to live in there; if he understood that he could do this because the Code Compliance Inspection was done, that is his interpretation; that's not the city's interpretation; the city's interpretation is that a dwelling is not allowed for occupancy until a Code Compliance Certificate has been issued and that has not happened; the definition under the code indicates that once a building has been declared a nuisance and the team inspection has taken place, followed by a report with a list of deficiencies that were identified (nuisance conditions that create the status) and a Code Compliance Certificate has been issued based upon the completion of all the deficiencies listed in the Code Compliance inspection report, done under permit; he thought this was made clear at LH that Mr. Adams was going to obtain help from the Dayton's Bluff Nhd Hsng Servs; between him and that organization, they would complete all of the items listed on the Code Compliance Inspection Report to obtain finals and sign off so that he could be issued that certificate; that was to happen within that 180 day period granted by the City Council; that hasn't happened and as such, the Resolution is outstanding; because a Code Compliance Certificate has not been issued (no final permit sign-offs), the City must enforce the Resolution as written, which means that DSI hires a vendor to go out and remove the structure

RECESS was taken to provide time to look over the documents

Ms. Moermond:

- color copies were made and attached to the Condemnation files and the Vacant Building Registration files; the online photos document a lot of the problems that are being discussed in the Orders
- had a chance to pull the Scope of Work that was put together by Dayton's Bluff Nhd Hsng Servs (asked for bids from developers/construction people); Nilles won the bid to undertake that work
- obtained the city's notes with respect to the building permit pulled in Jul 2014 but work had already been undertaken at the time the permit was pulled; immediately, inspectors went out and did Correction Notices for work that had already been done; contractors sometimes start the work before pulling permit although, that is not encouraged; this is particularly bad in cases such as this where there is an Order to Remove/Repair hanging over the property; it's important to make sure everyone is on the same page up front;
- she conducted the LH on this address; with respect to the Condemnation, there was an appeal both from Angela Lopez and Mr. Adams; a couple things struck her when she reviewed those hearing notes; in 2009, Inspector Pat Fish commented that the approved zoning for this building was a single family house; since that inspection, it appears that the building has been converted into a triplex without any proper permits, approvals, etc. (testimony from Fire Inspector A. J. Neis); the building was Condemned based on multiple code violations, including: exposed electrical; damaged foundation; incorrectly installed water heater; no smoke detectors; no proper fire separations if the building is a triplex; etc. (71 photos were submitted - all will be printed out)
- another concern was testimony from Ms. Lopez: she said that she was on the first floor; she was happy with her apartment - it's nice; the tenants on the 2nd floor didn't know that they needed to come; they thought that Mr. Adams would be coming to take care of that; Mr. Adams said in the hearing that he, himself lived in the house; so, that would default a 3rd unit or there was also an RV parked in the driveway that was hooked up to electrical; although, Mr. Adams said that the RV was not being lived in; she is really not sure where Mr. Adams was living; it was represented to her to be an owner-occupied house at that time
- when this was in front of City Council Aug 1, 2012, she recommended an extension

to Aug 3, 2012; her original recommendation was Jul 30, 2012, which preceded the LH; appeals were filed by Ms. Lopez and Mr. Adams

- the Vacant Building appeal: there was an amendment to that appeal; she revised her recommendation on it; at the first LH, she had recommended that Council waived the VB fee until Jan 2013 and obtain a Code Compliance Inspection; that was amended to waive the Code Compliance Inspection Report charge and waive the VB fee until Apr 1, 2013 (Mr. Adams received an approximate break of \$500 on the inspection charge and a delay of 3 months before the VB fee would be charged- all this was conditioned upon a new Code Compliance Inspection Report being requested and conducted; it looks as though that was taken care of right away; it was at Council on Oct 3, 2013; the Code Compliance Inspection itself was Oct 29, 2013; so, there had been leeway granted along the way for Mr. Adams; just as importantly, these were quasi-judicial action taken by the City Council both on the Condemnation appeals and the VB Registration for which there was no subsequent appeal to Appellant Court; so, she considers those matters set aside)
- next, was the LH on the Remove/Repair Order; first hearing Aug 27, 2013; the building had been placarded Jun 19, 2013, which was 7 months after obtaining the Code Compliance Inspection Report (7 months in which activity could have been undertaken to address the items and the Order to Abate the Nuisance building being issued); at that time, there were a lot of things going on; it was confusing with the Peoples' Park being dealt with at the same time; when she read commentary from the public and the district council, she was hearing just as much commentary, if not more, about the Peoples' Park than the house (it was enmeshed) but all she could look at was the house on the parcel at 676 Wells
- City Council's Order following the LH on Aug 27, 2013 wasn't issued until Mar 2014 (important because she was in front of the City Council for 6 months asking for Layovers related to getting Dayton's Bluff Nbhd Hsng Servs the time that they needed to process a loan application, develop a scope of work, get bids, etc., (very different from other Remove/Repair Orders in the sense that she almost never would ask for 6 months worth of Layovers if she didn't believe that this project could be undertaken by Dayton's Bluff Nbhd Hsng Servs and that there be forward progress); a lot of extra help and assistance was given, in this case; she was working with Mr. Erchul, DBNHS, on how things were going; it's been more than a year since this landed in front of her as a case
- reviewed the Code Compliance Inspection Report and the Scope of Work; the top letter says that Ms. Woolsey may qualify for a couple of different kinds of loans; the next document is from Dec 2013 (a good 4 months following the original hearing) the Scope of Work published by Dayton's Bluff NHS, looking for people to bid on the project; she does not have the final contract between Dayton's Bluff NHS and Nilles but she trusts that those pieces were in place
- the rehab was being undertaken next and there seems to be some agreement that Mr. Adams was living in the house at the time, which is contrary to the Remove/Repair Order and also contrary to the Condemnation that was issued in Jun 2014; the Condemnation says that this is an unsafe structure for the following reasons and all of these things need to be addressed before it can be occupied
- in the case of the single family home, not a commercial house or something over 3 units, a Code Compliance Inspection Report gives the laundry list of things that needs to happen to bring it back into compliance with city codes (the benchmark that used to say that a nuisance condition has been abated)
- a "no electricity" compliant triggered an inspector going out to the property; the inspector noted that the electricity was out and he also documented 9 items that needed to be addressed; it's standard operating procedure for the inspector to schedule a follow-up inspection that is a complete Certificate of Occupancy inspection
- strange situation because this is an owner-occupied home and a "tenant complaint" comes in; a C of O inspector notes that the house is being used as a triplex but is a

single family house according to zoning and tax records; it's all written up including the zoning violation; all violations equals a list and the house needs to come up to code; is gratified that a lot of these things are done but there hasn't been a sign-off on the Code Compliance Inspection Report and she doesn't have finalized permits - things she needs to see in order to make this a go

- so, rehab has been undertaken although Mr. Adams is living in the house even though the house is placarded a Registered Vacant Building and Keep Out signs, etc; there is also a tenant living here (used as a duplex)

- the Correction Notice is now redundant; it's saying "Get yourself and your possessions out the building," again! That is clear in the placarding; it's clear in the Condemnations; it's clear in the Revocation; it's clear in the Council's Order to Remove/Repair; now, they're saying it again

- will recommend that this appeal on the Correction Notice be denied

- the City Council is the decision maker on this, however

- you can continue to submit information

- CCPH will take place Dec 3, 2014 at 5:30 pm

Deny the appeal.

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/3/2014