



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

Tuesday, April 28, 2015

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR 14-15](#) Ordering the razing and removal of the structures at 1164 MINNEHAHA AVENUE WEST within fifteen (15) days after the August 20, 2014, City Council Public Hearing. (Public hearing continued from February 18) (To be amended to grant 180 days for rehab or removal)

Sponsors: Stark

Alex Stojmenovic, realtor and general contractor, appeared.
Elton Mykerezi, Arc Realty and Green Housing, owner, appeared.

Mr. Mykerezi:

- purchased property from Freddie Mac Feb 24, 2015

Mr. Stojmenovic:

- Mr Mykerezi has bought a lot of Category 2 Vacant Buildings
- when he attempted to pull a permit, he ended up talking with Reid Soley, who informed him that they needed to attend this hearing but he didn't go into detail as far as problems with this property; he took pictures and to him, it didn't look like a house that was in horrible shape
- Mr. Mykerezi has bought 11 properties in the area and most of them were Cat 2 VB; one is across the street at 11 23 Minnehaha, duplex, Cat 2 VB; they converted it back to single family

Ms. Moermond:

- background: Jul 2014, this property was subject to demolition and discussed at City Council; then, the property went to HUD; HUD is immune to city and state regulations; so, they don't have to fix the property no matter how many Orders the city issues; and they don't have to disclose to a purchaser the circumstances of the property, and Orders, pending assessments, etc; so, it's 'Buyer Beware'
- the city is aware that this happened and is trying to be sympathetic; at the same time, they are trying to get the nuisance condition abated
- we are not going to debate whether this is a Cat 3 VB subject to demolition; that's been going on for the past 9 months; this building is subject to demolition
- she wants to work on conditions under which the city would not need to demolish it; hopefully, something can be figured out
- wants them to hear Inspector Steve Magner's report

Inspector Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- as of Tue Jul 15, 2014:

-The building is a one-story, wood frame, single-family dwelling, with a detached two-stall garage, on a lot of 4,792 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since October 22, 2012.

-The current property owner is Tammy Martinez per AMANDA and Ramsey County Property records.

-On May 2, 2014, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An ORDER TO ABATE A NUISANCE BUILDING was posted on May 7, 2014 with a compliance date of June 6, 2014. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code.

-Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$20,400 on the land and \$115,600 on the building.

-Real estate taxes for the first half of 2014 are current.

-The Vacant Building registration fees were paid by assessment on December 3, 2013.

-As of July 14, 2014, a Code Compliance Inspection has not been done. (Note: a code compliance inspection fee was paid January 24, 2014; however, an inspection was never done.)

-As of July 14, 2014, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted.

-There have been seven (7) SUMMARY ABATEMENT NOTICES since 2012.

-There have been seven (7) WORK ORDERS issued for:

- Garbage/rubbish*
- Boarding/securing*
- Tall grass/weeds*
- Snow/ice*

-Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$75,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$12,000.

- on that day of the hearing, no one showed up; Aug 12, 2014 LH, the realtor for Freddie Mac appeared; Ms. Moermond indicated that she would lay this over for a code compliant inspection to be performed; the performance deposit paid; work plan; was going to CC Aug 20, 2014 with a lay over to Sep 16, 2014

Ms. Moermond:

- her notes indicated that 3 CDC's had been contacted on this, as well as Green Homes of MN

Mr. Mykerezzi:

- he was not contacted last year in Aug about this property by Mr. Duey Erlie

Mr. Magner:

- a letter was sent Aug 13, 2014 that went to Mr. Erlie, HighPointe Realty on behalf of Freddie Mac that laid out the conditions for the next LH, which was to be conducted Sep 16, 2014, at which time, Mr. Erlie appeared and said that they would maintain the property and rehabilitate the structure for the mortgage company or Freddie Mac at that time; his estimate came in at \$45,000; that was laid over to Oct 14, 2014 LH, at which time, no one showed; it was laid over

- fast forward..... we were apprised that the property was purchased by Corridor Properties LLC

- he read the letter that was sent to Mr. Elton Mykerezzi Mar 26, 2015 for an Order to Repair or Remove the Structure (attached); that letter listed conditions to be met

Amy Spong, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC):

- house built in 1947; vernacular cottage style; no Sanborn Insurance Map*
- Hamline Midway neighborhood; no current survey of the neighborhood*

- last neighborhood surveyed 1983; house was not old enough to be considered for historic purposes
- last photos she has are from 2013 showing some vinyl siding and newer vinyl windows and doors
- has no interior photos
- looks like a newer escape window in the basement
- the house lacks integrity to be considered for historic preservation
- demolition would not have an adverse effect

Ms. Moermond:

- asked Mr. Mykerezzi what they have been able to pull together

Mr. Mykerezzi:

- their usual process is to buy the houses, which usually are Cat 2 VB; Alex submits the Work Plan that is checked by Mr. Soley or another inspector; then, they usually do construction financing a few days after they are bought, either through Bridgewater Bank or Platinum Bank, small banks that are very experienced in commercial construction lending
- not actually knowing the situation, they have closed on a construction loan with Bridgewater Bank (they send their own inspector to make sure that the Work Plan is reasonable; they also send an appraiser to estimate the value of the property after the work is finished; then, they determine how much they can lend)
- he entered the Work Plan and the loan documents (\$45,000)
- he also has proof of additional funds, if needed

Mr. Magner:

- a performance deposit has been posted (Mar 18, 2015)
- code compliance inspection report was applied for Aug 27, 2014; so, if they get a grant of time from CC, they are free to pull permits and get moving on the project
- \$45,000 is probably very close to where it needs to be (DSI has no concern)

A short recess was taken to allow Ms. Moermond and Mr. Magner time to review the bids and other documents. (scanned)

Mr. Magner:

- the only history of problems is prior to their ownership

Mr. Stojmenovic:

- needs approximately 4 months to complete the project

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend a grant of 180 days
 - should be able to pull permits tomorrow (Steve Magner)
 - City Council Public Hearing May 20, 2015
- Remove or repair the building within 180 days.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

2 [RLH RR 14-12](#)

Ordering the razing and removal of the structures at 391 VIEW STREET within fifteen (15) days after the July 23, 2014, City Council Public Hearing. (Public hearing continued from February 4) (To be referred back to Legislative Hearing on May 26, 2015; Council public hearing to be continued to June 3, 2015)

Sponsors: Thune

A meeting is set up to discuss the matter.

Inspector Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

- *has not spoken with Betty Moran about this recently; it is his understanding that parties were seeking to see some recourse through some action the city could take - originally, the question was whether the city attorney could shorten the forfeiture to the State of Minnesota through a state law that allows a municipality to take that action against the property owner*
- *we have a scenario where the house is listed to Joseph G. Schwartz and to Deutsche Bank; DSI has notified Deutsche Bank but have not received a response; he believes that Joseph G. Schwartz is deceased and the family members, although local, don't seem to have the capacity to take any action, even probate; so, we are back to the total abandonment situation*
- *we had a discussion at the last LH about speaking with council and asking Ms. Skarda to start that action*
- *one option we have is to lay this over for a short period*

Ms. Moermond:

- *this is on City Council Public Hearing May 20, 2015*
- *let's set up a meeting with Ms. Skarda for next week to talk about this property and other properties in this same situation*
- *will lay this over to the May 12, 2015 Legislative Hearing*

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 5/12/2015

3 [RLH RR 15-11](#)

Ordering the razing and removal of the structures at 614 CALIFORNIA AVENUE EAST within fifteen (15) days after the May 20, 2015, City Council Public Hearing.

Sponsors: Bostrom

(No one appeared.)

Inspector Steve Magner, Vacant Buildings:

The building is a one-story, wood frame and brick/stucco facade, single-family dwelling with a detached one-stall garage on a lot of 7,405 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since April 23, 2012.

The current property owner is Robert R. Douglas per AMANDA and Ramsey County Property records.

On February 4, 2015, an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An ORDER TO ABATE A NUISANCE BUILDING was posted on February 17, 2015 with a compliance date of March 19, 2015. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code.

Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$16,700 on the land and \$33,300 on the building.

Real estate taxes are current.

The Vacant Building registration fees were paid by assessment on August 4, 2014. As of April 27, 2015, a Code Compliance Inspection has not been requested or performed.

As of April 27, 2015, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted.

There have been six (6) SUMMARY ABATEMENT NOTICES since 2012.

There have been six (6) WORK ORDERS issued for:

- *Boarding/securing*
- *Tall grass/weeds*
- *EFV*

Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$40,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$12,000. DSI, Division of Code Enforcement Resolution submitted for consideration orders the property owner to repair or remove this structure within fifteen (15) days; if not the resolution authorizes the Division of Code Enforcement to demolish and assess the costs to the property.

Amy Spong, Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC):

- build in 1927; original owner was C. A. Bodly
- Prairie Bungalow style; charming architecturally; unique details for being so small; low sloping hip roof; large, deep eaves; the brick band around the entire base of the house; bands of windows; it also has a brick window box with detail
- the 1-stall garage was added in 1935
- new windows
- looks pretty much in tact
- the neighborhood includes some infill housing right next door and across the street from different eras
- it was within the boundaries of the 2011 survey project in this neighborhood but was not identified as a potential historic structure nor was it in any identified historic district that were identified as having potential for district designation
- even though it's an architecturally charming little house, it doesn't rise to the level to meet the criteria
- encourages rehab but demolition would not have an adverse effect

Ms. Moermond:

- no information leading the city to believe that this is a foreclosure at this time
 - will recommend removal within 15 days
- Remove the building within 15 days with no option for rehabilitation.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Correction Orders

- 4 [RLH CO 15-6](#) Appeal of Tamika and Edgar Tate to a Correction Notice at 345 MAPLE STREET.

Sponsors: Finney

Tamika and Edgar Tate, tax owners, appeared.

Inspector John Peter Ross:

- a complaint came in regarding a retaining wall; it's condition and structural integrity
- Inspector Hoffman went out and took photos
- sent Correction Notice to repair or replace the retaining wall; it needs a plan to review and a permit to do the work
- completion date: Jun 26, 2015
- photo on the screen; you can see that the retaining wall abutts the neighbor's driveway; about midway down the driveway, you can see the bulge in the wall
- Inspector Hoffman contacted a DSI engineer, Brian Karpen, regarding the wall; Mr. Karpen provided a report (attached)
- Mr. Karpen's findings: 1) the top of the wall has deflected considerably - 6"; Although the wall is still standing and retaining the soil behind it, this excessive deflection could already be termed a failure of the wall; 2) at the interface between

the limestone and CMU, there is a projection of approximately 2 inches along a horizontal line in the wall, which indicates a shear failure of the joint between the limestone and CMU courses added above; and 3) the original limestone portion of the wall shows significant deterioration.

- he includes a number of repair options and photos that show some things the neighbors have done

Inspector James Hoffman:

- Structural Engineer Brian Karpen met him at the property and evaluated it; he wrote a recommendation on his report

- the initial complaint was a referral from Fire Inspection; the property at one time was a C of O property

Mr. Tate:

- they live at this property

- has been trying to get contractors and engineers out to take a look but they are booked solid and so they decided to appeal to buy some time

- when he got the report, initially, he understood that the wall needed to be replaced; to him, it looks like a good wall; so, he is a little confused as to what options he has; what he is required to do to come into compliance

- has a call into Planning & Economic Dev to inquire about financial assistance

- they don't know what to do and where to start

- some contractors said that missing caps could be a problem; also the trees; etc.
- has had quotes from \$2,000 - \$20,000

- they purchased the house Contract for Deed a couple years ago on a 15-yr plan; are from Indiana and weren't aware of these types of problems

- after they got the Notice, they looked at the history of Notices and found that back in 2007, there was a complaint on the same thing on the same part of the wall; they did not find anything that came out of it

- they want to make the wall safe with no damage to their neighbor's

Ms. Moermond:

- thinks that there should have been a disclosure to the Tates that this was a pre-existing condition

Mr. Ross:

- a TISH inspection done May 2013

- John Kauck is the owner

Mr. Tate:

- some of the repairs done to the wall were just not done correctly; done tacky; loose blocks; shoddy work

- Mr. Kauck never said anything about damage to the property

Ms. Moermond:

- community resources: a community development corporation may be able to help; some groups may have deferred loans or low interest loans but she is not sure what's available to Contract for Deed purchasers

Mr. Tate:

- he spoke with Dayton's Bluff Community Resource Neighborhood Group about a deferred loan program which they would not qualify for because of their income; they also have a low interest loan - 4%

Mr. Hoffman:

- anchor plates were put in by the neighbor to shore up his retaining wall (photo);

engineers core drill a hole and insert something that tightens up and pulls against itself

Mr. Tate:

- the wall goes all around the house*
- even the engineers said that it will be difficult to do because of the location of the wall*

Ms. Moermond:

- collapse is coming, we just don't know when*
- it can be repaired*
- Dayton's Bluff Neighborhood Housing Services, 823 7th St East: 651/774-6995; Executive Dir: Jim Erchul*
- Eastside Neighborhood Development Company, 965 Payne Ave, Suite 200: 651/771-1152: Ex. Dir: John Vaughn*
- they do homeowner-type assistance*
- need to figure out how much it's going to cost: 1) to stabilize the wall; or 2) to replace the wall; we are all about stabilization, financially*
- it's great you made it through the winter*

Mr. Hoffman:

- the repair is needed at the highest point of the wall; if it falls, it could, potentially, hit the neighbor's house*

Ms. Moermond:

- wants to grant some time to do the repair but if the wall collapses, all bets are off; then, everything has to be removed quickly*
- thinks we can get through the summer*
- the first thing is to get an engineer to write up what is needed to be done and the cost; something that a contractor could use or a landscaper to do the repairs; should be able to get funding for both those things; then, get finances arranged: loan, grant*
- we're just talking about "repair"*
- let's go with Sep 1, 2015 to work on getting this going; if there are problems, like a collapse, we will need to handle it immediately; if it goes down and you don't get it cleaned up right away, the city will issue an Emergency Abatement Order, which means that if you don't have it cleaned, a city crew will come in pretty quickly to clean out the neighbor's driveway because it would be a nuisance condition; and you would need to pay the cost for that; it would be far cheaper to do it yourself*

Mr. Tate:

- asked if the the city had an ordinance that said they must have a retaining wall that high right there*

Ms. Moermond:

- no; it just needs to be serviceable and stable*

Mr. Hoffman:

- based on what DSI's engineer said and based on how close that is to the house, 15-20 feet away, if you start dropping the wall down, you're actually going to be eating into the depth of your foundation, which could cause other problems*

Mr. Tate:

- some said that the tree roots might be causing the problem; he's talked with a tree removal service*
- now, we have better information and move forward more specifically*

Ms. Moermond:

Grant until September 1, 2015 to come into compliance with the retaining wall.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

Summary Abatement Orders

- 5 [RLH SAO 15-17](#) Appeal of StarShamia Cindrach to a Summary Abatement Order and Vehicle Abatement Order at 873 WOODBRIDGE STREET.

Sponsors: Thao

Inspector Joel Essling met with the occupant/appellant and found that the exterior is now in compliance except for one vehicle that has missing glass. The vehicle was vandalized so he gave appellant 30 day extension to get glass installed. Appeal is moot and a hearing was not necessary.

Withdrawn

11:30 a.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

- 6 [RLH VO 15-20](#) Appeal of Nancy Phillips to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation and Order to Vacate at 1117 WHITE BEAR AVENUE.

Sponsors: Finney

Deny the appeal; no one appeared.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 7 [RLH FCO 15-62](#) Appeal of Bonnie Shoebottom to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1551 GRANTHAM STREET.

Sponsors: Stark

Bonnie Shoebottom and her brother, Glenn Griffen, appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

- Attempted Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection - Correction Notice
- inspection conducted by Jeremy Hall on Apr 21, 2015; asking for access to conduct the C of O inspection
- appeal is asking to be out of the program

Ms. Shoebottom:

- her family has owned it for 85 years
- her father died in Aug 2012; her parents had been living there along with her nephew, Glenn's son, who was in and out of college and jobs

- when her father died, her mother would have nothing to do with "assisted living;" that house was built by her parents for her before she was born; she refused to move and refused to admit that she needed to move until she started to fall more often
- they thought they had her talked into an assisted living arrangement, at least for the winter; but she pulled a Power of Attorney
- after she came back from spending time with a son in Maryland around Christmas, she insisted that she was going to stay in the house
- the boiler died and they replaced it; the Power of Attorney was not yet in effect
- she stayed until she fell down the basement stairs and broke her leg; she went into TCU; they didn't keep her in the hospital; she broke one of the bones in her lower leg; when she healed from that, there was an opening in the Assisted Living Facility as that complex, so, she moved in there under protest; but she couldn't go home because she couldn't take care of herself; and, as she was getting used to living in the assisted living facility, she fell in her apartment and broke her arm
- they finally got her to agree to selling the house
- they've been trying to clean things out of the house
- family is living there

Glenn:

- his oldest son as been living in the house since 2006, helping out the grandparents; and his daughter moved in at the end of Mar 2015
- he is trying to work on his own house that he has lived in for the past 52 years, only 3 blocks from 1551 Grantham St
- they have gotten rid of approximately 80% of the newspaper, junk, etc. that have in there 50+ years
- they have a lot more to do; most of the furniture is gone
- there a lot of deferred maintenance: wiring, plumbing, ceilings, floors, etc.
- the grandkids will continue to be in the house until it's sold

Ms. Shoebottom:

- they need to sell the house in order to support her in assisted living facility; she has less than \$50,000 in the bank, total; she has their dad's pension and Social Security; her income does not meet her current expenses
- they have a realtor involved in the selling of the house
- they are aware that it would pretty much be an "as is"
- they are trying to get it sold by the end of the year

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend that this be out of the Certificate of Occupancy Program
 - if the grandkids move out, we will revisit this; Michael Griffen and Rachel Griffen live there
 - as long as they are there, she will treat it as an owner-occupied property
- Grant the appeal for owner to be out of the Fire Certificate of Occupancy Program.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

8 [RLH FCO 15-54](#) Appeal of Tony Hoong to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 407 LAFOND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thao

Tony Hoong appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

- Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection conducted Apr 7, 2015 by Fire Inspector Grant Heitman
- 9 items on deficiency list

- Appellant is asking for more time
- re-inspection date is May 19, 2015

Mr. Hoong:

- he needs more time; is has finals up until May 14, 2015; graduates May 18; then, he has a trip planned to Aruba for about 1 weeks
- their tenant is moving out Jun 1, 2015
- he is hoping to be finished with the house by Aug 1, 2015
- the house needs some upgrades and he's doing most of it by himself

Ms. Moermond:

- if tenants are out by Jun 1, she can grant an extension to Aug 1, 2015 because the house will be empty
 - we don't need to do a referral to Vacant Buildings
- Grant until August 1, 2015 for compliance provided tenant is out by June 1, 2015.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

9 [RLH FCO 15-52](#) Appeal of Alana Sasaki to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1701 MARGARET STREET.

Sponsors: Finney

Alana Sasaki, owner, appeared; Roger Strodman also appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

- Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection conducted Apr 1, 2015 by Fire Inspector Jonathan Gaulke
- 8 deficiencies
- appealing #1- provide an approved guard rail
- and #4- ceiling height measured 79 inches at the highest point (6'7"); code requires 7 ft high over half the floor area

Ms. Sasaki:

- #1- long, gradual stairs, 3 of them; since they are very gradual and have been that way for 46 years; and many of the neighbors in that area have a similar stairs, is it possible not to have to hire someone to put in a guardrail

Mr. Strodman:

- provide photos on his cell phone (Ms. Moermond asked for them to be emailed to her)

Ms. Shaff:

- that would not require a guardrail if the stairs were redone; then, they'd be looking at handrails (more than 3 steps)
- it's existing so, they will WITHDRAW that Order

Ms. Moermond:

- photo shows a set of stairs with a very low incline; the neighbors' stairs had a steeper incline; there is a pre-existing condition that there was no handrail or guardrail; because it's a pre-existing condition, the Order with Withdrawn by Fire Safety and Inspections
- done; that Order is WITHDRAWN (#1)
- re: Ceiling height

Ms. Sasaki:

- a 1940's house; at the peak of the ceiling, it measured 79 inches; has carpeting; it

was very close so the inspector told them to appeal

Ms. Shaff:

- photos on her computer - after the rehab
- doesn't think that it's original on the upper level - this type of closet structure
- it's a beautiful home; great remodeling

Ms. Sasaki:

- the City of Saint Paul remodeled it
- she doesn't think that they changed the ceiling
- typically, those areas were not constructed to be sleeping areas

Ms. Moermond:

- has a problem with the ceiling height; you won't have half of the floor area at least at 6'7"
- wondering if there's a signed-off permit; she wants to explore that
- will talk to the building official about this

Ms. Sasaki:

- thinks they called it a 2-bedroom home with a bonus when she purchased it; not a 3-bedroom
- they rented it out as a 2-bedroom

Ms. Moermond:

- will look into this; will get back to you
- Item #1 is withdrawn by the dept; forthcoming on the upper level ceiling height issue.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

10 [RLH FCO 15-58](#) Appeal of Robert Thayer and Nancy Meade-Thayer to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 2298 PRISCILLA STREET.

Sponsors: Stark

Robert Thayer and Nancy Meade-Thayer appeared.

Mr. Thayer submitted some photos (attached herein)

Leanna Shaff:

- a Fire C of O inspection conducted by Inspector Lisa Martin on April 7, 2015. There are 2 deficiencies left in this notice
- the exterior parking area, parking in the alley has been surfaced with wood chips
- this is a not an approved parking surface, as well as durable or dustless

Ms. Moermond:

- asking why they're appealing

Mr. Thayer:

- the dryer vent has been repaired
- don't know if inspector went back to look at it
- Standard Heating did the work and pulled the permit out
- regarding the parking area, photos were given to you, 5 of those showing our parking area, the next 3 show how much pavements there is around them
- learned in the Capital Region Watershed District, 42% of surfaces are impermeable
- this was a shock to me and I have no idea
- that means that to our environment that prudence the land in our parking pads and run down the alley into the street and contribute to flooding downstream

- believe strongly that using a surface like the woodchips allow the rain water to soak in instead of problem somewhere else
- every surface needs maintenance and if they were to put in permeable pavers, concrete, it would have to vacuum every year
- asphalt needs to be maintained
- with woodchips, when it breaks down they bring in a new load and spread them
- they never had any complaints from the neighbors because they take care of their property
- they understand our interpretation of dustfree does not include wood chips but they don't see dust flying
- it meets the intent of the ordinance

Ms. Thayer:

- they are very good landlords, had done friendly improvements to their property, installed high efficiency furnaces
- has very nice garden using the woodchips
- they are Class A building
- putting asphalt down goes against everything they believe in
- from the pictures, they had Capital Regions go to the property and to put in permeable pavers wouldn't work in this location because a slope towards the alley and they said it won't work here
- they have been trying to get a system that would meet the durable part

Ms. Moermond:

- she suggested two thoughts: not going to accept woodchips as a parking surface but she thinks that one thing hasn't been explored is that instead of paving or dealing with the entire surface, she likes the old car lines, like those old houses with driveways that has lines for a cement path for each tires
- that would work and that would be a permeable surface in between the lawn or woodchips
- that would keep it open and not a hard surface for the vast majority of the area
- she really appreciates the environmental concerns but have never seen woodchips as parking surface
- whether it should or shouldn't, it would be a policy discussion down the line
- suggested that they talk to site plan review and they should go with a light paver solution for where the tires need to go
- they would need 8 strips for the parking

Ms. Shaff:

- she drove by the property, it looks like the house to the west has the same thing
- the garage with the plywood over the windows, part of the parking area is that theirs
- the woodchips goes right up to the neighbor's garage
- Zoning will be talking to them about parking too close to the neighbor's

Mr. Thayer:

- that area is theirs
- permeable pavers across this whole area will be too costly, about \$33,000.

Ms. Shaff:

- and Standard Heating's permit has not been finalized yet.
- should have dryer vent inspected since it's done

Ms. Moermond:

- grant until October 1, 2015 for the tire lines

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

- 11 [RLH FCO 15-56](#) Appeal of Jim Hansen to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1692 RACE STREET.

Sponsors: Tolbert

Grant the appeal for owner to be out of the Fire C of O Program. No hearing was necessary.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 12 [RLH VBR 15-29](#) Appeal of Paul Johnson to a Vacant Building Registration Fee at 419 FRY STREET.

Sponsors: Stark

Paul Johnson, owner, appeared.

Inspector Rich Singerhouse:

- has been in the Vacant Building Program since Mar 24, 2009
- sale review was approved Nov 13, 2014
- code compliance inspection done Oct 30, 2014
- no permits as of yet
- Inspector Matt Dornfeld has spoken with Mr. Johnson on the phone; Mr. Johnson hopes to have the sign-off by mid-summer
- the building has been maintained; no problems
- Vacant Building fee was due Mar 24, 2015

Mr. Johnson:

- he purchased the house in Nov 2014
- goal: completely renovated by mid-summer
- the heating contractor is pulling out the old stuff and putting in new furnace/central air
- will be pulling permits for electrical and plumbing; heating permit will be pulled today
- he had an earlier goal but was in a car accident while on a bike and it took a few months to heal
- he took some before and after pictures (entered)
- has done a lot of exterior work; nonpermitted work - removal of trees/bushes; painted

Ms. Moermond:

- have it done by Aug 1, 2015 and she will waive the VB; if not done, there will be a VB fee and a lot less likely that it will be prorated
 - you will be allowed to pull permits; Mr. Singerhouse will put that into your file
- Waive the VB fee until August 1, 2015.*

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

- 13 [RLH VBR 15-30](#) Appeal of Todd Dexheimer, Chief Manager, S & D Real Estate Solutions, LLC, to a Vacant Building Registration Renewal Notice at 905 THIRD STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Finney

Todd Dexheimer, Chief Manager, S & D Real Estate Solutions LLC, appeared.

Inspector Rich Singerhouse, Vacant Buildings:

- has been a Vacant Building since May 5, 2014
- sale review approved Feb 9, 2015 to S & D Real Estate
- code compliance on file - done Nov 13, 2014
- permits open: plumbing, electrical, building
- no issues at the property
- the VB fee was due May 5, 2015

Ms. Moermond:

- sounds like you're working hard on it
- how long before you're done

Mr. Dexheimer:

- will be done Aug 1, 2015 - solid; we don't mess around
- all permits have been pulled
- have had rough-in inspections for plumbing & electrical signed off
- mechanical doesn't need any permits
- has the Orsatt Test
- on to the final stages of building; drywall starts this Wed

Ms. Moermond:

- will recommend that this VB fee is waived for 90 days
- if it will take longer than 90 days, you will get a bill; if you don't pay the bill, it will go to assessment and that can be appealed, at which time, we can talk about prorating it
- Waive the VB fee for 90 days.

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015

- 14** [RLH VBR 15-27](#) Appeal of Jamie Thelen, St. Paul Old Home Plaza, LLC, to a Vacant Building Registration Renewal Notice at 370 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST. (To be referred back to Legislative Hearing on October 20, 2015; Council public hearing to be continued to October 21, 2015)

Sponsors: Thao

Jamie Thelen, St. Paul Old Home Plaza, LLC, appeared.

Mr. Thelen:

- we only got involved less than 2 years ago
- it's an historic renovation
- he was here last year; we are still on that same schedule
- last year, we completed the demo on 3 other buildings on site; during the summer of last year, they removed all the asbestos inside the historic building; they pulled the final permit on the building to start the actual re-construction in Oct 2014, as scheduled; it's about a 12-month construction project inside the building; we are also doing an addition on the back of the building' we've been active at the building ever since; our goal for completion was fall 2015 and we will be done in Oct

Ms. Moermond:

- a lot of consideration has been given for this project; she has a lot of other VB where the fees are being paid in full and they are working on those, too; the program isn't meant to cut a break over the course of 5 years; this is the cost of the VB Program over all the VB in the city
- looking at this and thinking that there's been a lot of forgiveness on these fees

Mr. Thelen:

- *an historic renovation takes a long time*
- *we had an amendment; there were some changes to the plan; that needed to be approved*
- *they sat idle for work inside the building for about 75 days waiting for approvals at the state and federal offices that they just got this morning; it takes that much time*
- *they have been involved only since 2012; before it was owned by someone else*
- *it's almost a \$20M project*
- *building inspectors for reconstruction are out there all the time; we paid those fees*
- *we will continue to maintain the building and complete the renovation*

Mr. Singerhouse:

- *Inspector Matt Dornfeld's notes: property has been maintained; there's been no problems; permits are open; workers are on site daily*
- *it's been in the VB Program since Apr 23, 2012*
- *LHO cut the 2014-2015 VB fee in half*
- *on Apr 23, 2015, the 2015-2016 fee is due*

Ms. Moermond:

- *this is due at City Council Public Hearing May 20, 2015; she will recommend that they send this matter back to LH in 6 months, Oct 20, 2015, when you'll be finishing the project; it will go to CCPH right away the next day, Oct 21, 2015*
 - *reasoning: the real estate folks have to have the tax assessments certified so they can be sent over to the county to show up on your 2016 tax bill*
 - *will send you a letter confirming*
 - *if at that time, you are done or very, very close, she will cut the VB fee in half; if not done, she will sort it out*
- To be referred back to Legislative Hearing on October 20, 2015 and City Council Public Hearing on October 21, 2015.*

Referred to the City Council due back on 5/20/2015