



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, August 4, 2015

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 [RLH TA 15-400](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 253 ANNAPOLIS ST WEST. (File No. VB1511, Assessment No. 158824)
Sponsors: Thune

Delete the assessment; fees were supposed to be held back per the recommendation of the hearing officer related to another file. (No hearing necessary.)
Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 2 [RLH TA 15-412](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1128 BEECH STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)
Sponsors: Finney

No show; approve the assessment.
Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 3 [RLH TA 15-406](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1680 BEECH STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)
Sponsors: Finney

Delete the assessment.

*Youa B. Yang and Phoua Lee, owners, and daughter, Pa Nhia, appeared.
Mai Vang, interpreted.*

Inspector Paula Seeley:
-Summary Abatement Order to remove rubbish sent May 29, 2015; compliance Jun 4; re-checked Jun 4
-work done Jun 5 for a cost of \$308 + \$40 service charge = \$348
-no returned mail
-no Orders/complaints for several previous years; report of dumping in 2012 but was gone when the inspector arrived
-sent to: Youa B Yang and Phoua Lee, 6678 Ideal Ave S, Cottage Grove, MN; and Occupant

-in capital letters: Remove all wood furniture, building materials and rubbish from rear yard along the garage

Pa Nhia:

*-her parents don't live at this address
-parents don't know if they received a Notice; they don't read or write English
-the kids help them with the mail
-she lives on her own*

Ms. Moermond:

-in the photo, she sees sheet rock, broken furniture in the alley - just thrown there (dumping wise)

Ms. Seeley:

-it could be dumping; a previous Order was dumping, too

Ms. Moermond:

*-would like to give them a break but she doesn't want to encounter this problem again
-make sure there's a translation of the Notices; there's a phone number on the Notice to get you to an interpreter
-will recommend this assessment be deleted*

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 4** [RLH TA 15-398](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 955 BRADLEY STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Approve the assessment; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 5** [RLH TA 15-394](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 975 BRADLEY STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Approve the assessment; No show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 6** [RLH TA 15-401](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 618 BRIMHALL STREET. (File No. VB1511, Assessment No. 158824)

Sponsors: Tolbert

Ryan Holten, E. K. Johnson Construction LLC, owner, appeared.

Inspector Joe Yannarely, Vacant Buildings:

*-Category 1 Vacant Building; file opened Apr 2, 2015
-utilities were off; house unoccupied
-Summary Abatement Order issued; Work Order performed to clean up the yard
-warm air permit finalized
-plumbing finalized
-building and electrical permits open
-rehab is clearly underway*

Mr. Holten:

-had their final building inspection the first week in Jul 2015; not sure why it's not closed out yet

-it's done and on the market; he thought they had it sold last week but the buyer backed out

-should be occupied soon

Mr. Yannarely:

-he called Mr. Seeger about it; electrical and building permits are still open

Ms. Moermond:

-if all checks out, she will recommend this assessment be deleted

-call Mr. Seeger to get this taken care of; you might want to call the electrical contractor to make sure they have the inspector come take a look

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

7 [RLH TA 15-395](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 904 BURR STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Dennis and Ruth Workman, owners, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Order sent May 28; compliance Jun 1

-pre-authorized Work Order for failure to maintain exterior property

-work done Jun 1 for a cost of \$400 + \$160 = \$560

-no returned mail

-sent to Dennis and Ruth Workman, 35255 Elmcrest Ave NE, North Branch, MN; and Occupant

-overflowing trash containers; excessive amount of garbage

Mrs. Workman:

-appealing because they had a tenant change; the garbage hauler came out 2 days later than their normal pick-up day

-they used to have Walters Recycling and Refuse; they sold all of their St. Paul routes to Waste Management at the beginning of May when all this started; she has an email from a rep who explained this: there was a miscommunication between Walters and Waste Management (we had an agreement that they would take the 4 canisters; the driver would dump them and put them back where they belong; WM picked up their first pick-up; then, 2 weeks in a row, they didn't pick-up; then, we got another letter from Ms. Seeley; she called WM and told them where the canisters were and they were supposed to be picking them up and dumping them; WM said, well, they have to be by the curb; she told them that wasn't the agreement that they had with Walters; so, they were going to investigate and tell their drivers what to do; WM did pick up for another week and then again, 2 weeks in a row, they didn't pick up; she called WM again and tried to rectify the situation; WM told her that there was a miscommunication between Walters and WM and they would set them on valet service and they would not charge them any more; she thought it was settled; again, they picked up 1 or 2 weeks and then 2 weeks in Jul, they did not pick up; so she called WM again; WM told her that was a one time courtesy; they cancelled the valet service; she then asked for a supervisor; the supervisor sent her an email for her to bring this morning (scanned into record)

VIDEO - containers with trash on the side

Ms. Moermond:

-quite a pile of raw garbage

Ms. Seeley:

-she got complaints; did pre-authorized Work Order

-on 3 different occasions, she got complaints (5-7; 6-9; 6;15); told them to get more containers

-had sent 2 Excessive Consumptions but she cancelled them; thinks the neighbors were putting some of their garbage over there (the nbr across the street didn't have garbage service)

Ms. Workman:

-they did not get notified; when she called WM, they had said that their truck was out there but after a few phone calls, she realized that she had to ask them, "Did he pick-up?" The problem was that they said they were out there but they didn't pick-up

Ms. Moermond:

-she is stuck on the fact that there was a lot of stinky garbage hanging out there that you were notified about; understands that she has issues with the garbage service but that doesn't mean that all the nbrs should have to put up with all that garbage
-she can't see how the citizens of St. Paul are responsible for picking up you problem with your hauler (private responsibility/private contract)

Ms. Workman:

-she thought it had been taken care of several times; she acted on it right away and followed up with phone calls

-until they got a letter from Ms. Seeley, they didn't know that they even had an issue

-they keep having a problem with this company

-she is paying for the trash being picked-up weekly

-on Jul 31, they decided to go with a different company; Aspen will start next week and they will allow valet service

Ms. Moermond:

-suggested they talk with WM about taking care of the cost for not picking up the trash

-this situation had to be taken care of very quickly because it was raw garbage; so, the city did it

-will recommend approval of this assessment; the Excessive Consumptions were deleted

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

8 [RLH TA 15-415](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 924 COOK AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1511G, Assessment No. 158712)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Raymond Williams, tax owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Order sent May 13; compliance May 18; re-checked May 19

-work done May 20 for a cost of \$344 + \$160 service charge = \$504

-no returned mail
-Vehicle Abatement Order was also issued
-sent to Joan Bassing/Kelly Connor, 1559 Blackhawk Hills Rd, Eagan; Raymond T Williams/Dawn Blasen; 924 Cook Ave E; and Occupant
-trash containers full of cardboard, paper, blue tarp covering rubbish, misc small pieces of litter, white door, rolled up window shade in back yard

Mr. Williams:

-had an issue with Waste Management and they weren't picking up their 2 containers of trash

-he had his own trash service, Republic; he had been mailing payment to the wrong place; he took care of those and is paid up until the end of the year

-he doesn't see how he owes this much money for what they came out and did emptying WM cans

VIDEO - emptied containers by alley; removed trash, rubbish in back yard

Mr. Williams:

-there were a couple of coi ponds under the blue tarps they took and a yard cart
-he took care of the Order as far as he was concerned; the coi ponds were there for him to use (they were there last year, too, when the city came and they left the coi ponds so, he figured they'd leave them again)

-a friend of his got into an accident with her vehicle and she parked it back in the alley; someone came thru the alley and stole all 5 tires off the car and dropped the car onto the ground; he didn't notice that until he got the Vehicle Abatement in the mail

-he didn't need trash service from the city; he had Republic already

-he had to throw the WM cans away; they wouldn't come to get them

Ms. Moermond:

-looking at the description of things that needed to be taken care of, not sure why you didn't appeal these Orders that were sent... it doesn't say coi ponds but it does say tarp covering rubbish (coi ponds); they probably shouldn't have been out there

Mr. Williams:

-I would have put them into the garage but that had been broken into so, it wouldn't have done me much good to put the coi ponds in there, either

Ms. Seeley:

-history: reading inspector's notes - he called Republic and Waste Management; both had been suspended; she knows that WM won't remove when someone doesn't pay their bill; they charge extra; finally, on May 29, he acquired current service with Republic

-history: some in 2014; water shut-off recently; garbage and more shut-offs

Ms. Moermond:

-sees a problem with garbage cans and the material that's covered with the tarp

-there was a Notice to clean it up and it wasn't cleaned-up

-the inspector at the time said that he called Republic and WM; both said you were suspended

Mr. Williams:

-he had service with Republic but he mailed the payment to the wrong address and he's got it paid up now until the end of the year

Ms. Moermond:

-it wasn't taken care of by the deadline
-doesn't know why he didn't do something different
-for the clean-up, she will recommend dividing the \$504 assessment over 5 years
-for the hauler, she will reduce the assessment to \$50

Reduce from \$260 to \$50.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

9 [RLH TA 15-414](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 924 COOK AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Raymond Williams, tax owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Order sent May 13; compliance May 18; re-checked May 19
-work done May 20 for a cost of \$344 + \$160 service charge = \$504
-no returned mail
-Vehicle Abatement Order was also issued
-sent to Joan Bassing/Kelly Connor, 1559 Blackhawk Hills Rd, Eagan; Raymond T Williams/Dawn Blasen; 924 Cook Ave E; and Occupant
-trash containers full of cardboard, paper, blue tarp covering rubbish, misc small pieces of litter, white door, rolled up window shade in back yard

Mr. Williams:

-had an issue with Waste Management and they weren't picking up their 2 containers of trash
-he had his own trash service, Republic; he had been mailing payment to the wrong place; he took care of those and is paid up until the end of the year
-he doesn't see how he owes this much money for what they came out and did emptying WM cans

VIDEO - emptied containers by alley; removed trash, rubbish in back yard

Mr. Williams:

-there were a couple of coi ponds under the blue tarps they took and a yard cart
-he took care of the Order as far as he was concerned; the coi ponds were there for him to use (they were there last year, too, when the city came and they left the coi ponds so, he figured they'd leave them again)
-a friend of his got into an accident with her vehicle and she parked it back in the alley; someone came thru the alley and stole all 5 tires off the car and dropped the car onto the ground; he didn't notice that until he got the Vehicle Abatement in the mail
-he didn't need trash service from the city; he had Republic already
-he had to throw the WM cans away; they wouldn't come to get them

Ms. Moermond:

-looking at the description of things that needed to be taken care of, not sure why you didn't appeal these Orders that were sent... it doesn't say coi ponds but it does say tarp covering rubbish (coi ponds); they probably shouldn't have been out there

Mr. Williams:

-I would have put them into the garage but that had been broken into so, it wouldn't have done me much good to put the coi ponds in there, either

Ms. Seeley:

-history: reading inspector's notes - he called Republic and Waste Management; both had been suspended; she knows that WM won't remove when someone doesn't pay their bill; they charge extra; finally, on May 29, he acquired current service with Republic

-history: some in 2014; water shut-off recently; garbage and more shut-offs

Ms. Moermond:

-sees a problem with garbage cans and the material that's covered with the tarp

-there was a Notice to clean it up and it wasn't cleaned-up

-the inspector at the time said that he called Republic and WM; both said you were suspended

Mr. Williams:

-he had service with Republic but he mailed the payment to the wrong address and he's got it paid up now until the end of the year

Ms. Moermond:

-it wasn't taken care of by the deadline

-doesn't know why he didn't do something different

-for the clean-up, she will recommend dividing the \$504 assessment over 5 years

-for the hauler, she will reduce the assessment to \$50

Approve and spread over 5 years.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 10** [RLH TA 15-404](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 407 CURTICE STREET EAST. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Thune

Owner missed hearing and called to reschedule.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/18/2015

- 11** [RLH TA 15-409](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1176 DALE STREET NORTH. (File No. J1509P, Assessment No. 158408)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Delete the assessment; graffiti waiver letter signed on 4/26/15 and on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 12** [RLH TA 15-407](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1202 DALE STREET NORTH. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Rescheduled per owner's request due to missed hearing.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/18/2015

- 13** [RLH TA 15-403](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 714

DAYTON AVENUE. (File No. VB1511, Assessment No. 158824)

Sponsors: Thao

Rex King, owner, appeared.

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- this was found to be an unoccupied building with a garbage/rubbish complaint; referred to Vacant Buildings by code enforcement*
- VB opened up a Category 1 VB on Mar 20, 2015; a TISH was generated a week later that indicated the last Certificate of Occupancy inspection took place in 2008; seem to be some Heritage Preservation issues*
- complaints were received in Mar, May and Jul re: garbage; lack of trash hauler; tall grass/weeds*
- Vacant Building Registration fee: \$2025 + \$155 service charge = \$2180*

Ms. Moermond:

- doesn't see an assessment for the garbage hauling order*
- just talking about the VB fee itself*

Mr. King:

- just got approval 6 days ago from Allison at the HPC to do work*
- this assessment was put onto the property before he owned it and before it was listed with the MLS*
- the reason he's appealing is that he has an MLS print out and it doesn't disclose anything about it being a Vacant Building*
- the property was received by MLS on May 26, 2015; he closed on the purchase April 27, 2015; he was completely unaware that it was a Category 1 VB; then, he got this assessment Notice in the mail*
- the utilities have been on the entire time; he saw it prior to his ownership*
- he is trying to fix this nuisance property, working with HPC on the exterior; he has waited for their approval on some items to see what he could/couldn't do*
- now, that he has approval, he will start the work*
- he's been going over there, checking it, mowing the lawn, etc. while working with HPC*
- appealing the VB fee because it became that way before he was the owner and it wasn't disclosed to him by the seller*
- it will not be a vacant bldg in the future; he's working with the city to get the C of O*

Ms. Moermond:

- the TISH did disclose the VB*
- looking for an end game*

Mr. King:

- some permits have been pulled*
- the exterior should be done within 1 1/2 months*
- all should be done within 6 weeks; prefers to get tenants in before Oct 1, 2015*
- he wants to re-arrange the bathrooms and he needs HPC approval; so, he waited*

Mr. Yannarely:

- it was made a Cat 1 VB because it was found empty and referred by code enforcement*

Ms. Moermond:

- a building has to be empty for 365 days before it would be considered a Registered VB Cat 1 if there's nothing else wrong with it*
- was disclosed in TISH Report*

-it could be easily argued that it should not be a Cat 1 VB
-this VB should be deleted; if we need to re-visit it because the work hasn't been done, then we will
-to Mr. Yannarely, "Let's make it a prelim"

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 14 [RLH TA 15-405](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 42 FRONT AVENUE. (File No. VB1511, Assessment No. 158824)

Sponsors: Thao

Approve the assessment; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 15 [RLH TA 15-411](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 204 FRONT AVENUE. (File No. J1511A, Assessment No. 158524)

Sponsors: Thao

Delete the assessment; Inspector failed to send the summary abatement order.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

- 16 [RLH TA 15-402](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 707 KENT STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Thao

David Busch, DRB 24 LLC, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Order sent May 13; compliance date of May 20; re-checked May 21

-work done May 21 for a cost of \$450 + \$40 service charge = \$490

-sent to DRB 24 LLC, 1020 Davern St, St. Paul; no returned mail

-underlined: couches, RV and refuse on this vacant lot

-inspector went back and there were a bunch of tires in the alley; sent a Work Order on the tires

Mr. Busch:

-to the best of his knowledge, he didn't get a Notice or a call

-the property next door is a dumping ground, so he gets calls regularly from the enforcement people and then, I send someone over there to clean it up

-the city won't site the folks who are actually dumping the stuff

-he cleans up when he gets a Notice over the 5 years that he's owned it

Ms. Seeley:

-he did remove the couches, TV and refuse on the vacant lot but then, Inspector Essling indicated that there were tires when he went back

-to her, it's clearly dumping - in the bushes

-vacant lots are notorious for being dumped on

Mr. Busch:

-he's responded when he's gotten Notice; he did not get Notice on the tires

Ms. Moermond:

-the tires were dumped; not so confident about the Notice

-will split the difference - \$250

Mr. Busch:

-he knows that he cleaned up the couches; not sure whether he got Noticed but no Notice on the tires

-will offer to donate the property as open space

Ms. Moermond:

Reduce the assessment from \$490 to \$250.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 17 [RLH TA 15-396](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 309 LAWSON AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Approve the assessment; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 18 [RLH TA 15-408](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 2013 LINCOLN AVENUE. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Stark

Camille B. Traylor, owner, appeared.

Ms. Traylor's documents were entered

Ms. Moermond reviewed the document; scanned

Inspector John Peter Ross:

-garage demolition that goes back to May 2014 when a Summary Abatement Order was sent for tires, brush, tabs; and also a Correction Notice to repair the severely dilapidated garage; upon re-inspection, the items were gone but no action was taken on the garage

- Aug 1, 2014 re-inspection - first Excessive Consumption for noncompliance on the garage was sent; there was a total of 3 EC sent for noncompliance (Aug 1, Oct 6, and Nov 3, 2014)

-Dec 4, 2014, after receiving no compliance with the garage, an Order to Demolish the garage was sent; no action was taken

-Dec 16, 2014, a follow-up Summary Abatement Order was sent to demolish the garage

-during this time, Inspector Smith was noticing that no permits were being taken out on the garage

-a Work Order was sent to demolish the garage Apr 28, 2015

-the garage was demolished May 8, 2015 for a cost of \$3310 + \$40 service charge = \$3350

Ms. Moermond:

-these written documents are a great summary; a lot of this information you shared in

the appeals' process already

Ms. Traylor:

-pointed out that she did respond immediately to the initial request back in May 2014 except for the garage; she was dealing with unemployment and the death of her father

-she was in communication with Inspector Ed Smith during this time; he understood her challenges

-in spite of living with chronic pain and having difficulty with the use of her muscles and loss of employment

-her father died in the summer; she had a contractor come look at the property; he thought that maybe \$2,000 would cover the garage; she thought that she might be able to pull that off; when he finally provided a bid, it was almost \$8,000; she didn't know how she was going to address the garage issue given that she didn't have a job and had a chronic illness; her illness kept getting worse; she has to force herself out of bed every day and has collapsing episodes

-finally got into Mayo the beginning of Jun 2015 and during this time, she was really struggling but got people to come and look at the garage; a couple different contractors said that the garage walls aren't leaning, it's very solidly built; the roof could use repair but it's not sagging; your neighbors have garages in worse condition; why is the city pressuring you about this? She was wondering that, too.

-she talked with Ms. Moermond on May 14 about the feedback that she was getting and at that point, her understanding was that the building inspector was going to come out and assess the soundness of the garage

-the person who created this problem she is dealing with now is someone who made this into a man cave before she bought it; he insulated it quite thickly and the animals wanted in; it did have peripheral animal damage; it was safe from human entrance

-she thought the building inspector was going to come out and talk with her about this because she wanted to let him into the garage so he could see it from the inside; also, if worse came to worst and it would be torn down, she wanted him to let her know when they would come to tear it down so that she could cover up her organic garden; she got a call May 6 that the bldg inspector was there and she could talk to him but no

-every weekend when her son came home, they would sort out things like children's memorabilia, put into containers and back into the garage; every chance she had to do this, she took

-3 years ago she would have been able to participate and fix this garage but not today

-when she got to the house, her garage was completely empty; she asked to speak to the lead person and asked "Where is my children's artwork in the containers?" and he said, "Everything in here was already demolished. It's gone; you can't have it back." She then called Ms. Moermond but it was too early; she called Joel Essling and he called her back. She told him that she had contractors tell her that the garage was very solid; that there were worse garages right in her immediate neighborhood; he said that maybe they could push the "pause" button and her contractors could write up a summary, which she now has; so, she thought we were pushing the pause button; 20 minutes later, she got a call from Mr. Essling and he said, "This has to go."

Mr. Ross:

-there were 2 separate Summary Abatements issued; the first one was appealed

-Apr 17, the garage was inspected to see if it was structurally sound; no report on that; notes say, "No change in the garage"

Ms. Traylor:

-on May 5 she noticed the garage door was open; and she didn't understand why

-the next day the city came back to demolish it; it left her wondering if the inspector

had come back

-she really doesn't understand why the city was forcing this on her; no one gained entrance into the garage to establish its structural stability and 2 very fine contractors who told her that the garage was sound but needed some work; she is curious, how did this all start; why would she get so many complaints in the first place? When did the bldg inspector come out and if he was truly able to make an assessment without entering the garage? What made her situation special as opposed to all the other garages in the neighborhood? Demolishing her garage doesn't make sense to her

Ms. Moermond:

-this was handled in Dec 2014 when you filed your appeal of the Summary Abatement Order and we went over the garage conditions and talked about how they could be addressed, etc.

-the original Correction Order went out in May 2014 and she didn't see her for another 7 months and things weren't addressed; you had a variety of health things going on, etc.;

-by the beginning of May, it was nearly 12 calendar months since the original issue of the Order

-the inspector wanted the garage to be repaired rather than demolished

-in Dec we talked about having to move out the interiors of the garage if you weren't able to demolish it yourself

-things weren't addressed by the timeline; the nuisance condition remained

-the City Council can look at this differently

-will recommend approving the assessment divided over 5 years

Ms. Traylor:

-asked Ms. Moermond to explain the criteria for the demo since the walls were not sagging and there was no danger; and it was secured; also, explain the pricing

-it would be better for me not to have to pay this all at once; she is struggling to pay her taxes right now

-she is finally starting to see a slight improvement in her physical condition

Inspector Rich Singerhouse:

-explained the process and costs of the demo

Ms. Moermond:

Approve and spread over 5 years.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 19** [RLH TA 15-413](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 122 LYTON PLACE. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Thao

Approve the assessment; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 20** [RLH TA 15-397](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1141 MARGARET STREET. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Finney

Julia Twaddle, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement sent Apr 28 for failure to maintain exterior property; compliance May 4; re-checked May 7
-work done May 11 for a cost of \$288 + \$160 service charge = \$448
-no returned mail
-sent to Julia A Twaddle, 2930 Aldrich Ave S, Apr 157, Mpls; and Occupant
-a little bit of history
-capital letters: Remove broken wood table in rear yard near alley

Ms. Twaddle:

-she was at the property with her landscaper doing some work and she noticed some items had been dumped there; sometimes people in the neighborhood dump there
-she called the garbage company to have them picked up; she paid by credit card; they couldn't come out until May 7 - the next pickup
-subsequently, she got a Notice from the city informing her that she had to remove the items by May 5; she contacted the inspector to let him know that she already had it pre-paid and scheduled to have the items picked up; he did agree that there could be delay in the Abatement
-she called and got confirmation from the garbage company, which she entered into the record along with an email indication that they removed the items May 7
-she also contacted her tenant and had her go out and check to see if the items had been removed
-she heard nothing more until she got this Notice that the city had removed the items

VIDEO - some furniture; wood;

Ms. Twaddle:

-those items appear to be different from the ones in the Notice - a different wooden table and a couch cushion were there before; doesn't see a couch cushion in the video
-the company said that they removed the items May 7

Ms. Moermond:

-I don't either
-she has a photo taken May 7 of the table we just saw in the VIDEO; and 2 halves of a table top and a cushion underneath

Inspector John Peter Ross:

-the VIDEO does not indicate the specific date it was taken; it only show that it's between May 7 and 13

VIDEO again

Ms. Seeley:

-the record in STAMP shows that the crew was out there May 11
-think it's illegal dumping

Ms. Moermond:

-I think so, too; and a good faith effort was made
-will recommend deletion

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

Sponsors: Finney

Approve the assessment; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 22 [RLH TA 15-389](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1455/1465 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Finney

Rescheduled per owner's request.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/18/2015

- 23 [RLH TA 15-410](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1809 OLD HUDSON ROAD. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Finney

Jeffrey Tschetter, owner, appeared.

Mr. Tschetter:

-there should be 2 assessments (J1502A and J1601A); he called in and was scheduled for all 3 - 2 on 1809 and Stewart; he talked to the Assessor's Office; he said to call back; he just closed on 1809 Old Hudson Road the middle of May; the city called for a puddle to be pumped off and then a couch

Ms. Moermond:

-just have the 1 clean-up for 1809 today

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Orders sent May 28; compliance Jun 3; re-checked Jun 3

-work done Jun 5 for a cost of \$158 + \$160 service charge = \$318

-no returned mail

-sent to: Olin 5 LLC, 9031 Avila Cv, Eden Prairie, MN

-Remove sofa from blvd

VIDEO - picked up sofa

Mr. Tschetter:

-did not receive Notice

-I'm not Olin 5 LLC

-purchased property on May 12, 2015

Ms. Moermond:

-Orders went to previous owner during your ownership

-will recommend deletion of this assessment

-J1502A and J1601A are not on today's agenda; the Orders went to Olin; when those come forward; those will also be deleted

Mr. Tschetter:

-have owned this for only a few months and there's a lot of dumping going on there; there's been 2 TV's, a hot tub, etc.; and he's on top of it as much as he can be; it's vacant property and shouldn't require so much attention for sending over people to

mow the lawn

Ms. Moermond:

-those other 2 should be deleted; if you get a bill, give us a call.

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 24** [RLH TA 15-391](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 933 PAYNE AVENUE/ 635 SIMS AVENUE. (File No. J1509P, Assessment No. 158408)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Delete the assessment; waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 25** [RLH TA 15-399](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1891 SEVENTH STREET EAST. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Finney

Laura Shulte, EIG Property Management, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement Order sent May 7; compliance May 11; Pre-authorized Work Order

-work done May 13 for a cost of \$338 + \$160 service charge = \$498

-open, on-going file

-sent to: Twin Empire Investments LLC, 3168 Berwick KN1, Mpls; EIG Property Mgmt, 2531 Marshall St NE Ste C, Mpls; and Occupant

-no returned mail

-history: 3-11-15; 3-17-15; 4-6-15; 6-19-15 - all Orders on Rubbish/Refuse

-underlined: Remove rubbish, mattresses, box spring, recycling materials, tires, etc, from the NW end of the property

Ms. Shulte:

-believes that this Order is the one that Ed Smith already waived

Ms. Seeley:

-thinks that was the Excessive Consumption Order

Ms. Shulte:

-when we get city Orders, we send a team out to take care of them

-they had to get a roll-off to clean up all the stuff out of this property

-at the rate that things get dumped here, there's a good chance of our going out in the morning to check, get it cleaned up and by night, there's more dumped

Ms. Moermond:

-has the Orders issued May 7 along with a photograph of what things looked like

-let's look at the VIDEO

VIDEO - mattresses, box spring, carpet, tires, loose and scattered, etc.

Ms. Moermond:

- this photo taken May 7 looks exactly like the VIDEO
- will recommend approval of this assessment

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

26 [RLH TA 15-348](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Real Estate Project No. J1511A, Assessment No. 158524 at 619 SIMS AVENUE.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Philip Black, appellant, appeared.

Mr. Black:

- he works for Mr. Fung
- he was in a car accident; it was fairly minor

Ms. Moermond:

- the City Council Public Hearing on this will be on Aug 19, 2015

Inspector Paula Seeley:

- Summary Abatement Order sent Apr 1; compliance Apr 6; re-checked Apr 6
- work done Apr 7 for a cost of \$410 + \$160 service charge = \$570
- sent to: Wing Cheong Fung, 1279 22nd Ave, San Francisco, CA; and Occupant

Mr. Black:

- during that time, he talked to Stephen, who was filling in for Paula; Stephen said that he was taking it off the list because it was handled; he doesn't think that he actually say it but over the phone he said that he'd taken it off; he went by the property afterward and it was gone

Ms. Seeley:

- checking Stephen's notes in the system: scrap wood, tree parts, yard waste, mattresses, plywood, door in backyard near alley; on the compliance day, he puts all remain in backyard near alley; sent Work Order; Coolidge container was overflowing but Coolidge said they were not scheduled to pick up any extras; they send a Work Order when the hauler company says that they don't pick up extras
- photos indicate a lot of stuff

VIDEO - picked up the stuff

Mr. Black:

- maybe he didn't call off the Work Order

Ms. Moermond:

- according to the VIDEO, the city did the work and it aligns with what was in the original SA Order
- perhaps, the inspector could write a quick email about any conversation he might remember

Ms. Seeley:

- he may not remember; that was in Apr and he is fairly new
- history: Sep 2014-rubbish and tall grass & weeds; now, we're looking at a shut-off

Mr. Black:
-the tenant just killed herself
-the electric was shut-off

Ms. Moermond:
-this is a pretty big clean-up exactly as described
-will recommend approval of this assessment
-let's double check with the inspector

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

- 27 [RLH TA 15-393](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 929 SIXTH STREET EAST. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Finney

Approve the assessment; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 28 [RLH TA 15-380](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 737 STEWART AVENUE. (File No. J1509P, Assessment No. 158408)

Sponsors: Thune

Delete the assessment; waiver received and on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 29 [RLH TA 15-416](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 453 HATCH AVENUE. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Josefina Mendez, owner, and Lachesa Rumley appeared.
Laura Caroll interpreted.

Inspector Paula Seeley:
-Summary Abatement Order sent Apr 27; compliance May 4; re-checked May 4
-work done May 7 for a cost of \$280 + \$160 service charge = \$440
-sent to Josefina Mendez Rodriguez, 453 Hatch; and Occupant
-remove mattress/box spring on side of house underneath east canopy

Ms. Mendez:
-they put this mattress/box spring outside where it couldn't be seen because they were cleaning; then, they had to go out-of-town and when they came back it was gone

VIDEO - city took it away

Ms. Moermond:
-normally, being out of town isn't an excuse for not managing the property; but in this particular case, when she looks at the photos, she doesn't know that she would have written Orders on it
-will recommend this assessment be deleted

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 30 [RLH TA 15-417](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 305 EDMUND AVENUE. (File No. VB1511, Assessment No. 158824)

Sponsors: Thao

Terence C. DeRosier LLC, owner, appeared.

Mr. DeRosier:

-he was confused; 2 letters were sent out

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

-Category 2 Vacant Building; opened May 24, 2013

-got Certificate of Code Compliance Aug 3, 2015, a little over 9 weeks past the anniversary date

-there are no issues

Ms. Moermond:

-2 months out of 12 in the VB Program

-will recommend the VB fee is deleted

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

Special Tax Assessments - ROLLS

- 31 [RLH AR 15-56](#) Ratifying Property Clean Up services during May 5 to June 5, 2015. (File No. J1512A, Assessment No. 158527)

Sponsors: Stark

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 32 [RLH AR 15-57](#) Ratifying Trash Hauling services during May 6 to June 3, 2015. (File No. J1511G, Assessment No. 158712)

Sponsors: Stark

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 33 [RLH AR 15-58](#) Ratifying Graffiti Removal services during April 24 to May 19, 2015. (File No. J1509P, Assessment No. 158408)

Sponsors: Stark

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 34 [RLH AR 15-59](#) Ratifying Collection of Vacant Bldg Registration fees billed during February 27 to April 24, 2015. (File No. VB1511, Assessment No. 158824)

Sponsors: Stark

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

- 35 [RLH AR 15-60](#) Ratifying Tree Removal services from May 2015. (File No. 1508T, Assessment No. 159008)

Sponsors: Stark

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary Abatement Orders

- 36 [RLH SAO 15-57](#) Appeal of James Smith to a Summary Abatement Order at 2215 WILLIAM TELL ROAD.

Sponsors: Finney

James Smith, owner, and Kate Kahlert, Attorney, representing Mr. Smith, appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

*-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection conducted by Fire Inspector George Niemeyer
-process started Sep 2014
-multiple no-entries culminating with repairs not being made and not being able to find the owner
-phone number for homeowner is no good; Inspector Niemeyer was unable to make contact
-12-1-14 - final inspection; no show by owner; house still appeared occupied; tire tracks
-he Revoked the Fire C of O and sent the file to the Vacant Building Program*

Inspector Rich Singerhouse, Vacant Buildings:

*-opened up a Category 2 Vacant Building on Jan 5, 2015
-they found some activity at the property: a dog and tire tracks leading to the door going in and out
-did not find anyone home when they went to the door
-towards Feb 2015, there was no one there anymore; no tire tracks
-Jun 1, 2015: noticed vehicles in the driveway; he wrote a Summary Abatement Order on tall grass/weeds
-he went back a couple days later and the grass was cut
-Jun 24, 2015 - no answer at the door; tall grass/weeds; pile of refuse in front of house; vehicles in the driveway; sent SA and an NCC, which explains that they need a code compliance sign-off before they can occupy the building
-Jun 30, he found a young male at the property, who said he was a friend of the new tenant; I told him that the house was a Cat 2 VB and to have the tenant call him; he sent Work Orders on the rubbish and tall grass/weeds; then, he played phone tag with the tenant but did finally explain the situation and gave him some time to vacate
-also sent a SA to board-up the house and removed more rubbish on Jul 13, 2015*

Ms. Moermond:

-asked if a registration letter was sent out when this originally went into the VB Program indicating that it needed a code compliance inspection?

Mr. Singerhouse:

-yes

Ms. Kahlert:

-my understanding is that the city had some encounter with the previous tenant and that is what brought inspectors to the house
-her client has had some personal issues during this past year and he has tried to be as responsive as possible
-probably, there have been some mixed messages going back and forth - communication not getting through
-her client is interested in being compliant and did a number of the corrections as soon as he possibly could
-doesn't think that her client understood that he could not have anyone in there while he did the repairs; when he understood the situation that he was to finish all of the repairs, then have an inspection, etc., at no time, did he intend to not follow thru
-knows that the previous tenant was not very helpful by not being responsive; he wasn't in communication with Mr. Smith at all, which was very unfortunate because her client was helping that tenant; he had been that person's children's foster parent and ended up adopting those children and giving that person a place to live during a period of time while he was trying to get his life in order; that person isn't representative of her client
-after he moved out, her client tried to get issues corrected and the vast majority of them have been corrected but he couldn't get anyone out to re-inspect; and when he filed an appeal, he was told that he filed it too late
-Mr. Smith wants to be in compliance and get these issues resolved
-the new tenant is here today; she has no place else to go; she has 3 children, one of whom is 10 years old, getting ready for school

Ms. Shaff:

-the initial letter for this Fire C of O inspection appointment started in Jun 2014; it was sent to James R. Smith, Molly Smith, 2160 State Road 35, Somerset, WI, 54025-7422; all letters were sent to the property owner at that address
-inspector notes: 9-8-14 - I left voice mail for property owner at 337-0555 to see if I could use the appointment on 9-11; left voice mail at same number as before to find out why no one was there to meet me

Mr. Smith:

-he didn't recognize the phone number

Ms. Shaff:

-9-30-14, inspector writes no show by owner for today's inspection; tenant was home but denied access because he did not have notification; he supplied the phone number for the property owner and himself; I will also be sending a letter to the tenant
-10-14-14, no show by owner; tenant claimed he had no knowledge of inspection but allowed access anyway
-11-13-14, attempted re-inspection today; spoke with tenant who stated that nothing's been done; property owner's not been around in quite some time
-they have great difficulty getting in even though they send the letters and make phone calls

Mr. Smith:

-the phone number you have for me is not correct
-his wife met with one of the inspectors during that time frame; he was never there for inspections because they were always on Wed and Wed was the only day he was required to be at the office

-he lost his job in Oct; so, the phone number that was on record went away along with his emails

-we have fixed pretty much everything on the list

Ms. Moermond:

-there's a couple different paths out there now

-we can keep you in the VB Program as a Cat 2 meaning that the building is empty and has significant code violations that would require a complete code compliance inspection before re-occupation

-another way would be to say that you are a registered VB but somewhere in the mid-status and it might be OK to do what's required for a Fire C of O - get that re-instated in certain time and she'd be happy

-she thinks that it's terrible that he rented out a registered VB and put it on the city to Vacate a building that he should probably be written a Criminal Citation for

Mr. Smith:

-I didn't know it was Vacant

-there was no placard

Mr. Singerhouse:

-he posted 3 or 4 placards

Ms. Kahlert:

-Mr. Smith wants to comply; he did not understand; she has 2 letters and they said it "may" be Revoked

-he had come to the house to make corrections and repairs; he did understand that they needed to be made; he had a limited amount of time so he could not do all of them; he should have appealed at that time but he had health issues- a broken leg, a broken arm; there are financial issues, etc; he did not pay close enough attention to the house at that time

-he did file an appeal in Nov to ask for more time not to dispute these repairs; he is not trying to avoid things

-most items were fixes in Jan-Feb

-Mr. Smith did not see a posting on the house prior to the Jul date when the tenant saw it posted there

-he came into the office to file an appeal and they said "No" in Nov and there was no option, as he understood it, to request more time; and he didn't understand the process either

-Nov was the very last letter

Ms. Shaff:

-all of their letters state: Failure to comply will result with enforcement action

Ms. Kahlert:

-the list of deficiencies don't justify that the building is dangerous; he did not understand the process

Ms. Moermond:

-the C of O was Revoked for long term noncompliance

-you would have received the Registered VB letter in Jan 2015

Ms. Smith:

-I didn't see half those letters; he didn't know it was Vacant and he didn't know that the C of O had been Revoked

-he would not have put the new tenant in this situation; he didn't know it was a VB

-he doesn't want to restrict access

Ms. Kahlert:

-largely, those issues were corrected by that date but no one would come out to look at the repairs

-to get all this resolved is the goal

Ms. Moermond:

-this has been going on since May of last year

-a lot of junctures to talk about this along the way and that hasn't happened

-she doesn't have a good sense of what the house looks like since there was limited access

-is sure that he has been making some repairs but she doesn't have any idea of the significance of what's going on

-she will have Jim Seeger and/or Ms. Shaff to go look to determine which inspection should be done: the code compliance inspection or the C of O inspection; that determination will be made within the next 2 weeks

-if the code compliance inspection is warranted, the place will need to be Vacated by Sep 15, 2015

-if it's determined that re-instating the Certificate of Occupancy is a possibility, she will give you until Oct 1, 2015 to complete those repairs or it must be Vacated at that time

Layover to get Fire inspector or Jim Seeger out there to see if a code compliance inspection is required. If only a Fire C of O is required, hearing officer will give until October 1, 2015 for compliance or it must be vacated. If a code compliance inspection is required, tenant(s) must be vacated by September 15.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/18/2015

Correction Orders

- 37** [RLH VO 15-41](#) Appeal of Elias Cuellar to a Correction Notice (Condemnation) and Order to Vacate at 711 HOPE STREET.

Sponsors: Finney

Elias Cuellar, owner, and his son, Santin Cuellar, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-ongoing scrapping issues; she has been out there with SPPD on a couple occasions

-has Orders on the clean-up outside and exterior of the house

-now, we have an electric shut-off and a Condemnation due to the elect shut-off

-Mr. Cuellar called an wanted an extension on the clean-up; she advised him to file an appeal

Ms. Moermond:

-she remembers that someone from the front desk telling her that there were some health issues that necessitated running an extension cord from your neighbor's house to this house

Mr. Cuellar:

-just when he sleeps; he has sleep apnea

Santin:

-asking for an extension because on Jul 30, they had explained this to the guy at the front desk that they are waiting for an approval from Xcel; his dad has not seen a

doctor for 3 years and he's been using a machine for sleep apnea to help him sleep; otherwise, he starts to fall asleep while having a conversation, etc. - nods off
 -ever since the electricity has been shut-off, it's been harder for him to do just regular things; harder to comply with the Orders
 -the electricity has been on and off a few times
 -at first, they were shut-off because of an outstanding bill with Xcel; they were getting it situated but since he hasn't been to the Dr. in 3 years, Xcel doesn't think that he has sleep apnea
 -Aug 17, he has an appointment with Health Partners on Phalen Blvd; after that they can get a document to submit to Xcel; so, they need approval from Health Partners
 -Inspector Seeley's letter said to Vacate Aug 3
 -they also recently acquired more paint for the garage where graffiti was put on
 -back in May, they removed the commercial vehicle, a U Haul truck, the transmission broke down, along with 4 or 5 other vehicles that were unfit for use and tabs were expired
 -they got rid of all the scrap and the truck load of scrap
 -everything that was asked of them to do has been done

Ms. Moermond:

-she hopes that's the case and that all scrapping is done, too
 -asked Ms. Seeley to drive by and decide whether or not to issue a Work Order

Santin:

-they still have the trailer but they are getting rid of it

Ms. Moermond:

-Ms. Seeley will stop by in the morning and if it's not cleaned up, she will write up a Work Order and Parks crew will take care of it Friday

Santin:

-electric shut-off: waiting for the test Aug 17 to prove he has sleep apnea; after that, Health Partners will fax the results and medical assistance papers to Xcel
 -would rather not risk him sleeping without the machine
 -it has been shut off since Jun 29
 -the house is in default; no sheriff's sale yet

Ms. Moermond:

-the power cord from the neighbor's house has to go
 -if you can't live there without electricity, you have to find some place else to live/sleep while this gets resolved
 -will give you until Aug 21 to get the electricity turned back on or the house must be vacated
 -you can't run the sleep apnea machine with a power cord from the neighbor's and no generators
 -City Council Public Hearing is Aug 19, 2015

Grant until August 21, 2015 to have power restored or the house must be vacated.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

38 [RLH VO 15-45](#)

Appeal of Elsie Mayard to a Condemnation and Order to Vacate at
 755 MINNEHAHA AVENUE WEST

Sponsors: Thao

Elsie Mayard, owner, appeared.

Inspector John Peter Ross:

-Jul 22, 2015: electric/gas shut-off

-on the same day, Inspector Westenhofer went out and issued a Summary Abatement Order to remove refuse in back yard; also, he issued a Correction Notice to immediately both electric/gas service; compliance day for utilities to be turned back on was Aug 5, 2015

-Mr. Westenhofer went out this morning and sent an email saying that Xcel said that they would be cutting the electric at the pole and tagging the meter; upon going out there, neither of those were done; he inquired why and Xcel reported that it needed a police escort to the property, which was delayed in showing up; but it would be happening soon

-Xcel reported a threat from the owner; Xcel stated that they have to have police escort for every trip

-Mr. Westenhofer had a conversation with Ms. Mayard where she relates what she assumes the bill would be; he advised that she go to a hearing to present her case

Ms. Mayard:

-she doesn't know anything about what Mr. Ross was just saying

-I have a letter dated Jul 22 - Correction Order for utilities; she called the inspector and he was not there; she came down here yesterday; she called inspector this morning and talked to him; the problem is that Inspector Seeley has some issues with here

-took pictures

-Ms. Seeley called Xcel but Ms. Mayard and Xcel have a dispute going on; she has an attorney now; I have a bill (Jul 10, 2015) now that she has been looking for a long time; she also has a letter from the Attorney General's Office; she brought it with so that Ms. Moermond knows what's going on

-she owes \$7,231.23 to Xcel; thru Jun, she owed \$1,139.62; the bill from Xcel says that I owe \$11,922.84

-at last hearing, you had a lady from House Calls, who was to help me; at that time, Attorney General's Office was looking into this matter and they asked Xcel how much money I owed; Xcel said, "3,924.50;" the Attorney General's Office told her to find a way to get some help; pay \$2,000 and then you only owe \$1924.50; that lady called Xcel at the hearing and they said she owed \$5,000; Why all of a sudden \$5000?

-now, Xcel billed me for some kind of meter; when she called to ask Xcel, she got no response; now, she has an attorney

-now, this is a big dispute; now, it's about \$25,000+

-something is wrong with Xcel; I have only one house; at one time the bill was much smaller and I tried to get everyone involved; how can I owe so much money to Xcel? I'm being set-up

-the lights are on; the meter is going; I have electricity

-she entered all her documents

Ms. Moermond:

-right now, she understands from Mr. Westenhofer's email and from you that both the gas and electricity are on

Ms. Mayard:

-she will be out of town for one month unless she has to stay to prove this; she is sure that Xcel knows what's going on but they don't want to admit it

-her attorney is Chris _____ at 651/269-8463

Ms. Moermond:

-will set her up for City Council Public Hearing Sep 16, 2015 to give your attorney a change to get the power restored after Xcel cuts it; if the power/gas hasn't been restored by Sep 16, the place will need to be vacated by Oct 1, 2015

Owner and/or her attorney needs to sort out Xcel bills to have gas and electric restored or continued; otherwise, owner must vacate by October 1, 2015.

Referred to the City Council due back on 9/16/2015

11:30 a.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

- 39 [RLH VO 15-38](#) Appeal of Maypop Sales & Services (Benjamin Helberg) to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation and Order to Vacate at 2554 COMO AVENUE BUILDING C

Sponsors: Stark

Benjamin Helberg and Tara Schweiger, co-owners, Maypop Sales & Services, appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

-Revocation of the Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate date Jul 13, 2015 re: an inspection Jul 8 by Inspector Mitch Imbertson

-only item being appealed is #2: provide approved permanent heat source for the office areas per code

-notes: tenant doesn't think he needs a new furnace since he has electric baseboard heat; baseboards were only noted in 2 locations (not adequate) and the tenant was unable to demonstrate that they actually work; could not find thermostat or switch
-code requires temperature to be 68 degrees 5 feet above the floor
-code requires an "approved heat source"

Ms. Moermond:

-they were not shown to be operating and they lacked a thermostat
-also, probably need more baseboards to provide adequate heat for the space

Mr. Helberg:

-following the last inspection, they had to take out the propane tank; it's gone
-they are in the process of having Xcel put in gas piping (there's no gas from his warehouse; the length of approx. 2 football fields of piping has to be put in; Xcel wants \$18,000 to do that; they are working to get that done; it's Tom Tomaro's building and he won't pay for the gas piping; so, it's up to him to do it)
-the baseboard heat in the building is not what he planned on using in the winter; they will start on the piping this week; he has a mechanical company that will do the work and it will be cheaper; will start the middle of this week; will take a least a couple weeks to finish all the testing, etc; so, they need more time to finish
-the baseboard heat is a permanent heat source (in a warehouse and he didn't know how warm it had to be); was unaware of the code; regardless, he wasn't going to keep heating it with baseboard during the winter - it was just a way to show a source of heat while the pipe line gets installed

Ms. Moermond:

-can you have the office heated under permit by Sep 15, 2015

Mr. Helberg:

-for sure

-the garbage is not actually his garbage; it's leftover from one of Tom's other tenants;

it will all be gone, including the cars

Ms. Moermond:

Grant until September 15, 2015 to come into compliance with Item #2.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

40

[RLH FCO
15-144](#)

Appeal of Vince Zewers to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 261 EIGHTH STREET EAST

Sponsors: Thune

Vince Zewers, C of O Responsible Party, and Fr. Bijir Mathau, Pastor, Church of St. Mary, appeared.

Mr. Zewers:

-they were not notified of anything; that's why it was re-scheduled; your office called me last week and I told them that we had not been notified

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Notice

-inspection conducted by Fire Inspector Wayne Spiering

-3 issues were identified:

-provide code compliant emergency lighting in the sanctuary area, in the east exit corridor and along the exit access corridors/exit stairways in the basement

-post an occupant load sign near the main exit of the church sanctuary stating the maximum occupancy is 610 occupants

-provide code compliant exit signs in the church sanctuary and in the east exit corridor

Mr. Zewers:

-the only thing they are appealing the emergency lighting in the sanctuary

Mr. Neis:

-this building has been inspected and approved by their office multiple times; Inspector Diane McCabe inspected in 2010; it was approved in 2009 and 2011; some exceptions had been made for aesthetics

Mr. Zewers:

-the sanctuary has large stained glass windows

-most of their masses are morning and afternoon; rarely, do they have evening masses

-he has been there for over 20 yrs and no inspector ever mentioned emergency lighting in the sanctuary

-Mr. Spiering spent 1 1/2 hours inspecting; usually, the inspections were 10-15 minutes; he measured every sq. foot of this and that

-they have 5 exits to the outside; they are all clearly marked; there are always ushers there to help

-this is not necessary

Ms. Moermond:

-will recommend this appeal be granted; it will be put into the Fire Inspection records; if there's any question about it in the future, there will be a resolution on the record that was adopted by the City Council

Grant the appeal for Item #3 which is the only item being appealed.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

41 [RLH FCO
15-150](#)

Appeal of Jonathan Proctor (Holy Trinity Orthodox Church) to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 956 FOREST STREET

Sponsors: Bostrom

Fr. Jonathan Proctor, Holy Trinity Orthodox Church, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

-she and Mr. Neis viewed the photos entered by Mr. Proctor

Mr. Proctor:

-the Correction Orders don't pertain to their new construction (new photos); the Orders pertain to the rear of the church

-he has included these because they are still pending final inspection on the new construction

-the corrections plus the new construction have caused financial difficulties

-the new construction is an attempt to make the front steps safer (\$500,000 project that is just wrapping up)

-finances is one aspect of their appeal

-have questions about 2 items: 1) the rear door, page 4-5; and 2) furnace area in a classroom, page 7

-entered financial statement

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection conducted by Inspector Jim Perruca

-2 items in question: 1) swing of the exit door, downstairs; room used as an education facility for youth and need a 2nd exit; and 2) furnace area used as a church school room; occupancy separation of the furnace area used a school room (would require a 1-hour fire separation); these are being called because of their use

Mr. Proctor:

-they have 3 school rooms in the basement; between 5-8 kids per room; and none of that usage if new to this basement

-the basement used to be the church hall; and occupancy is a third of what it used to be

-in adding the new addition in the front, a 3rd egress was added

-at a time, when egress increased and occupancy dropped, these corrections are required (?)

-it's a financial impossibility for them to marshal the resources to do these modifications at this time

-they understand that the key issue is that the door swings outward; he can do that himself but because that's a masonry wall, to widen it would require a lot more alteration and a lot more money when they are already deep in the hole (\$11,000 behind as of the end of Jun)

-hoping to get permission to do moderate modifications; he can switch the swing of the door and they could withdraw the school room or make the whole room the furnace room

Ms. Moermond:

-will recommend granting your appeal on #2, the 1-hr separation, given the occupancy is under 12
-with respect to the egress door; there are not that many people in the church basement at the same time; 1 exit would suffice at that lower level

Mr. Neis:

-has a major concern with exiting; can you at least have it swing outward

Ms. Moermond:

-will grant your appeal during your occupancy of the building

Mr. Proctor:

-he is deeply appreciative

Grant the appeal for Item #2 for the duration of its current occupancy load of less than 12 students; grant the appeal for Item #1 provided that owner changes the swing of the door.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

42 [RLH FCO
15-160](#)

Appeal of Davie Veit to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1982 HAWTHORNE AVENUE EAST

Sponsors: Bostrom

David and Karen Veit, owners, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice by Fire Inspector Laura Huseby
-items #4 & #5 are being appealed - about a flexible duct that was allegedly improperly installed for an addition out back
-condensation is dripping onto the furnace
-challenge: the Veit's had a furnace and warm air ventilation permit pulled in Apr 2014 for the installation of this furnace; everything was finaled and approved by the mechanical inspector, in addition to the plumbing inspector
-the work did not look right to Fire Inspector Huseby; she brought another mechanical inspector, James Lichtblau, to look at it with her at the time of inspection; he determined that the installation was improper
-Inspector Huseby also spoke with the Sr. mechanical inspector, Gary Reinsberg, who actually finaled the permit; he, too, said that it was not properly installed;
-Maureen Hanson was the inspector who finaled everything
-the only conclusion that they can come up with is that is vent work was installed after the furnace had been put into place because it shouldn't have passed inspection the way that it was
-a building warning was put into the computer by Inspector Lichtblau - to the best of his knowledge, the duct work was installed to an addition without the permit
-the Appellants say that it was there and finaled; the inspectors say that they would not have finaled it that way

Mr. Veit:

-the duct work was there in 2006 when he purchased the house
-the city inspected it; there was one fire inspection; have had CO inspections; Tom Henning with Henning & Co went out to look at it; he said it was fine and another contractor who said that he's using the same application in a house in Stillwater; he said to call Inspector Randy, city of St. Paul
-it was there when he bought it; Tom said that if there were problems with it, they

*should have said something when they put in the furnace in 2014
-he had photos of what it looks like*

Mr. Neis:

*-it's not in his expertise; he'd revert back to the mechanical inspectors
-the addition was there, too, when the Veit's purchased the property
-no permit for this addition
-the house whole house re-roofed in 2003
-Ms. Huseby looked at the file and noticed mention of a rear porch in 2001, which is now gone and this addition was added
-can assume this addition was put on some time between 2001 and 2006
-recommends that Inspector Gary Reinsberg or the building official go out and look at it
-flexible ducting can only be used up to 14 feet*

Mr. Veit:

*-all that this venting does is carry cold air into the furnace and hot air out of the furnace; no CO - just moving air to and from the furnace
-the dripping condensation has been taken care of
-Tom Henning told him that if he were forced to make this change, it would cost \$2200
-he spent \$3200 on the furnace last year
-this isn't a major issue*

Ms. Moermond:

*-tends to agree with the Veits
-she wants to send an email to the building official who's out until next week and also to Gary Reinsberg; wants to send them the photos and have them discuss this; wants to ask them how it happened that this was finalized and approved if this is a problem
-she doesn't think that this is a problem; she just needs an answer back from them*

Mr. Neis:

*-re-inspection date Aug 14; if the Veit's would like to keep it on Aug 14, he will encourage Ms. Huseby to do her best to get Inspectors Ubl and Reinsberg out there with her; there will be no additional fees
-if Ms. Huseby can't get Ubl or Reinsberg out then, we could set it up for a different time*

Ms. Moermond:

Legislative Hearing Officer is leaning towards granting the appeal; however, she would like to have the building official and the mechanical inspector look at the flexible duct work (Item #4).

8/19/15: Gary Reisberg made inspection of the duct work and approved it. Marcia Moermond said she will grant the appeal regarding the flexible duct work in excess of 14 feet; however, this item shall be revisited with each subsequent Fire C of O inspection to determine if the duck work remains in good repair.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

43 [RLH FCO
15-154](#)

Appeal of Mark Jossart (Kleinman Realty Co.) to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 177 MCKNIGHT ROAD NORTH

Sponsors: Finney

Per agreement between Inspector Migdal, extension was given to owner.

Withdrawn

44 [RLH FCO
15-155](#)

Appeal of Pha Vang to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction
Notice at 1105 ROSE AVENUE EAST

Sponsors: Bostrom

Pha Vang, owner & Leng Her appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

*-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice issued to LP Capital Holding LLC,
2355 Fairview Ave N #222, Roseville, MN by Fire Inspector Brian Schmidt
-appealed is the Order regarding a tree on the property that's pushing up and
jeopardizing the structural integrity of the garage
-in his opinion, is issue isn't necessarily the removal of the tree; option: alteration or
modification of the garage
-if the garage is not structurally sound, that's really the code violation; they don't
enforce tree ordinances in Fire Inspections*

Ms. Vang:

*-the tree is between her property and the neighbor's (between their garages); she
doesn't think the responsibility for the tree removal should be hers alone; the
neighbor should share that responsibility*

Ms. Moermond:

*-when she read the appeal, she thought about the appeals she gets about tree
removal (diseased or dangerous tree that needs to be removed); the foresters make
a determination about who's responsible for the tree: one property or maybe both
properties; so, she asked the head forester to go take a look at this situation and give
his input about responsibility; the forester took a picture and drew a line where he
determined the property line was (he says: I measured, made an estimate of the
property line between these 2 addresses; 128.46 feet from the Frank ROW and
determined the tree is over 90-95 % on the property of 1105 East Rose Avenue; the
tree originated on this property and grew large encroaching onto the 1107 East Rose
property; this should be the full responsibility of 1105 East Rose); so, his assessment
is that the tree is yours
-the tree is undermining your garage; taking down the tree would be one solution;
dealing with the building is another
-knowing this information, which proposal would you consider doing?
-will not pressure you for an answer right now*

Ms. Vang:

*-her main concern is that removal of the tree will be very costly
-the garage is not being used for anything except storage
-that was never called out until now
-doesn't know where to go from here*

Ms. Moermond:

-wants to see exactly what the Order says:

*Mr. Neis:#23. garage..... "Repair the eaves on the east side and repaint all
exposed wood. There is a large tree growing alongside of the garage and pushing on
the wall and now, there's a curve in the wall. The tree needs to be removed; contact
a licensed contractor and have him evaluate the structural soundness of the
building." First off, you can't cut part of a tree; by doing that, you will kill the structural
stability of the tree and it will be extremely dangerous. The tree will rot and fall.*

Ms. Moermond:

-you may want to have a certified arborist look at the situation and develop a plan; an arborist may be able to tell you something that building inspectors wouldn't be able to tell you; should take their advice about cutting the tree

Ms. Vang:

-the foundation of the garage is being jeopardized

Mr. Neis:

*-the true violation is not the tree; the violation is what the tree is causing
-it will be thousands of dollars to take this tree down and it will be very time consuming being in very close proximity between 2 garages; they can't make one mistake
-options would be to either take down the garage or modify it
-perhaps Brian Karpen, our structural engineer could look at the structural part of the garage*

Ms. Moermond:

*-she agrees, Mr. Karpen could take a look and make an evaluation on the structural integrity of the garage
-she's not seeing the garage wall looking like it's unsound, right now*

Ms. Vang:

*-and there is no issue, whatsoever, inside of the garage
-she does want to find a solution but financially, it's going to be way out of her reach*

Ms. Moermond:

*-we have a little time in terms of the structural integrity of the wall
-it's a good idea to get the structural engineer out there to take a look and we'll have him make the call on this; then, we can change the Order to reflect what he is seeing
-thinks we can take some time for Ms. Vang to gather funds*

Mr. Neis:

-asks if Ms. Moermond would consider determining the health of that tree; concerned that the tree's roots may be growing into the foundation; we don't want the tree to fall because it's not rooted properly

Ms. Moermond:

*-let's get Brian Karpen out there and see what he says
-will Lay this Over for a couple of weeks; we'll reconvene Tue Aug 18, 2015 and talk about a plan to deal with this; maybe the plan can be for 12-18 months; we can adjust according to what Mr. Karpen says*

Layover so that the City's engineer, Brian Karpen, can take a look at the garage and its structural sound and maybe the arborist can determine the health of the tree.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/18/2015

45 [RLH FCO
15-149](#)

Appeal of Lee Ann Schray to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy
Correction Notice at 1380 WHITE BEAR AVENUE

Sponsors: Bostrom

Lee Ann Schray, 1380 WB Ave Futures LLC, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice; inspection Jul 10 by Fire Inspector Laura Huseby

-9 violations were identified; don't know what's being appealed

Ms. Schray:

-would like an extension to next spring for the 3-foot limestone retaining wall

-they inherited the wall

-the wall abuts a driveway on the far end

-finding a contractor has not been easy

-everything else has been completed

Ms. Moermond:

-will recommend granting an extension to Jun 1, 2016

-the city will monitor

Grant until June 1, 2016 to come into compliance with the retaining wall.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 46 [RLH VBR 15-57](#) Appeal of Choua Fang to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 860 BEECH STREET.

Sponsors: Finney

Choua Fang, owner, and her husband Yee Fang, appeared.

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

-this was made a Category 2 Vacant Building Jul 30, 2013 by Inspector Dave Nelmark per Certificate of Revocation issued by Fire Inspector James Thomas

-then, it went into HUD ownership

-Inspector Nelmark noted the building was vacant, in fair shape; roof shingles worn, cracked, broken siding, peeling paint, had rotting doors, windows and torn & missing screens; see Condemnation for other interior violations

-Feb 21, 2014, the Fangs went thru Sale Review and were approved for purchase by Inspector Reid Soley

-a current code compliance inspection report is on file

-permits on file

-house & yard have been maintained

-here to discuss the VB fee

Mr. Fang:

-we took over on Feb 14; got the code compliance inspection report

-plumbing, heating and general contractors - we've had problems with the contractors; they start and finish part of the work and then run away; it took him 2-3 months to trace the heating contractor; we asked him why he didn't come back and finish and he had no response so we went to his company to complain about him and to the city; his company said that there was not much they could do; he looked for another contractor for almost 1 year; finally, he got a contractor to come and finish the work; the same with the plumbing contractor

-the electric work is done

-in process of waiting for heating & plumbing contractors to finish

-today, asking for the VB fee to be waived
 -it's not that we don't want to finish the project; the contractors are unreliable
 -expect to be done in 30 days

Ms. Moermond:

-will waive the VB fee for 90 days; if the building is still vacant and you don't have your sign-offs, the VB fee will become a proposed tax assessment; send in the yellow post card, come to the hearing and she can reduce the fee in that process, if it's warranted.

Waive the VB fee for 90 days.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

- 47 [RLH VBR 15-55](#) Appeal of Manoj Bhakta to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 1377 HOYT AVENUE EAST

Sponsors: Bostrom

Rescheduled per owner's request. No more further continuance.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/11/2015

- 48 [RLH VBR 15-58](#) Appeal of Terrell Bellfield to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 950 MCLEAN AVENUE

Sponsors: Finney

Terrell Bellfield, owner, appeared.

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

-a Category 2 Vacant Building was opened Jun 17, 2014 by Inspector Dave Nelmark per a Condemnation by Code Enforcement

-Inspector's notes: numerous cats in dwelling, complaints filed with Animal Control advising them to open the front door and remove cats; please secure door when done; chimney has loose bricks and mortar; appears ready to fall; shingles are loose, worn and deteriorated; cracks in foundation; rotting wood; peeling paint on doors, windows, frames, siding and porches; debris in porch and throughout yard; issued SA; tall grass & weeds, as well included in SA; originally Condemned for electric being off and the cat issue

-turned into a HUD ownership

-Mr. Bellfield purchased the property Jun 29, 2015; he was not disclosed any of the city's VB rules and regulations

-code compliance inspection report is on file as of Jul 13, 2015

-VB fee is due

Mr. Bellfield:

-he wants to bring life back into the property; it's a nice neighborhood

-there isn't much he can do without permits

-he had to pay for the code compliance inspection; now, the VB fees

-had all of these things been negotiated by the seller, he would have negotiated differently on the purchase price

-is trying to get a home equity loan (halfway thru that process)

-he's been working on getting contractors

-about 4 months to completion

Ms. Moermond:

-will grant a 4 month VB fee waiver; if it's not done, it will go to assessments
 -asked Mr. Dornfeld to make sure that Mr. Bellfield could pull permits tomorrow morning

Waive the VB fee for 4 months and allow permits to be pulled.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

- 49** [RLH VBR 15-59](#) Appeal of Justine Beran (Twin Cities Community Land Bank) to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 544 MINNEHAHA AVENUE WEST

Sponsors: Thao

Justine Beran, Twin Cities Community Land Bank LLC, appeared.

Inspector Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Buildings:

-a Category 2 Vacant Building file was opened Aug 12, 2011 per Inspector Mike Kalas per Fire Certificate of Occupancy Revocation
 -Jan 28, 2014 per Steve Magner - he allowed Twin Cities Community Land Bank LLC to purchase this Cat 2 VB without having to go through our Sale Review process
 -code compliance inspection report is expired Feb 9, 2013
 -no permits on file
 -22 Work Orders have been performed for either snow/ice on sidewalk; tall grass/weeds; junk, refuse since 2011; none in the last 8 months

Ms. Beran

-the Lang Banks buys vacant and foreclosed properties metro wide at a discount typically through First Look Program, National Community Stabilization; some properties come through other sources
 -the Frogtown Rondo Home Fund requested that the Land Bank purchase this property and then have a set of our approved developers rehab it and sell it to a moderate or low income homeowner
 -the developer whose Purchase Agreement was signed could not fulfill his agreement so, the Land Bank took over management
 -lots of dumping happens there
 -they have worked with many developers and many want to tear it down
 -550 Minnehaha is in much better condition but the package deal includes 544 Minnehaha
 -scheduled to close tomorrow
 -their projected rehab time: 4 months

Ms. Moermond:

-will waive the VB fee for 4 months

Waive the VB fee for 4 months.

Referred to the City Council due back on 8/19/2015

3:00 p.m. Hearings

Other

- 50** [RLH OA 15-9](#) Appeal of Paripat Tabtimthai to a Permit Approval Inquiry at 1296 POINT DOUGLAS ROAD.

Sponsors: Finney

*Paripat Tabtimthai, Sirjundho Meditation Center of Minnesota, owner, appeared.
Piyanud and Tim Montgomery also appeared.*

Ms. Moermond:

*-has a letter from Dave Nelson dated Jul 17, 2015 which says that there is a
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy in place
-asked Mr. Dornfeld to look up permits filed*

Mr. Montgomery:

*-1296 Point Douglas Road South was changed from 1318 Point Douglas Road South
in Aug 2011, when the city approved the site plan
-it's the land that Paripat received on Jul 17; this is what they are actually responding
to in this appeal because they didn't understand that they should respond by the 27th*

Inspector Matt Dornfeld:

*-showing all permits are under review; no notes
-they were inspected but not finaled*

Mr. Montgomery:

*-he thinks they were finaled
-Mr. Nelson came out on Jul 30 and I was there too; he went through and inspected
the residential structure and the garage (storage structure); he said that everything
looked fine; he was out there with Mike Palm
-he thinks that he issued a temporary - a 90 day Certificate of Occupancy (Jul 31)*

Ms. Moermond:

-that is her understanding, too

Mr. Montgomery:

*-why is it temporary because everything has been approved
-they've done all work in close consultation with DSI; they've meeting meeting and
talking regularly with the people involved
-the 3 buildings on the property were not code compliant when they purchased the
property in 2009; they went along with the city's idea that they should be demolished,
so, they paid to have them demolished;
-a house and garage have been moved onto the property*

Ms. Moermond:

*-there must be some permits still hanging out there waiting to be finaled; thinks that
the 90-day C of O was issued because it's OK enough to be there but not quite
everything is done yet
-whatever the inspector did, it wasn't entered into the system*

Mr. Montgomery:

*-he looked at the property listing on the public site and it said that everything had
been finaled
-basically, he'd just like to ask Mr. Nelson if everything is OK or is there anything else
that needs to be done*

Ms. Moermond:

-her impression was that the matter was resolved when he gave the 90-day C of O

Mr. Montgomery:

-but what happens after 90 days?

Ms. Moermond:

-after 90 days we are back to talking about emptying it if it's not all done in that time period (the nature of a Temporary C of O)

Mr. Dornfeld:

-in the 2012 permit, he put his Jul 31st notation of "Final inspection approved"

Mr. Montgomery:

-pointed out another thing: on the actual 90-Day Certificate, it mentions the use of the structure; it says the use of the building is a "monastery, temple and a residence" which is not accurate; the Paripat and the fellow monks who were living there were required to sign a statement included with the site plan that the reason for the residence was a place to live (house being moved onto property as a residence and the garage moved onto the property for storage) maybe that is causing a problem (?)

Ms. Moermond:

-she doesn't have the answers to those questions; she's about whether or not it needs to be emptied

-she is surprised that you guys showed up; she understood that it was taken care of -the email that Steve Magner sent: Dave Nelson said to Steve Magner, I gave them a 90-day temporary Certificate of Occupancy and they need their Revised Site Plan approval to get their permanent C of O

-let's have you call Dave Nelson and find out what's he's talking about

-will have to Lay this Over for a couple weeks; 2:30 session on Aug 18, 2015

Mr. Nelson:

-maybe it could be worked out on the phone and then you don't even have to come back

Ms. Moermond:

-perhaps

Although, owners were given a temporary C of O; appellants showed up at hearing. Layover so we can get better information about all the open permits.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 8/18/2015