



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, January 19, 2016

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 [RLH TA 16-29](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1741 ASHLAND AVENUE (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 158204).

Sponsors: Stark

Delete the assessment; inspector entry error.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016
- 2 [RLH AR 15-108](#) Ratifying Demolition services from September 2015 at 1404 BARCLAY STREET (File No. J1604C, Assessment No. 162003)

Sponsors: Bostrom

Approve; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016
- 3 [RLH TA 16-7](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 970 EUCLID STREET (File No. 1602T, Assessment No. 169001).

Sponsors: Finney

Approve; property owner called and wants to reschedule. This is the 3rd time so reschedule was denied. Told to go to City Council.

Ms. Moermond:

 - the original hearing was scheduled for Jan 5, 2016; it was re-scheduled to Jan 19 (today); no one is here; she is welcome to come to the City Council Public Hearing*

Inspector Karl Mueller, Parks. Forestry:

 - this is an assessment for 2 diseased trees (7" wide & 3" wide) dated Jul 8, 2015; compliance Aug 5; re-checked Aug 10*
 - given to contractor; work done Oct 19, 2015*
 - cost: \$219 + \$161.45 service charge = \$380.45*
 - no returned mail*

Ms. Moermond:

- there was 9-10 weeks Notice for this to have happened
- no communication from property manager during this time period
- will recommend approval of this assessment

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

4 [RLH TA 16-4](#)

Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 495 FRED STREET (File No. J1604B, Assessment No. 168103).

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Faith Kruger, owner, appeared.

Inspector Joe Yannarely:

- this is an assessment for an emergency boarding requested by SPPD Sep 11, 2015 at 5:30 pm for an unsecured garage door
- cost: \$75 + \$160 service charge = \$235

Mr. Kruger:

- tenant started renting last Dec 2014 and she was arrested late Mar, early Apr 2015; and she left children behind (16, 14, 12 yr old)
- she had been told that someone was going to be there with the children; then, it appeared that there wasn't, so, she called Children's Welfare; they said that they couldn't do anything without the police doing a welfare check; so, she called the police, who couldn't get in (long before Sep)
- she doesn't know anything about the garage being boarded up
- Sep 20, 2015, the tenant on the other side called her and said that the front door was open on the 495 Unit and there was also a broken window
- she had called the police on occasions because the kids were running amuck
- she met SPPD out there and they went thru the house; no one was there
- she had her maintenance man come and board up all the windows; and put new locks on the door
- does not know anything about the garage

Ms. Moermond:

- Mai is printing the police report
- read police report: Sep 11, 2015 at 1:30 pm -we've got a call in about teenagers climbing in window of vacant house - 2 black males and 1 black female; complainant has no description and wants to remain anonymous; on-going issues with juveniles at this house; complainant is watching from ?? - barefoot female run up complainant's driveway saying, "Dogs were chasing her;" no dogs were following her; then, she ran down the street toward Payne; suspect light black female wearing grey, pink and orange tank top and blue jeans
- some burglary going on
- call for board-up - this doesn't tell her what's going on with the garage

Ms. Kruger:

- the kids were causing problems so, she requested the neighbors call the police any time there was something going on; she was trying to get them out; finally, the mom was out of jail and she served her with eviction; gave her a 30-day notice to get her stuff out but she didn't
- her garage doesn't have any windows; the power to the garage was shut off

Mr. Yannarely:

- the cop's could have meant the house; 3 windows were screwed shut

Ms. Kruger:
-I don't know
-the place is not rented yet
-she was over there washing and boxing up clothes, etc.

Ms. Moermond:
-our invoice seems to be incorrect, as written
-is not reading anything in the police report indicating that they had made an attempt to contact you, which is their responsibility to do; this is during the afternoon (1:30 - 5:30 pm); they had plenty of opportunity to contact you

Ms. Kruger:
-has invoice from Sep 20 Home Solutions, boarding up windows and changed locks

Ms. Moermond:
-this is from Sep 11, a week earlier
-will recommend this assessment be deleted
-she would not be deleting it if she saw that there was an attempt to contact you; she's not seeing that; is seeing an invoice that isn't written correctly; if the garage has no windows, this is really silly

Delete the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

- 5 [RLH TA 16-36](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 171 GRANITE STREET (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 168204).

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Layover to 2/16 at 10:30 so staff can give a staff report before 11:00 hearing.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/16/2016

- 6 [RLH TA 16-24](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1853 HAWTHORNE AVENUE EAST (File No. J1605A, Assessment No. 168504).

Sponsors: Bostrom

Approve; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

- 7 RLH TA 16-33 Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1358 HAZELWOOD STREET (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 168204).

Sponsors: Bostrom

Thai Xiong, owner, appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:
-Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection
-cost \$340 + \$155 service charge = \$495

-appointment letters sent: 12/15/14, 3/2/15, 4/20/15 and 5/14/15
-correction Orders sent: 6/2/15 and 7/2/15
-it was complied with: 8/3/15
-billing dates: 8/5/15, 9/4/15, and twice on 10/27/15 (one to property owner and one to HUD)
-no returned mail
-all letters and Orders including the first Correction Ltr and third bill were sent to: HUD
-the second Correction Ltr and first 3 bills were sent to: Thai Xiong, 7053 Upper 36th St N, Oakdale, MN
-the inspector was working with HUD and consequently, the property owner
-property owner made a late payment after it was sent to assessment
-DSI applied part (\$50) of the payment toward the provisional fee and refunded the remaining amount (\$340) to the owner
-in the meantime, the owner has received the refund for \$340; that is now the amount being assessed plus the service charge of \$155, which = \$495
-DSI recommends deleting the service charge, which would = \$340 total

Note: both Ms. Xiong and Ms. Shaff were very difficult to understand after Ms. Shaff's staff report

Ms. Xiong:

-she bought the house Mar 19, 2015
-the first time the inspector came, she had received the appointment letter
-the second time, he just showed up with a knock on the door
-the third time, he sent me a letter

Ms. Shaff:

-part of that issue maybe, was because we weren't informed of the responsible party at that time

Ms. Xiong:

-when she received the bill, she was confused; she decided to make payment on Nov 18
-notified of new owner (inserted by Ramsey County) on Mar 28, 2015
-on Jul 2, 2015, the letter was sent to Thai Xiong and the billing went to both
-on Aug 2, it would have been approved

Ms. Moermond:

-you were unaware of the previous appointment because HUD was receiving notice
-you closed with HUD Mar 19, 2015
-so, Ms. Xiong was notified -given the Correction letter Jul 2 and she had things fixed within 1 month on Aug 3, 2015; we're also dealing with HUD, a beast to deal with because they are the federal government and they don't own responsibility under local codes; so, they blow it off
-once you did get notification, you took care of business within 1 month
-there are 2 re-inspection fees here
-she'd like to delete the re-inspection fees and the admin fee as recommended by Fire staff; and approve the assessment of \$170
-don't pay anybody until you receive an invoice in the mail; it will come about by Mar 10, 2016

Reduce from \$495 to \$170.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

JESSAMINE AVENUE EAST (File No. J1605A, Assessment No. 168504).

Sponsors: Bostrom

Delete the assessment as the summary abatement order failed to generate and was never sent to the property owner. (No hearing necessary)

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

9 RLH TA 16-31 Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 792 LAKE STREET (File No. J1605E, Assessment No. 168304).

Sponsors: Prince

Sandra Nelson, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

*-Summary Abatement Order issued Aug 26; compliance Sep 1; re-checked Sep 1
-Parks went out Sep 3 and the work had been done
-Excessive Consumption fee: \$120 + \$35 = \$155 (PAEC bill)
-remove all car parts, wood, tree debris, furniture, mattresses and debris from the property
-sent to Sandra M. Nelson, 792 Lake St, St. Paul; and Occupant
-history: Apr 29, 2015-had a burning complaint; Sep 8, 2015 -back yard full of junk;
Dec 30, 2013 - every year we get a complaint on this property*

Ms. Nelson:

*-they did everything that was on the sheet
-she is appealing because of her low income
-she is on disability*

Ms. Moermond:

*-she cannot do anything based on income because this isn't an income based system; it's cost for services
-the work crew had a wasted trip
-why didn't your son take care of this*

Ms. Nelson:

*-her son that lives with her gets GA because he's ____; he gets only \$200/month
-we both living on not much money
-it was cleaned up before the deadline*

Ms. Moermond:

*-it was cleaned up before the crew showed up but not before the deadline
-you have Orders coming about once every year to clean up the yard*

Ms. Seeley:

*-the deadline was Sep 1, 2015; Inspector Martin sent a Work Order and sent photos on Sep 1, 2015
-all viewed the photos taken on Sep 1*

Ms. Nelson:

*-she doesn't believe that those pictures were taken on Sep 1
-her disabled son has been there 2 years now; it's a problem with him because he's mentally ill, too; it's very hard for her*

Ms. Seeley:

-the police were out there Sep 2014 about scrapping and the son living and sleeping in the car

Ms. Nelson:

-she didn't want him living with her; she didn't want to take care of him, he's 42 years old

-so, he was sleeping in the car; it was getting too cold in the fall and she couldn't leave him out there

-she has a mortgage and is a little behind on the property taxes

-she had a student loan and they took that money out of her monthly Social Security check and they took her tax money

-it's harder to maintain

Ms. Moermond:

-the city did have to deploy a crew

-she will divide the payments over 2 years

Approve and spread over 2 years

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

10 [RLH TA 16-25](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 823 LAUREL AVENUE (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 168204).

Sponsors: Thao

Reduce from \$591 to \$218 to correct billing. (No one appeared)

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

11 **RLH TA 16-32**

Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 794 MARYLAND AVENUE EAST (File No. J1605E, Assessment No. 168304).

Sponsors: Bostrom

Mark Klinkner, owner, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Excessive Consumption fee

-Summary Abatement Order issued for failure to maintain exterior or the property Sep 10; compliance Sep 14; re-checked Sep 16 - it was still there

-inspector issued a EC for \$120 + \$35 service charge = \$155

-sent to Mark D. Klinkner/Elizabeth M. Klinkner, 114092 Dearborn Path, Rosemount MN; and Homes For Now, 14870 Granada Ave, Ste 288, Apple Valley; and Occupant

-Remove large quantity of garbage, rubbish and refuse including headboards, mattress, chair and shopping cart strewn around garage area

-the inspector accidentally sent out EC multiple; should have been EC noncompliance

Mr. Klinkner:

-he got a call from the inspector

-they had a person moved out, who left some garbage - didn't put it into the container

-a company in Mpls does all his maintenance; he called them and they got over there within 2 hours and cleaned it up

-he is trying to improve the area; he took a vacant property and improved it; it irritates him to be charged \$120 for an excessive fee; he remodeled the house, spent a lot of

money; is paying taxes of \$1296; paying maintenance assessment of \$177.20; paying a storm sewer charge of \$72.41 every year; C of O fees;
-he responded within 2 hours; there's something really wrong here; he's agitated about it

Ms. Seeley:

-reading over inspector's note and he sent the EC before the compliance date on the Summary Abatement letter; so, she recommends deleting this; he sent it on the 10 and the compliance day was the 14; eventhough he thought it was a multiple; it wasn't a multiple

Ms. Moermond:

-recommends deleting it

Delete.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

12 [RLH TA 16-18](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 2138 SCENIC PLACE (File No. J1602A1, Assessment No. 168510).

Sponsors: Prince

Approve; no show.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/3/2016

13 [RLH TA 16-30](#)

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 749 SIMS AVENUE (File No. J1605A, Assessment No. 168504).

Sponsors: Bostrom

Mai Yang and Vincent Vang, tenants, appeared.

Inspector Paula Seeley:

-Summary Abatement issued Oct 23; compliance Oct 27; re-checked Oct 29
-work done Oct 29 for a cost of \$160 + \$160 service charge = \$320
-no returned mail
-sent to Steve Vue/Moua H. You, 350 Main St, Circle Pines, MN; Steven Vue, 2161 Suburban Ave, St. Paul, MN; and Occupant
-there's a pending EC
-cut & remove tall grass, weeds & rand plant growth; tall grass & weeds remain on property, mostly in back yard, on blvd by tree and along stairs
-history: several tall grass/weeds & snow complaints

Mr. Vang:

-the landlord, Steve Vue, receives the letters and he doesn't notify us
-he provides us with the lawn mower but it can't cut the weeds along the neighbor's fence and along the house
-he had already mowed the lawn the week before this
-landlord came in Nov and gave us these letters and told us we had to pay

Ms. Yang:

-she rented this thru Moua Vue; she pays her rent to Ms. Vue at work

Ms. Seeley:

-the Notice was sent to the Occupant, too; and there was no returned mail

Ms. Moermond:

*-the city sent Notice to the owner and also to Occupant, which is you guys; the owner is held responsible; it's his property; it will go onto his taxes; he will get the invoice
-she doesn't know if there's a provision in the tenants' lease about this type of circumstance; check your lease*

Ms. Yang:

-she doesn't know about the lease but they told us that they wanted us to help them with some things

Ms. Moermond:

*-this work wasn't taken care of so, the city crew did the work
-the city did give Notice to the responsible party
-you can tell the owner that if he wants to appeal it further, he came come to the City Council's Public Hearing on this, Feb 17, 2016 at 5:30 pm
-will recommend approval of this assessment*

Ms. Yang:

-the inspector told us that the SA for picking up a fish tank had been dropped; she wants to know if that is true

Ms. Seeley:

*-that was done by owner
-there may be a PAEC (Mai Vang: that is scheduled for LH Feb 16, 2016; the Notice will go only to the owner)*

Ms. Yang:

-our lease expires the end of Feb 2016; she doesn't know if they are going to stay

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

14 RLH TA 16-26

Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1034 SUBURBAN AVENUE (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 168204).

Sponsors: Prince

Aaron Schumm, new property manager as of Sep 1, 2015, appeared.

Fire Inspector Leanna Shaff:

*-Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection of a 17-unit building
-cost: \$1207.50 + \$155 service charge = \$1362.50
-appointment letter: 1/23/15
-correction letters: 2/26, 3/27, 4/27, 5/28, 6/18 and 8/3/2015
-was approved with corrections on 8/24/15
-billing dates: 8/26 and 9/15/15
-no returned mail
-all letters, orders & billings sent to Matt Bartlett, PO Box 16542, St. Paul MN*

Mr. Schumm:

*-the property runs on a very slim margin; and their objective is to provide affordable house; the property has a lot of deferred maintenance so they are trying to reallocate all profits to fix it up because it's an old property
-the appeal is more of a plea - that money would be better spent on fixing up the property than spending money on the mistake of the previous property manager; they*

were doing a very poor job
-since we have taken over in Sep, they have fixed a lot of things; they want to provide a healthy, safe place for tenants to live

Ms. Shaff:
-the inspection fee for Aug 24 has already been removed

Ms. Moermond:
-the city did send out an inspector each time and the work wasn't done
-will recommend approval of the assessment

Approve the assessment.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

- 15 [RLH TA 16-28](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 421 SUMMIT AVENUE (File No. J1605P, Assessment No. 168404).

Sponsors: Thao

Delete; waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

- 16 [RLH TA 16-23](#) Deleting the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 2328 TERRITORIAL ROAD (File No. J1605P, Assessment No. 168404).

Sponsors: Stark

Delete; waiver on file.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

- 17 [RLH TA 16-3](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 663 THOMAS AVENUE (File No. J1605A, Assessment No. 168504).

Sponsors: Thao

Need staff report. Received a response from Mark Kaisersatt stating this property is not in his district and he doesn't recall talking to property owner. Waiting for Sean Westenhofer's response.

Follow-Up: Nothing in staff notes indicates communication on this with the owner/owner staff. -MM

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

- 18 [RLH TA 16-27](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 550 VANDALIA STREET (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 168204).

Sponsors: Stark

Reduce from \$5537 to \$3726, per DSI bookkeeping correction. (No one was present for hearing)

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016

- 19 [RLH TA 16-35](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for Property at 1809 YORKSHIRE AVENUE. (File No. J1603C, Assessment No. 162002.)
- Sponsors:** Tolbert
- Inspector Joe Yannarely:*
-they sent in the gold card; they weren't disputing the fee; they were looking to have the amount spread over time
- Ms. Moermond:*
-will recommend approval spread over 3 years
- Owner was not present but asked to have payments spread over number of years. Ms. Moermond recommends approval of the assessment and spread over three years. Owner was not present but asked to have payments spread over number of years.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016**

Special Tax Assessments - ROLLS

- 20 **RLH AR 15-104** Ratifying Collection of Fire Certificate of Occupancy fees billed during August 8 to September 11, 2015. (File No. CRT1605, Assessment No. 168204)
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016**
- 21 **RLH AR 15-105** Ratifying Excessive Inspection/Abatement services billed during August 24 to September 25, 2015. (File No. J1605E, Assessment No. 168304)
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016**
- 22 **RLH AR 15-107** Ratifying Demolition services from July to August 2015. (File No. J1603C, Assessment No. 162002)
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016**
- 23 **RLH AR 15-106** Ratifying Graffiti Removal services during October 14 to November 9, 2015. (File No. J1605P, Assessment No. 168404)
- Sponsors:** Stark
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2016**

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary Abatement Orders

11:30 a.m. Hearings**Correction Orders**

- 24 [RLH CO 16-2](#) Appeal of Mark Santi, Imperial Vapor, LLC, to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection, including Condemnation at 841 GRAND AVENUE.

Sponsors: Noecker

Following appeared:

Mark Santi, Thompson Hall Law Firm, on behalf of Imperial Vapor LLC, The Wengler Family Limited Partnership, owner .

Dan Niziolik, Deputy Director; Wendy Lane, Zoning Administrator, Dept of Safety & Inspections (DSI); and 3 others from DSI.

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

*-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Referral Correction Notice issued by Mr. Neis
-he was informed by the dept that 841 Grand had a recent determination by the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA); it was not approved for them to operate due to Zoning Ordinances cited in Correction Notice; when he was advised of that, he was told to take appropriate enforcement action; therefore, he researched what the most appropriate applicable codes were*

-he went out to the building and placarded the building as Condemned, an illegal occupancy; he advised the gentleman, who was operating there, that the business had to close at that time; since then, the Orders have been appealed so the Orders are stayed

-the final decision of the BZA was Aug 18, 2015; the vote was 5-2; no appeal was filed on the BZA decision

-we also have DSI staff here from Zoning and Licensing

-under the Ordinance, a tobacco store or someone selling electronic cigarettes or devices are used to dispense or use nicotine are not permitted within at least a half mile of another shop; there's another tobacco retailer within a half mile of 841 Grand; so, therefore, this shop would not be able to operate; it is his understanding that they understood that when they first applied for their licensing; they opened business without a license, from his understanding

-they tried to explain that they are not a retail establishment but an online distributor, where someone purchases product on the Internet and goes to the shop to pick it up; there were 2, if not 3 occurrences where that was found to be inaccurate of the way that they were operating

-has a police report conducted by SPPD Vice Unit were advised that this business was not complying with Zoning regulations so they went out and did a Controlled buy; they sent an undercover officer into the building; he met one of the business owners and went to purchase some e-cigarette liquid with an ipad; went back inside and was given the product

-another purchase in which the customer was told that first time customers were not charged taxes on their first purchase

-there was another Controlled buy by DSI staff

-they have been operating without a license

Ms. Moermond:

-because the police reports were written, has there been any other enforcement action through the court system?

Mr. Neis:

-from his understanding, there has been at least 1 criminal citation issued
-his enforcement action is based on the operation of an establishment that's in violation of the zoning code; therefore, under the Fire Certificate of Occupancy, it would be an establishment with illegal occupancy

Dan Niziolik, DSI, Deputy Director; was also serving as licensing manager at the time of a number of these purchases:

-based on those purchases, there are 2 criminal citations going forward, which the City Attorney's Office is working through
-online vs shop sale: Chap 324 - Tobacco Ordinance says that no person shall sell or offer for sale at retail within the city any tobacco or any manner represent or hold himself or herself out as one who sells or offers for sale at retail any tobacco or maintain a tobacco vending machine for the sale of tobacco without a license
-for definition sake: sale means and includes any transfer, traditional or otherwise, of title or possession; speaking to the fact that the transactions that happened clearly were a transfer of possession of a tobacco product as defined in city ordinance, did occur, which would require license, and no license was present on 3 separate occasions that city staff went in to purchase tobacco related items

Mr. Santi:

-(all documents are attached)
-he and his clients think that, respectfully, in this particular situation, the city has it wrong; criminal proceedings have been initiated; his clients are 2 young entrapneuers, who are trying to made a go of a business in the city
-Condemnation proceedings: the Notice made reference to the Zoning issue; there's no reference to the licensing issue; the licensing issue arises under the code, section 324; he does object to any consideration of the licensing issue
-under 65.535 zoning: his clients are not a tobacco product shop; it's a new technology; it confuses him and a lot of people
-this is a simple, rudimentary electronic device; it's a battery pack and also a vaporizer; it simply sends electrical current to any sort of liquid; this can be sold anywhere and does not require any licensing, whatsoever
-we also have e-juice: the juice that's placed into e-cigarettes and then turned into some sort of vapor; the question is, "Should that be banned, prohibited; does it meet the definition of tobacco product shop?" Simply, it does not; tobacco product shop is defined under section 65.535 (long, winding definition):
we are a retail establishment with the principal entrance door opening directly to the outside that is operating within one half mile of another product shop
-the 3rd prong: Do we sell loose tobacco, plants, herbs,,,,,cigars, cigarettes, pipes, other smoking devices for burning tobacco, related smoking accessories? "No" and in which the sale of other products is merely incidental - that's all we are selling - is other products (vaporizer)
-we are simply not a tobacco product shop; there is not a zoning issue
-the city wants to say, "Well, you applied for a variance from that zone, so, perhaps that's some sort of implicit admission that you needed a variance." It's a red herring because all that matters is that business is actually being conducted
-the city has brought nothing in here today to show that loose tobacco, plants, herbs, cigarette, pipes and other smoking devices for burning tobacco and related smoking accessories are being sold on the premises; they can't do that because they're not
-pointed out that the city told them that they needed to apply for a variance; maybe because of confusion of what was being sold; but the fact that they applied for a zoning variance and that it was denied is not why we're here today
-also pointed out that in their application for the zoning variance, page 5, they stated that Imperial Vapor will NEVER sell tobacco products.....
-these proceedings, the criminal proceedings would be appropriate if Imperial Vapor

were selling those products

-the fact that the city wants to say that they applied for this variance so they must think that they need a variance; he is saying that they never needed a variance; they knew they never needed a variance; the only reason they applied for one is because the city told them that they needed a variance (I wasn't involved at that juncture or I would have told them that they didn't need a variance)

-his clients actions then is consistent with their actions now, which is to not sell tobacco products

-he was not at the BZA mtg but he read the minutes; thought it was interesting that the city focused the debate on "Do we offer a variance to this business?", which technically, would then allow them to actually sell tobacco products, which they had no intention of doing because they are not a tobacco product shop

-from reading the BZA minutes, it seemed as though some people there sympathized with his clients saying it looks like what you're doing may not be selling tobacco and you promised that you wouldn't but we can't accept that promise because if we issue that variance, you could then, actually go ahead and sell tobacco and tobacco products and then there'd be shops in too close proximity selling tobacco

-that is the focus of this appeal because the Notice of Condemnation is only supposed to apply to the zoning issue; and what matters for a Condemnation that's occurring now, is what's taking place at the premise now; and that is not selling tobacco

-certainly a license would be required if tobacco were to be sold (section 324.01), which begs the question, "What is tobacco?"

-definition of tobacco: snorted, sniffed, ingested, granulated, etc.. ... but we're not selling any of those things

-the definition of tobacco winds down to a 2013 amendment, which says, tobacco includes electronic cigarettes containing or delivering nicotine..... something you can take and smoke; we don't sell that; Imperial Vapor does not sell that and the city has not shown that we sell that; thinks that the City Council chose that wording for a reason and that wording needs to be upheld and respected

-Imperial's business operations are completely lawful under the zoning and licensing ordinances; therefore, the Condemnation is not proper; and even though this action is supposed to be in abeyance, there is still a big, ugly Condemnation sign on the building and it should not be

Ms. Moermond:

-that sign can be removed until the City Council makes its decision on this matter
-whenever an appeal is filed, enforcement is stayed under the Legislative Code

Ms. Lane, Zoning Administrator, DSI:

-on Jul 27, 2015, Jacob Ernstein applied for a variance on behalf of Imperial Vapor, the lessee at the property at 841 Grand Avenue; the request was for a variance of the required half mile separation from another tobacco shop; the location is 1282 feet away instead of the required 2640 feet

-the Board of Zoning Appeals considered it on Aug 17 and they denied the variance request for 2 reasons: 1) there were no practical difficulties in finding a location that met the half mile separation; and 2) there wasn't anything unique to this particular property that would constitute a plight to the application

-there was considerable discussion from the board about the difference between different types of tobacco shops

-the resolution was sent Aug 18 denying the variance; there is a 10-day appeal period; the applicant did not file an appeal within that 10-day period, so the BZA's decision was finalized

-when they originally came in, they were inquiring about a tobacco license; our Zoning staff said, if it's a tobacco license; it's a tobacco shop and it has to meet this half mile separation from an existing tobacco shop

-the license ordinance was changed to amend the City Council's position that e-cigarettes should be considered the same as tobacco; the application came in as a tobacco shop and we processed it as such and the BZA made a decision on that

Mr. Santi:

-asked what the city's point is in raising all of that; we applied for a variance and we did not receive one; how does that.....

Ms. Moermond:

-explained that it was procedural

Santi:

-clarified the fact that the variance was applied for and denied, he believes, is completely irrelevant to our proceedings here today; there's been a Notice of Condemnation; it's based on a violation of an ordinance saying that if you are a tobacco product shop, you cannot be a certain distance from another tobacco shop; the question is, "Is that occurring?" Our answer to that is, "No; because we're not a tobacco product shop."

A Short Recess was Taken per Ms. Moermond

Hearing Reconvened at 12:05 pm

Ms. Moermond:

*-you are right about a few things; I should not be looking at licensing at all
-the definition that's used in the Zoning Code is very similar; she does believe that this business qualifies as a tobacco products' shop; "a retail establishment with a principal entrance door opening directly to the outside that derives more than 90% of its gross revenue from the sale of loose tobacco, plants, herbs, cigars, cigarettes, pipes and other smoking devices for burning tobacco and related smoking accessories in which the sale of products is merely incidental"*

-the finding about whether or not this meets the definition in the Zoning Code and therefore, is subject to enforcement based on the Zoning Code - that finding belongs to the BZA; and the appropriate place to appeal a decision of the BZA is the City Council; the time has come and gone to appeal that decision and she can't take into account what your client did or didn't know about why to appeal; and whose advice to take,, and.... there was a finding that did meet the definition; that's the way the board voted; it was a 5-2 vote although there was conversation questioning no appeal; it makes sense, therefore, that there would be enforcement based on that determination

-it will be in front of the City Council; you'll get there; you'll be there on enforcement on that determination

-enforcement under Chapters 34 and 40 of the Zoning violation

-for the record, the distance we're talking about - you are less than half the distance that's required under the code

-will recommend this to be on the City Council agenda for Feb 3, 2016; she won't be staffing that meeting; the Councilmember may ask that it be re-scheduled to Feb 17, 2016; she would respect that; will let you know by letter

-the Council will be making the decision in a quasi-judicial capacity; and therefore, an appeal after that would be to Appeals Court

-there's no need for the placards on the building

-this will be in the form of a resolution that goes before the Council; you will get a letter confirming my recommendation; the resolution will be done no later than next Wed (draft resolution)

Deny the appeal and grant until February 22, 2016.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations**1:30 p.m. Hearings****Fire Certificates of Occupancy**

- 25 [RLH FCO](#)
[15-337](#) Appeal of Jennifer Patraw to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy
Correction Notice at 776 DESOTO STREET.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Jeffrey DeLisle, owner, Jennifer Patraw, secretary, and Frank Minship, tenant, appeared.

Fire Inspector A.J. Neis:

*-photos were added to this file; inspection done by Inspector Mitch Imbertson
-update: appealed was the driveway-pkg area; ground cover; a lot of exterior issues that need to be addressed; the shed was ordered removed/repaid; (Mr. Minship removed it)
-they are asking for additional time to get the work done*

Ms. Moermond:

-looks like we're talking about a building that you say isn't a building because it has 3 walls, not 4

Mr. DeLisle:

*-one building has 3 walls with a roof
-the main building has 2 garage doors (concrete bldg with a bathroom in the basement; electrical power, furnace, about 2000 sq.ft.)
-the property is fenced in with an 8-ft fence; it's kept locked*

Ms. Moermond:

-we were also talking about running a business out of it (Mr. DeLisle indicated that Mr. Minship does not run a business here; he uses it for storage, so, it makes perfect sense to keep the utilities off); there was some discussion about whether or not this was an illegal use of the property; you were invited to apply for a change in use at the Planning Commission to be able to do what you're doing; this is zoned I-1 Industrial; the question is, "Can it be used for recycling;" you'd need a permit to do that; talked about what constitutes recycling; recycling vs storage vs scraping vs

Mr. Minship:

-he is storing

Mr. DeLisle:

*-they had an electrician come in and do what was necessary
-they want to get the furnace tested*

Mr. Minship:

*-the utilities have been turned on; electrician can in
-they have a small 10-gal electric water heater, too
-he has been a tenant here 8-9 years*

Mr. DeLisle:

-hopefully, they can get the utilities turned off again

-don't want the water to freeze; their main issue
-the bathroom is not used

Mr. Neis:

-2012: there was a complaint that there was an illegal business running without a license going on here (from licensing and from zoning but it was closed out and resolved)

Mr. DeLisle:

-in 2009, they had to foreclose on a person; it was just a big junk yard; the county called me trying to find out if there was mercury still there; the lot was cleaned up and there have been 3 inspections (once every other year since then); only a couple items that needed to be addressed

-for this last inspection, he wanted all this stuff done

Ms. Moermond:

-basically, you want to continue to use this for storage and want to turn off the utilities

Mr. Neis:

-if it's going to be strictly used for cold storage, they wouldn't be opposed to having the utilities completely shut off at the building; if there are plumbing fixtures, however, they need to be properly capped and sealed to prevent any other issues (pull toilet; cap sewer line)

Mr. Moermond:

-make sure you properly cap the sewer line (Mr. Neis: you can buy a proper plumbing cap for about \$5-\$6 at the store)

-use for cold storage only; the utilities can stay off

Grant the appeal provided Mr. Minship is only using the building for cold storage. Plumbing fixtures need to be properly capped and sealed and power turned off.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

26 [RLH FCO
15-344](#)

Appeal of Jeff & Judy Otto to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 391 TOPPING STREET.

Sponsors: Thao

Jeffrey Otto, Otto Investments LLC, owner, and Drew Engleman appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

-we were going to do an assessment of a couple of things since the last time we talked

-her understanding is that you had a chance to talk with the Director the Dept of Safety and Inspections (made phone calls and spoke with a number of people there)

Mr. Otto:

-we've corrected everything except for the roof and the pallet stacking

-he is requesting more time; he doesn't have the money to do all the things that are necessary to get this all done

-information he provided was scanned into the record

-is waiting for Summit Company to call him back regarding a meeting with them (water pressure text)

-would like to talk to his Councilmember Thao but was told that he could not regarding sale tax money to give back to businesses for things like this; he was told to wait until this hearing was over

Mr. Neis:

-the water pressure test hasn't happened because of the weather; should be above 32 degrees, if possible

Ms. Moermond:

-there are 2 kinds of sale tax monies: 1) STAR, annual grant cycle; and 2) monies available thru the Ward Office

Mr. Engleman:

-they are trying to explore all options/avenues to find money for this work (Mr. Otto: Mr. Cervantes said that he was exploring other avenues of financing for them, too; so, he's asking for more time)

-asked if they could self-install the sprinkler system

Mr. Neis:

-the Fire Code specifically, prohibits that; there's a lot of engineering, designing, calculation, etc.

-you would need to supply plans to our office from your contractor and we would review those plans; your sprinkler contractor pulls a permit and they submit the plans to our office as documentation and we review them to make sure that it's adequate for the building; then, we'd issue the permit upon approval

-maybe the confusing part is that we do the flow test before those plans come in to make sure that there's adequate water in the area

Mr. Otto:

-he is stressed; his business is at stake, here

-in the past, what's been required - he's been told by Summit and SPRWS that he's required by the Fire Marshal to put in a 'volume impression' that they have never had to install in St. Paul; that's it's excessive and beyond what they've ever had to do before; when we've examined this in the past, the water pressure and line has not been in the street; so, when he talked with Mr. Cervantes, he said, OK, put in an official request to get a test done and DSI will be there at the same time the water dept comes out; he said that the water dept has gone thru a lot of gyrations and they can't even get information from the water dept about previous things that have gone on before

-he is just trying to move to a solution

Mr. Neis:

-the good news is (he was in a meeting with Mr. Cervantes last week re this property) that either 2000 or 2010, unbeknownst to us previously, is that the water lines were upgraded in area

Mr. Otto:

-no one has dug up our street; if they had dug up the street, we would've known about it

Mr. Neis:

-he was in Mr. Cervantes office talking with Water; they said that they can come on either side and they were upgraded (thinks it was 2010 and was new to us)

Mr. Otto:

-but I talked with him subsequent to that conversation; (Mr. Engleman: our understanding is that to upgrade these lines, they'd have to come and tear up the whole street and they haven't done that)

Mr. Neis:

-he is going from the information from Water

Mr. Otto:

-Mr. Cervantes said, "I'm sure that Water is giving me accurate information based on what we're specifically talking about"

-I need the Fire inspector to say, "This is the amount of pressure you want because I have to tell that to Summit when they come out - this is what is going to be required"

-roof: weather is an issue; once the weather improves, we want to get up there and patch the roof; over the years, they've spent several hundred thousand dollars on that building - majority of which has been on the roof; there are only 2 places left with leaks; Peterson Bros Roofing comes over regularly; weather and finances are the issues; we need time to explore finance opportunities

-wants to talk to Commissioner Rettman about that; last time, Councilmember Helgen told him that there was grant money and other monies available and that's why he'd like to talk to Councilmember Thao; he will also sit down with Kerry Antrim

Ms. Moermond:

-without talking with Mr. Thao, you can talk with Planning & Economic Dev (PED); STAR money, administered thru PED; contact person Michele Swanson, 266-6574

-is happy to give some time

-her concern is between now and when a decision is made, how high can those piles be? The Orders say that piles went as high as 16 feet, which is a good 6 feet above the requirement for maximum height; that has to come down

Mr. Engleman:

-if they were able to find some money to put in a sprinkler system, then, what becomes.....

Mr. Neis:

-again, it depends on the exact flow there is; the fire code treats pallets similarly to flammable liquid because they are so dangerous; the code would allow them up to 30 feet high for pallets with the proper sprinkler system with the proper water pressure/level; each system varies based on the density of the droppage that the head can handle; your contractor's input would be necessary to make a determination

Mr. Otto:

-can we store those pallets outdoors?

-how can we comply in the meantime?

Mr. Neis:

-there are issues on the fire code for the lot lines; it has to be zoned for outdoor storage; there are regulations

-will get back to Mr. Otto on this

Ms. Moermond:

-is you'd put in a sprinkler system, your contractor would pull a permit; that permit would be approved and, for the future, you will always be governed by the code that is valid today, in 2016, provided you maintain the sprinkler system

Mr. Neis:

-technology changes things over time; the 12-foot height is the rule for standard height on a sprinklered building; anything over 12 feet falls into a "high pile" storage classification, an ESR system (Early Suppression Fast Response); probably not available when Mr. Otto inquired years back

Mr. Otto:

-he has never been told that, not even 3 years ago; if he had been told that, they would have a sprinkler system; no one ever from Fire has ever indicated anything over a 12-foot height; since he's talked with Mr. Cervantes, he is finally getting some new information

Ms. Moermond:

-there are a lot of moving parts here, including the water pressure, volume issue
-understands his frustration; wants to give time to sort this out; wants to figure out what an appropriate height will be between now and when whenever
-thinks this will all take more than 90 days to pull together
-thinks he had a very good idea about exterior storage in the meantime

Mr. Neis:

-as a fire fighter himself and as an inspector, this building is set up in it's current configuration to kill fire fighters; it's extremely dangerous
-pallet storage is similar to a flammable liquid; once they get going, they have just the right amount of fuel and oxygen to burn very fast
-previous inspection records indicate that pallets have been out of compliance for each inspection since 1991; it's a volatile situation

Mr. Otto:

-he needs some kind of assistance to solve this problem; they don't want to see anyone injured; the issue is time and money
-he wants his building sprinkled

Ms. Moermond:

-pallets currently are stored very high and tight in excess of what's allowed
-we'll go with a phased-in decrease in height over time
-the City Council Public Hearing will be Feb 17, 2016; you'll get a letter
-her plan is:
March 1 - reduce to 14 ft high;
April 1 - reduce to 12 ft high;
May 1 - reduce to 10 ft high;
July 15 - the pallets may be stored in rows of two but there must be a separation between rows of 6 ft.
-hopefully, you'll be on your way to solving this by that point; if not, we'll need to talk about
-stacked lumber between the rows will not be allowed; would be a very dangerous situation; exterior storage is a much different situation under fire
-talk to someone who does site plan review in DSI; draw a diagram the lot and how you'd like the outdoor storage to look; ask them if this is acceptable storage; she doesn't think that he needs to apply for a site plan review; if they say it's not OK to store this way outside, then, you file an application that can be appealed later; basically, touch base with them and get advice
-she will call Mr. Cervantes and tell him what she is recommending; she will suggest that he or his staff reach out for a discussion
-thinks that you would benefit greatly with a sit down with site plan review and zoning; they may know something about you having a temporary structure
-contact Jonathan Sage-Martinson, Director, PED through Laura Eckert, 266-6633; Michele Swanson for STAR money

Deny appeal on the height of the pallets and grant the following extensions:

March 1 - reduce to 14 ft high;

April 1 – reduce to 12 ft high;
May 1 – reduce to 10 ft high;
July 1 – the pallets may be stored in rows of two but there must be a separation between rows of 6 ft.

If there is any additional information before the public hearing, Ms. Moermond may adjust deadlines accordingly.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

27 [RLH FCO
15-343](#)

Appeal of Susan Dunlop to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 631 SNELLING AVENUE SOUTH.

Sponsors: Tolbert

Susan Dunlop and Joanne E. Schmitt, owners, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

*-she read their menu; sounds delicious
-looking thru their proposed plan and procedures about what's heated in the pizza oven and how you prepare your foods, there were only a couple of items that gave her pause regarding grease laden vapors
-also looked at the safety measures you put into place to mitigate risk
-if you continue to have the same cleaning schedule and do the hood every 6 months, you can continue to do that
-will recommend granting the appeal to continue using the pizza oven, if you continue your cleaning schedule (once a week) and hood cleaning schedule in place (attached procedures)
-if all is going well in 2 years, we can look at a permanent variance*

Grant the appeal for owner to continue using the kitchen as is, provided owner uses the current menu items and have professional cleaning as stated in her plan. This can be visited again in 2 years.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/17/2016

28 [RLH FCO 16-14](#)

Appeal of Charles McCarty to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 1734 SEVENTH STREET EAST.

Sponsors: Prince

Charles McCarty, owner, appeared.

Ms. Moermond:

*-your concerns:
-you appealed the Revocation because you didn't receive due process; you didn't receive correction orders in a timely manner, which is against the law; you were told that your Certificate of Occupancy was not Revoked and the building was to be taken off the VB list; St. Paul Fire is illegally targeting you because they are biased; and you wanted more time
-the fact that you can appeal these orders is due process*

Fire Inspector A. J. Neis:

*-Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice issued by Inspector Brian Smith
-there were multiple code violations identified; and there were multiple attempts to gain access
-this started in Nov 2015 with the Revocation Notice; went out again Nov 17, 2015;*

another went out Dec 3, 2015; and Jan 6, 2016
-started originally because of a complaint sent to their office for a missing hardwired smoke detector, no CO detector, heat wasn't working, no trash service, garage was full of debris; orders were issued after that initial inspection for repairs to be made
-long history of a lot of complaints and lack of maintenance
-the file includes pages and pages of complaints since 2009; in 2011 the city had to provide trash service for several weeks; vehicles parked in back yard; people scrapping; tall grass & weeds, etc.

Ms. Moermond:

-went back to the Nov 5, 2015 orders: #2 front concrete steps cracked & damaged
-garage has chipping, peeling paint, panels broken, holes in main garage door, side entry door damaged, hardware missing - also on Nov 5 list
-access to garage was denied; work being done without a permit for patio door and new wall (Mr. Neis: does not see a permit)

Mr. Neis:

-Nov 5 list: Fire official has made several attempts to contact the owner of this property; he has hung up on the phone and will not return his calls - no response from owner; the tenant fixed the problem of the CO detector
-does not have fuel burning equipment text nor the smoke detector affidavit

Ms. Moermond:

-you are appealing the Revocation, item #8 on Jan 6 Orders

Mr. McCarty:

-the first person to mention anything about damages was me; I evicted the tenant (went over this last time)
-the allegation that I hung up on a fire official is false; Ms. Shaff admitted to me that they had sent out the original orders 2 weeks late; she acknowledged that on the record; there was a death in the family
-looking back, why was it automatically Revoked on the original Nov 5 Order?

Ms. Moermond:

-we dealt with that and the decision of that hearing - she recommended to the Council that they not Revoke your C of O if you completed the items by Dec 21, 2015, which is the deadline that you had asked for

Mr. McCarty:

-and both you and Ms. Shaff talked about the weather related issue - you can paint in the winter or do concrete work - it's too cold

Ms. Moermond:

-yes; let's take the weather dependent items off the list
-she'd like to know why the rest of the items weren't done when you asked for the Dec 21 deadline

Mr. McCarty:

-he has a picture of the garage - the doors are intact and the locks are intact
-the interior of the garage is personal storage; the garage is homesteaded; the tenants don't have access to it; it's not in the lease
-now, he has different tenants
-he screwed his garage shut; I had offered the inspector access the last time he was there and he said he didn't need to see it; it's fine
-the lack of garbage service is false; the previous tenant said that because I was evicting them

-there's no power inside the garage
-the wall that I erected (Nov order); patio door was completely broken and he had to make an emergency repair so, he boarded it up, insulated it, painted it, sheet rocked inside and painted it (pictures)
-he tried to get a smoke detector affidavit off line but he couldn't; he can fill one out right now
-the building's been inspected by Section 8
-#7- CO detector; apparently there's an issue with my securing the cover so people can't remove batteries

Mr. Neis:

-once you screwed the CO cover; you've ruined it; you need a new one

Mr. McCarty:

-he called the manufacturer and asked if he could put a cover and they said, "Yes, there's no circuitry there." (picture)

Ms. Moermond:

-the Fire Code says that's an issue

Mr. McCarty:

-I got an Orsat Test; provided a copy to Mr. Neis; Mr. Neis said it was Good (was done Jan 14, 2016); he had a rough time with the original contractor
-Fire wants to Revoke my C of O and kick out a single mother in the middle of winter; the only issues with the house are some minor deteriorating concrete steps, a CO cover; and the lack of a permit

Ms. Moermond:

-we have the problem with the garage; the garage does not get completely written up because of what's stored in it; the building needs to be secure and anything that's visible from the outside is counted; and the electrical service or lack there-off, if it's called out - just because you're using it for personal storage doesn't mean that it isn't a code violation that can be called on it
-the garage door seemed to be somewhat off its track and it did need to be repaired; I'm not going to revisit that
-sees broken siding and that's not weather dependent; you can do the painting inside; they are shakes

Mr. McCarty:

-he was the one who brought up all the damages; he evicted his tenant solely because of all the damages and now, they want to pull my C of O

Ms. Moermond:

-is frustrated herself because we've been down this road before; the decision was that you would come into compliance by Dec 21.. with the other items that are not weather dependent so.. in early Jan, they wrote a Revocation for noncompliance, which makes sense to me

Mr. Neis:

-using a drill to secure - is not approved locking hardware; the code specifically says that the door has to be maintained in a professional state of maintenance and repair; using brackets for an emergency type of situation is completely understandable but the proper way to do that would have been to put on appropriate locking hardware

Mr. McCarty:

-he screwed it shut because he didn't have a key; the garage side door is not

damaged and the locking hardware is not missing; the dead bolt is still there
 -this wasn't an issue in my mind at the last hearing
 -that was written up Nov 5; show me the pictures; the hardware is not missing

Ms. Moermond:

-the Revocation is based on your not being in compliance by Dec 21, 2015 except for the weather dependent items
 -the Orsat Test was completed Jan 14, 2016; (Mr. Neis called Hinding to verify); Mr. McCarty was having trouble with the original heating contractor who did the test in mid-Dec; they said that they were going to FAX a copy and they never did and when he went down to their office, they said that they couldn't find it
 -stuff in garage: if it's your personal home, the inspectors can go back in to check and they can write orders on it; to re-check it, they have the authority to get an administrative search warrant (Mr. Marty: they didn't need a search warrant; I asked if he wanted to go in and he didn't want to go in)

Mr. McCarty:

-he rented to new people in Dec 2015

Ms. Moermond:

-the stuff in the garage needs to be stored in an orderly fashion with no excessive accumulation of materials
 -she wants Ms. Shaff to do an inspection in the next week
 -wants Mr. McCarty to pull a building permit for the garage door; wants to know how extensive that damage is; the locking mechanism for the door and let the inspector take a look at it; we need to know that's acceptable
 -the panels on the house and garage need to be replaced; the painting of those can be done on the inside

Mr. McCarty:

-the garage has full sheets of plywood; where am I supposed to paint those?

Ms. Moermond:

-Ms. Shaff will take a look at that; she can pick a day & time and contact Mr. McCarty
 -I can live with the garage door; so, let's just see what you've got going on
 -LAYOVER to next week LH, Jan 26, 2016

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/26/2016

2:30 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 29** **RLH VBR
15-106** Appeal of Ian Houmas, Adonis Eco Housing, to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Fee Requirement at 1036 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Bostrom

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/26/2016
- 30** [RLH VBR 16-3](#) Appeal of Kaojia Vang to a Vacant Building Registration Renewal Notice at 286 STINSON STREET.

Sponsors: Thao

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/26/2016