



# 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, May 22, 2018

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House

---

#### 9:00 a.m. Hearings

##### Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 [RLH RR 18-19](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 664 CASE AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the June 6, 2018, City Council Public Hearing.

**Sponsors:** Bostrom

*Remove the building within 15 days. No one appeared. There are no minutes.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2018**

- 2 [RLH RR 17-19](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 412 GOODRICH AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the July 19, 2017 City Council public hearing.

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Aaron Rubenstein & Elyse Jensen, Historic Saint Paul Corporation, owner, & Naomi Austin, appeared.*

*Ms. Moermond: looking at the Work Plan from Mar, you anticipated that you'd be closing on your construction loan in May; and there's an application for a permit to work on the envelope of the building; I recommended that the dept issue that permit*

*Mr. Rubenstein: we are not closing on the construction loan this month; we needed to spend some time evaluating the condition of the foundation & establish electrical service on the property; we discovered that the foundation of the original building needs to be replaced; so, we it took some time to sort that out & we had to put our fundraising on hold during that time because we didn't know how much we needed to raise; we did have a fundraiser scheduled with major donors that we had to put off but we're continuing ahead with the project; we have continued to raise money; we've raised a total of \$20,000; we need to raise another \$58,000; we do have a signed agreement with a contractor, Pelco Construction, the primary contractor; a secondary contractor will do the finishing work; we're hoping to start construction in early fall & close on the financing... ; we realize that our 180-day clock is ticking & we're doing all we can to move the project along; frankly, we didn't know if the project was going to be viable*

*given the uncertainty about the foundation; we are cautiously optimistic*

*Ms. Moermond: when do you think you'll close on the loan?*

*Mr. Rubenstein: I can't give a specific date; we just don't know*

*Ms. Moermond: asked for a revised proposed time table & a contingency plan*

*Mr. Rubenstein: entered a revised Work Plan*

*Ms. Jensen: we're trying to work with Don Peltier & Fred ..... interior; still have broad neighborhood support; Carol Carey is doing direct asks to our major donors; we're going to have another broad community fundraiser on Jun 21, 2018 at Bad Weather Brewing again; the last one raised \$13,000; we also had a number of private donors, who will host events*

*-our contingency plan - we had a board meeting last night & if we're not at a place that we need to be by this fall, that we would seriously consider demoing the property*

*Steve Magner, Code Enforcement Manager: I have some questions: your proposal shows \$78,400 for shoring material/labor; is that dollar amount what they're estimating would stabilize the property so that they could take the foundation down underneath it? are they going to jack the house up, take the foundation down, build a new foundation & set the house back on it; so, from the first bullet points down to block, those are all taking about a foundation issue that wasn't originally part of the scope*

*-if you get down to the 7th bullet point, \$12,100 for the block - is that getting you into that \$25,000 because it seems like a little bit bigger than that or*

*Mr. Rubenstein: yes; and the additional cost is \$25,000 - \$30,000 but the project involves demolishing the rear part of the house & rebuilding that; so, there would be some foundation costs for that part*

*Mr. Magner: when I see the term "exclusions," I start to wonder; these are things that are not in here that we might need to do*

*Mr. Rubenstein: those are included in the scope of work for the secondary contractor*

*Mr. Magner: so the \$197,050 does not include the secondary contractor*

*Mr. Rubenstein: that's right; this proposal is from Jan for \$37,000; I think you have a copy*

*Mr. Magner: is there any overlap between these two?*

*Mr. Rubenstein: No; right now contractor 2's cost is down to about \$28,000 (not revised)*

*Mr. Magner: we're at \$218,000-\$219,000 - OK*

*Ms. Jensen: some of the items from the exclusions are being donated (left over doors/trim, etc.)*

*Ms. Moermond: I have the May work plan; you can keep that; we'll scan those both into the record*

*Mr. Magner: I'm kind of worried about the time frame dragging out; ultimately, if the asset is something that you want to save & the numbers don't work out on that, I think you have another option than razing the structure - so, I think you'd want to consider that; if you believe that the rear of the structure doesn't really have any historic significance, the option would be to talk to a vendor about removing just the front house & storing it some place*

*Ms. Moermond: what we're looking for are alternate paths between total rehab & demolition & moving the house is on the list of an alternate of abating the nuisance condition; I would be willing to entertain the stabilization of the structure, mainly looking at the foundation & making sure the roof & other parts of the bldg weren't likely to lead to further deterioration*

*Mr. Rubenstein: this bldg is not in imminent danger of collapsing; the bldg doesn't need to be stabilized now*

*Ms. Austin: our attempt is to try to get it on the state register & the local register; it seems as though time's been wasted but it really hasn't; we've been trying to find alternative ways of doing this*

*Ms. Jensen: we've not gotten to the point yet where we're talking about alternatives other than worse case scenario - we're confident from a financial standpoint as an organization that the project is either going to be viable & move forward or worse case scenario, we're still going to come out fine*

*Ms. Moermond: when is your decision point on this, do you think?*

*Ms. Jensen: we haven't set an exact date; by Nov, we might apply for money (1-1 match)*

*Ms. Moermond: I need to see more progress than that; you said that you were going to close this month & you're not*

*Mr. Rubenstein: the application is due in Jun & we'd find out in Nov -the permit we were applying for was to remove the vinyl siding & the trim*

*Mr. Magner: is the project not cost feasible if you only do the original part; do you have to have the additional square footage to make it a sellable product?*

*Mr. Rubenstein: yes; the original part is a little over 800 sq.ft; the rear is probably less than half of that*

*Ms. Moermond: can you work up the numbers to move the house?*

*Mr. Rubenstein: yes*

*Ms. Moermond: we'll talk after your next board meeting; will Lay Over to Jun 26 LH*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 6/26/2018**

**3**      [RLH RR 18-3](#)

Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 735 MARGARET STREET within fifteen (15) days after the February 14, 2018, City Council public hearing. (Public hearing continued from February 14)

**Sponsors:** Prince

*Ms. Kris Kujala & Mr. Paul Scharf, Ramsey County Property Records & Revenue, appeared.*

*Ms. Moermond: our records show that 735 Margaret St forfeited to the State of MN for nonpayment of taxes; there was an Application for Repurchase of the property that was made & reviewed by the City Council; a recommendation was made by the Council to Ramsey County; the county opted to allow for Repurchase if it happened within 60-days & it was going to be sold a rehabilitation to an approved buyer with an approved plan; that didn't happen so, it's back in the hands of the county as the administrator of the property; last week, Steve Manger & I went to the property with Ms. Kujala, Mr. Sharf, Mr. Samuel & Ms. Denise Begvidere from the county manager's office; we looked at plans that had been developed by Ramsey County & we discussed the range of options that were under consideration; this property exists in an historic district; so, there are special requirements for exterior work, which does complicate the process; your decision making process at the county includes that your plans require a review by your 4-R Committee before it would be green-lighted for you to proceed*

*Ms. Kujala: all the facts that you presented are correct; after our on site meeting, we now need to meet with our 4-R panel, including additional members within the county who make decisions on any property that might enter the 4-R Program; one of the paths that this property could take is putting it into the 4-R Program & doing a full renovation on the property; that meeting is scheduled for next week Tue for a review & discussion with the entire panel*

*Ms. Moermond: so, I'm quite comfortable doing a Lay Over to allow for that conversation so that we have better information on how the county wants to proceed*

*Ms. Kujala: I can't be confident that we'll come out of that meeting with a firm decision; this panel meets as needed*

*Ms. Moermond: so, there may/may not be additional questions before the panel is comfortable making a decision*

*Ms. Kujala: the panel is comprised of tax forfeited land staff; Mr. Samuel, the director of the Dept; Community & Economic Development Staff within the County Manager's Office; Mary Lou Eagan; the Deputy County Manager for each of the two groups; our deputy county manager is new; her name is Karen Van Vaughn, she came on board 2 weeks ago; the other deputy county manager's name is Johanna Berg*

*Ms. Moermond: I consulted with Councilmember Prince & I said on the site visit that of the options available, it was the preference of the City that the 4-R Program pursue the renovation*

*-in reviewing your plan, it was possible that there be an opportunity for closing the envelope on the outside of the bldg prior to a vote by the Council to order the rehabilitation or razing & removal within 180 days; & we talked exclusively about how, if you reach the 50% mark at 180 days, that it is a matter of course that there would be an extension on time for another 180 days; & that time period would be consistent with the one that you've proposed in this plan; in fact, it would provide a couple month's buffer*

*-will Lay this Over to Jun 26, LH*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 6/26/2018**

- 4      **RLH RR 18-22**      Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 830 UNIVERSITY AVENUE WEST within fifteen (15) days after the June 20, 2018, City Council public hearing. (Amend to remove to repair within 180 days)

Sponsors:            Thao

*Craig Watson, Executor of the estate & Bruce Nelson, Bridge Realty, working with the buyer with whom they have a Purchase Agreement, appeared.*

*Steve Magner, Code Enforcement Manager:*

- The building is a two-story, wood frame, duplex on a lot of 4,792 square feet. According to our files, it has been a vacant building since September 30, 2015.*
- The current property owner is Albert Harris (deceased) per AMANDA and Ramsey County Property records.*
- On March 8, 2018 an inspection of the building was conducted, a list of deficiencies which constitute a nuisance condition was developed and photographs were taken. An ORDER TO ABATE A NUISANCE BUILDING was posted on March 14, 2018 with a compliance date of April 13, 2018. As of this date, the property remains in a condition which comprises a nuisance as defined by the legislative code.*
- Taxation has placed an estimated market value of \$20,000 on the land and \$155,600 on the building.*
- Real estate taxes are current.*
- The Vacant Building registration fees were paid by assessment on October 31, 2017.*
- A Code Compliance Inspection was applied for on May 8, 2018 but has not yet been completed.*
- As of May 21, 2018, the \$5,000 performance deposit has not been posted.*
- There have been fourteen (14) SUMMARY ABATEMENT NOTICES since 2015.*
- There have been fifteen (15) WORK ORDERS issued for:*
  - Garbage/rubbish; Boarding/securing; Grass/weeds; Snow/ice; Graffiti*
- Code Enforcement Officers estimate the cost to repair this structure exceeds \$50,000. The estimated cost to demolish exceeds \$20,000.*
- city did garbage/rubbish on Apr 19, 2018*
- good spread of activity: boarding Order in Mar 2018; snow/ice WO in Feb & Mar 2018; garbage in Jan 2018; graffiti in Jan 2018; garbage in Aug 2017*
- the mechanical inspector went out there but was not able to enter because the door was nailed shut; the inspectors need access available*

*Mr. Nelson: the inspectors can go back in; we do have a hasp & hinges on the plywood now*

*Mr. Magner: so, if you solved that, I'd request that right after this meeting, someone contact Mr. Seeger so that he can notify the rest of his team that they can use the lock box*

*Ms. Moermond: what's the plan?*

*Mr. Watson: the plan is to sell it; I've been trying to sell it for a while now; my first letter & contact with the city was just recently; Mr. Harris passed in 2015-16*

*Ms. Moermond: but this hasn't yet completed the probate process so, it continues to be in the wrong person's name; why is that?*

*Mr. Harris: I don't know & even the lawyer, who represents the state didn't know why*

*Ms. Moermond: how can you sell it if it's not in your name? I often see "The Estate of so & so " in these cases but I'm not seeing that here; it's still specifically in his name; so, your ability to take action on it is limited*

*Mr. Nelson: I'm not sure about the legal aspect but the Purchase Agreement is written for the "Estate of Albert Harris" with Craig Watson as the Executor*

*Ms. Moermond: do you understand that under city code, you can't transfer this property to a private individual because it's a Category 3 Registered Vacant Building?*

*Mr. Harris: we heard about that after the fact; I was notified in Feb-Mar 2018 that it was a Category 3 VB; before that I had no contact with the city; in fact, the lady called me at work*

*Ms. Moermond: it sounds like you hadn't found your way over to take care of the property; I'm seeing & I heard that there's a lot of Work Orders of the city taking responsibility for mowing the lawn, shoveling snow, boarding the building, etc.... that's a problem*

*Mr. Harris: I paid to have the grass cut; I paid the city one time*

*Ms. Moermond: I've got 15 Work Orders issued since 2015; that tells me that you weren't taking responsibility for taking care of the property as the property's executor - where the city has to tell you & then go ahead & do the work*

*Mr. Harris: the city never notified me of anything but once*

*Ms. Moermond: it's still in the deceased's name & you didn't change the contact information  
-we have a very nasty nuisance building & you did a Purchase Agreement that you are not allowed to do with a Cat 3 VB; what date did you do it?*

*Mr. Nelson: the Purchase Agreement was written on Apr 13, 2018*

*Ms. Moermond: you wrote the PA after the city declared this a nuisance bldg*

*Mr. Magner: the Order to Abate went out on Mar 14, 2018; it was to be in compliance by Apr 13, 2018; the building was placarded; we did a title search because no one came forward to register it as a VB; the city did as much as it could to notify the parties involved*

*Mr. Nelson: Paramount Investment Group, a licensed residential contractor, is the buyer; they have done 104 rehab properties in the metro within the last 3 years; I have a list of them*

*Ms. Moermond: under city code, you can transfer this property to a community development corporation, to Habitat for Humanity, the Housing & Redevelopment Authority - all are partners with the Housing & Redevelopment Authority but once you get to this point with the property, you have a very limited pool of purchasers/recipients of the property; if it had been transacted prior to the declaration of a nuisance building, the requirements would have been to have a code compliance inspection report in order to sell it; you, as a realtor should have been aware that you couldn't even enter into a Purchase Agreement without having a code compliance inspection report on a*

registered vacant building; so, I'm really surprised that the application for the inspection wasn't even made until May 8, 2018 when you did your PA on Apr 13, 2018; so, you were signing this without having that in hand contrary to city code; there seems to be absolutely no regard for the city, the neighbors; you're not taking care of the property; the city is putting up with a nuisance on a major thoroughfare; you're not getting the inspection reports that you're required to; the property wasn't registered, as required with you as the contact person or you would have been receiving Notices

Mr. Magner: so at this point of the venture, another option would be to have this 3rd party enter into an agreement to rehabilitate the property & once it's rehabilitated & a code compliance certificate is issued, they could transfer title & sell it to a fourth party or whatever they want to do

Mr. Nelson: we actually did have a conversation where Craig could hire Paramount Investment Group to do the rehab to get it up to that point - code compliance, then transfer it; then sell it

Mr. Magner: basically, you're just entering into a contract to do that

Ms. Moermond: all of this is subject to approval (contract, financing, rehab plan, etc.); I'm really uncomfortable with the title situation & would want to have an attorney representing you to make sure - the title work says to us that it is owned by Albert Harris & it is not Albert Harris; it is the Estate of Albert Harris for which you are a representative; so I would like to have very specific documentation that you are able to conduct this transaction on behalf of the Estate of Mr. Harris; so, can you even do this? #1; #2, if these folks are going to buy it & do the rehab & are willing to enter into a contract with you, the Purchase Agreement won't be considered that contract; what we need is a contract that says that they will do the rehabilitation; they will take full financial responsibility; they will put their money on the line; they will show me work plans; they will show me that they have the capacity to do all of this & the title won't transfer until a code compliance certificate is issued

-it should go without saying that the city should not have to issue an Order to maintain this property from this point forward (I have you under a microscope)

-let's get a hearing where your purchaser can be present (Jun 12, 2018)

-get the door fixed; get a lockbox with the combination supplied to the inspection group (Jim Seeger) so that we can have an inspection to talk about

-at the LH on Jun 12, I think it's fair that the purchaser will be able to demonstrate that they have at least \$50,000 available to do the rehabilitation plan; that there be a \$5000 performance deposit posted; that the property be maintained; & perhaps we could have an initial Work Plan (sketch of their approach)

Mr. Magner: most imperative: advise Mr. Seeger today that he can get into the property to do the code compliance inspection; provide him with the lock box combination

Ms. Moermond: consult with an attorney about drafting this kind of agreement

Mr. Magner: where are we with probate or trust or whatever; where are we with the title to the property?

Mr. Watson: I thought that it went to the Estate of Alber Harris; all the bank accounts went to it; so, I'm not sure why the property didn't go

Mr. Magner: because the value of the property is over \$75,000 & it's real property; if

*you have real property, it has to be probated; even if you have a will, it still has to be probated*

*Mr. Watson: have you engaged an attorney to look at this, as the Executor?*

*Mr. Watson: I thought that's what he did so I'm going to have to call him to find out what he did - what he ended up with; (the lawyer for the estate, Peterson Law Firm, downtown)*

*Mr. Magner: go back to the lawyer & ask where the title is; the Ownership & Encumbrance Report lists the owner as Craig A. Watson; so, it has been transferred into his name*

*Ms. Moermond: OK; the listing here as the owner being Albert Harris is incorrect?*

*Mr. Magner: the original ownership came up as Albert Harris & still shows that today; Ramsey County Taxation says, c/o Craig Watson, Albert Harris; double check with your attorney to make sure that the title is ready to be moved along*

*Ms. Moermond: we will look for documentation of that*

*Continued to June 12. The following conditions must be met or provided in order to receive a grant of time:*

- 1) the \$5,000 performance deposit must be posted;*
- 2) provide lockbox combination to Inspector Jim Seeger as soon as possible;*
- 3) a detailed work plan or sworn construction statement, including timelines and bids, for completing the work, noting the work plan will be revised in accordance with the Code Compliance Inspection Report;*
- 4) documentation of financing of at least \$50,000 to execute the work plan;*
- 5) if the funds being used are not tied to the project, provide an affidavit that states the necessary funds will be set aside from other business or personal accounts; and*
- 6) the property must maintained.*

*If Craig Watson is proposing a 3rd party who will conduct rehabilitation of the property prior to transfer of title, all of the above conditions must be met. In addition, the contract between the 3rd party and Mr. Watson must be approved by the City.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 6/12/2018**

## 11:00 a.m. Hearings

### Correction Orders

- 5**     [RLH CO 18-16](#)     Appeal of Scott Rehovsky to a Correction Notice at 1171 RANKIN STREET.

**Sponsors:**     Tolbert

*Scott N. Rehovsky, owner appeared; also Shane Schaaf, designer, & Jamie Brown, builder*

*Supervisor Lisa Martin: I received a complaint in Apr 2018 regarding a possible tiny*



home placed on a vacant lot; upon inspection I issued Orders on Apr 27, 2018 regarding a storage container; when I spoke with Mr. Rehovsky, he mentioned that he is in the process of building a home on this property & wanted to keep that pod there; when I look at the STAMP activities, it looks like this has been going on for some time; a building permit was issued & withdrawn in Jun 2017; currently, we have something under review with the building official; waiting on the approved contractor & signed engineering plans, etc.

-photo shows a maintained property; grass has been cut; storage pod & a small dog house

Mr. Schaaf: it's been there fewer than 30 days

Mr. Brown: we are in the works - nearing final stages of architectural plans, I am the builder

Mr. Rehovsky: it will be my private residence

Ms. Moermond: what's inside the "black box"?

Mr. Schaaf: the black box on the property is a demonstration construction office; it's a non-permanent structure that we anticipated would stay there during the entire construction process; a place to keep our construction documents, to discuss plans, to make a very clean presence; we anticipate to keep the site very clean through the project

Ms. Moermond: it looks exactly like a cargo container to me

Mr. Schaaf: it is; from the outside it is designed to be secure

Mr. Brown: it is finished; I can show you a picture of the interior; the 2 containers have the center walls removed & they're compressed together with a gasket so that there's a sufficient amount of space; it has ventilation, a functional window; French doors out the back designed to open up; we have a stainless steel table in there for reviewing construction documents; photo will be entered into the record (scanned)

Ms. Moermond: email the photo

-looking at this, I see 2 problems: 1) the type of structure; it's a cargo container; the code clearly prohibits cargo containers; and 2) the construct of an accessory structure on an otherwise vacant lot (you have a secondary structure/use without a primary structure/use); having an office during the construction time period, having storage of materials on site, is, of course allowed; & managed by the building official & his staff; without the issuance of a building permit, you're not in the building process

Mr. Brown: if, in a reasonable amount of time, we applied for a site work permit.....

Ms. Moermond: if you received within a short period of time an actual permit to do the work would be, from my perspective .... because if you are simply in an application process, you are not in the construction process simultaneously

-it's the building official's call

-while this is an empty parcel, code enforcement will look at those 2 pieces

-the dog house?

Mr. Rehovsky: my brother, who lives by me got a puppy & I take the puppy over there when I go; I gave it a little place; I can get rid of the dog house

*Ms. Martin: the neighbor's are concerned that it is a finished interior container - that somebody is actually living in the container*

*Mr. Brown: which, I assure you, there is not*

*Ms. Moermond: things that the building official will look at: 1) whether there are manufacturer specs that say that this is a solution for storage of materials & an office space; 2) is this grounded as it would need to be, etc.*

*Mr. Brown: as a non-permanent structure? Where, in another venue it would represent like a construction trailer (?)*

*Ms. Moermond: if you're taking us into the realm of the temporary structure, that's into an area where we're talking about tents; for temporary structures, the city has a window of 6 months (that's our definition of temporary); so, then, it would have to be installed according to specs so that it's considered to be safe*

*Mr. Rehovsky: I plan to build my home there in Aug, 2018*

*Mr. Brown: our architect got pushed back a little bit; I think that he's been in contact with the city about the fact that this is in the pipeline; we expect to have full construction documents within the next 60 days, max, for presentation for someone in Plan Review; it is in the works, heavily*

*Mr. Schaaf: we anticipated early May in our initial construction documents; the timing of bringing the construction office from another site in Duluth & the availability of the crane & equipment - but it's been pushed back twice now so it's been extended for 2 months*

*Mr. Rehovsky: it's been a little bit complicated because my main architect is out of Brazil; so, I had to hire a local architect, who can translate into St. Paul languages from Brazil languages (from Portuguese, metric, their building code, etc.); he worked with the city to try to iron out as much of that as possible; he was here for 3 months*

*Mr. Brown: I think you will all like it when it's finished; I have pictures*

*Ms. Moermond: I need to give you a deadline to either remove it from the parcel or get permission from the building official to have it there as a part of this building process; it isn't traditional for there to be an entire office on the site of a residential construction project*

*Mr. Schaaf: the reason behind this - architectural plans involve re-modified use of shipping containers; that's basically what black box is; we're basically bringing architectural designs & incorporating shipping containers into the design; this has been a cutting edge approach of building along the east & west coasts - in cold climates as well as hot climates; it's been a solution-based & architecturally-based approach to building; the office itself is designed to go hand-in-hand with the future building plan there; a lot of construction offices on construction sites are basically modified containers; a lot of them are 8 ft containers with a door & a window; they're just a little bit more utilitarian than what ours are; ours are designed so that when you leave the cargo doors shut & lock up all your doors & windows to the construction office, it's not left vulnerable; the reason that it just simply looks like a shipping container is because when the doors are all shut, your actual doors & windows are*

*enclosed on the opposite end of it; it's designed that way to be secure; it's also designed to coincide with the building project & to act as a living model & a taste of the project to come; if you'd see the interior, you'd instantly understand that; it's fully insulated, fully wired, like just another construction office*

*Ms. Moermond: you have an office within a cargo container; & I'm looking at an exterior shell, which is a cargo container; it could be a anything... from a code perspective, exterior storage - it's a cargo container  
-this is about timing & it doesn't sound as if you have a ton of control over the timing from the architect's side of things*

*Mr. Brown: at this point, we're the messengers; we obviously are proactive; it has gone thru engineering; it's in final draft stages right now to be presented; the start date is late summer; there is a sense of urgency placed on the project*

*Ms. Moermond: where does the cargo container come from? Where does it normally live?*

*Mr. Schaaf: we have an office in Mpls but this particular structure is designed to travel - go to our sites & to advertise to familiarize people with the concept; it's a model; we had it on Grand Ave for Grand Old Days last year; we are, by no means, the first ones to incorporate this in architectural use; we anticipate to bring this into a respectable architectural approach; we are looking to clarify that this is designed to be a construction office for this project & we do not intend to use it for any other purposes; we are asking for an extension on allowing us to keep it there until we ..... (fading out)*

*Ms. Moermond: that all sounds kind of vague in terms of when the final documents will be pulled together because you've had a couple of setbacks already; I don't have a concrete timeline*

*Mr. Brown: would 60 days be appropriate to ask for?*

*Ms. Moermond: the Order was written Apr 27, 2018 with a May 24, 2018 deadline; I will go to Jul 1, 2018 with it (either it be removed or approved by the building official, Steve Ubl - I would look for something in writing from him saying that it's OK to have it on site as a part of this project)*

*Mr. Schaaf: it is possible that we could push it a little bit; from your perspective, does it sound like-- if we could get our bldg plans accepted by then (?) because it was 2017 when Scott originally brought it in so, we're past the long stretch .....*

*Ms. Moermond: what I have is an empty parcel with a cargo container on it & until there's active construction happening, it doesn't make sense, from the city's perspective, to have an office/storage of bldg materials there*

*Mr. Rehovsky: my current place goes on the market Thu, so I am making sure that this happens sooner*

*Mr. Schaaf: if we get the bldg permits, is it pretty hand in hand that the construction office would be accepted or is that also .....*

*Ms. Moermond: that's totally within the domain of the building official*

---

Grant to July 1, 2018 to remove the cargo container from the vacant lot or have plan approval from the building official. Owner indicated he will remove the dog house as soon as possible.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/6/2018**

## 11:30 a.m. Hearings

### Orders To Vacate, Condemnations and Revocations

- 6 [RLH VO 18-13](#) Appeal of John Kerwin to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 667 LINCOLN AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Noecker

*Appeal granted. A chimney inspection report was submitted by Gausman & Moore Mechanical & Electrical Engineers on May 21, 2018 to Sr Plumbing Inspector Rick Jacobs in which he reviewed and found the report to be sufficient; therefore, he considered the matter resolved. Legislative Hearing Officer concurs.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2018**

## 1:30 p.m. Hearings

### Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 7 **RLH FCO  
18-70** Appeal of John Bailey to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1725 HAGUE AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Henningson

*John Bailey, co-owner, appeared.*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff: this is a condo bldg; Fire Certificate of Occupancy inspection conducted by Inspector Mike Cassidy; appealed today is the requirement for the basement ceiling #1 - Repair & maintain the required fire resistive construction with approved materials & methods (required is a 1 hour rated assembly between the basement area & the occupied units above that - 5/8 inch fire rated sheet rock or a fully sprinklered bldg); the photos show some sheet rock; Insp Cassidy noted that it looked like that at one time there was a sprinkler head up there but it was replaced with an on/off valve; it's very possible that this was modified*

*Ms. Moermond: there's a lot of basements that don't have this requirement because of the occupancy; a single family home does not require it*

*Ms. Shaff: when we have different occupancies or different tenants, each space is a compartment*

*Ms. Moermond: scanned cited Chap 703.1 of the fire code: "the required fire resistance rating of fire resistant rated construction..... shall be maintained; such elements shall be visually inspected by the owner annually & properly repaired, restored or replaced when damaged, altered, breached or penetrated"  
-so, it looks like what we're talking about is an alteration that has occurred over time;*

so that what had been, perhaps, sheet rock covering the area or a sprinkler head .....  
"where concealed, such elements shall not be required to be visually inspected by the owner unless the concealed space is accessible by the removal or movement of a panel access or ceiling tile or similar movable entry to the space openings made therein for the passage of pipes, electrical conduit wires, ducts, air transfer openings & holes made for any reason shall be protected with approved methods capable of resisting the passage of smoke & fire; openings thru fire resistant rated assemblies shall be protected by ..... so,  
-would this Order have been written had there been a change from what was likely a sprinkler head to a valve?

Ms. Shaff: if the sprinkler head was there, then we wouldn't have written the Order because that was an approved method once upon a time

Ms. Moermond: so that is one method that he could come into compliance that would be much more affordable then (?)

Ms. Shaff: yes

Mr. Bailey: all the building owners want to be as safe as possible; it was just kind of shocking to see the estimate..... actually, I can't even get a person to come out & do a bid for this particular fix

Ms. Moermond: it doesn't sound like putting a ceiling in is the right fix for your

Mr. Bailey: I don't think it is; it's expensive

Ms. Moermond: suggested getting a sprinkler company out there to see what would be involved & what they would charge to take that valve & having the area in question sprinklered to re-introduce that element of safety - I would consider that a comparable measure

Mr. Bailey: I'm a newer owner in the building & I didn't know about this sprinkler head but if it's there...

-checked out the photos: "this is the boiler; right next to it is the water heater"

Ms. Shaff: all the inspector said is that it looks like a sprinkler head might have been installed at one time & replaced with on/off valve

Ms. Moermond: so, setting aside all these estimates for adding fire resistant construction & going with the possibility of taking a plumber in there to see what would be involved ---- are you willing to take a look at that?

Mr. Bailey: absolutely

Ms. Moermond: OK; let's have you get some estimates within 3 weeks & also a commercial sprinkler company in to take a look

Ms. Shaff: Inspector Cassidy is retiring at the end of the month; so I think that it would be a great idea to have his supervisor, A.J. Neis weigh in on this - 651/266-8992; I encourage you to talk with Mr. Neis beforehand

Ms. Moermond:

*-I will Lay this Over for 4 weeks to Jun 19, 2018 LH to figure out whether you've found a viable option & what's a reasonable time period for you to execute it based on costs, availability of contractors, etc.*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 6/19/2018**

**8**      [RLH FCO 18-69](#)      Appeal of Patrick Hogan to a Correction Notice-Complaint Inspection at 1142 MARION STREET.

**Sponsors:**      Brendmoen

*Patrick M. Hogan, North End Apartments LLC, owner, appeared.*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff: a complaint of over-occupancy came in on Apr 26, 2018 for 1142 Marion St; the complaint was investigated by Fire Inspector Efrayn Franquiz on May 1, 2018; there was no finding of over-occupancy; however, there are 7 items on the list - maintenance issues; photos; I understand that there's a dispute between a couple of tenants; a Certificate of Occupancy was last approved in Sep 2013; the cycle for that started in Jul 2013 - the bldg was given an "A" rating; next Fire C of O is due next year, in 1919*

*Mr. Hogan: it's challenging to manage tenants who are disputing; generally, our policy is that when it gets to a point where we can't solve the issue on our own, we have to let both tenants know that we'll have to evict them both - give them both a vacate date; that is what I communicated to both & one of them decided to call the city about the other resident complaining that they were over-crowding the property; when the inspector came out, he confirmed that there was clearly no evidence of over-occupancy -I submitted a letter explaining the situation & the fact that it's an old building; we try to maintain it really well; the winters are hard on the property -both tenants are now on Section 8 so the property is inspected on a yearly basis for safety issues -I'm requesting that we do the maintenance on our own as we've been doing*

*Ms. Moermond: it seems that in this case, there was not only a complaint inspection but also a pretty comprehensive inspection of the building*

*Ms. Shaff: when I look at the photos, I had some huge concerns - glaring at me; so, of course, I'm going to write them; it's an opportunity to get those things done before the next C of O comes up; I'm not seeing anything that would lead me to say, "Let's do an early Fire C of O inspection"*

*Ms. Moermond: what I was thinking is that if you did do an early Fire C of O inspection, he would be pushed out.....*

*Ms. Shaff: in a year or so when we do the Fire C of O inspection, it would be a 1 inspection deal but there's definitely some things that need to be addressed now*

*Ms. Moermond: where I was going.... if he did his Fire C of O now, he would not do it next year; the downside for him would be the rating; if these items came up at the next inspection, he could very possibly, not be an "A" -I do see deferred maintenance issues (photos)*

*Mr. Hogan: part of my concern is that we weren't budgeting to do all these things right now - a few thousand dollars worth of work (tuckpointing a chimney; having a heating company come out, etc.); to all of a sudden be facing a \$3000-\$5000 bill with a 4-week*

*deadline that we weren't expecting, is somewhat shocking to me; it feels very abrupt*

*Ms. Shaff: I understand what you're saying but realistically, Inspector Franquiz did you a favor by writing some of these things together rather than separately because of the point values*

*-when I look at this chimney, it scares me; & the other chimney out of the upper unit, it's cocked at an angle & it shouldn't be - that is, potentially, another life safety issue*

*Ms. Moermond: in the phrasing of this, if it is written, it is by definition, a safety item & we could call things of greater or lesser urgency/severity but if it exists in the code, we're presuming that it needs to be in good repair - is it urgent? it shows up here because of safety concerns*

*-I'm willing to work with you; I understand being beset with an unexpected bill*

*-what I would have said is, "Some of this looks to me like deferred maintenance kinds of issues"*

*-taking into account the cost of these things, would you be willing to put together a plan that would show me how you could do this over the next 3-6 months, at the most (space this out); provide the estimated cost of the items to help me make a more informed decision - with timelines; could you do that in 2 weeks for the Jun 5 LH*

*Mr. Hogan: OK*

*Ms. Moermond: some of these things won't take you very long at all*

*-#3 refers to the metal, cylindrical chimney - awkward angle (it's supposed to be straight up & down); if there's a failure with venting, CO could accumulate*

*Mr. Hogan: both water heaters are vented thru the brick chimney; the only thing vented thru the cylindrical metal chimney is the furnace on the 2nd floor attic*

*Ms. Shaff: looking at the photo of the brick chimney; bricks are spalling (faces popping off); it's an issue because of the height of the chimney that is already being supported*

*Ms. Moermond: #3 needs to be taken care of before the next heating season*

*-you also, I believe, would qualify for rental rehab assistance from the city to cover some of these costs; go to the city's website to check that out; it's a month out if you're approved for the loan*

*-will Lay this Over to Jun 5, 2018 LH; will send letter*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 6/5/2018**

**9 RLH FCO  
18-71**

Appeal of James Kampa to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1827 SAINT ANTHONY AVENUE.

**Sponsors:** Henningson

*Recommendation is forthcoming.*

*James A. Kampa, owner, appeared.*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff: on Apr 6, 2018, a Correction Notice was issued by Fire Inspector Laura Huseby; photos; from one of the bedrooms, you have to walk thru the other bedroom to get to the hallway; the Fire Code is specific about egress not happening thru an intervening space*

*Ms. Moermond: I can't get the floor plan layout from looking at the photos; asked Mr. Kampa to draw a simple floor plan; asked who slept in the bedrooms*

*Mr. Kampa: showed a picture on his phone (will email it); from that room, you can also access the roof thru a window; the same situation exists in the other unit of the duplex; the woman tenant & her daughter occupy the bedrooms; her son is 12 years old; the house is old; doesn't know if it has the structural integrity to have a wall removed; I could also provide a fire extinguisher in that bedroom*

*Ms. Moermond: the Fire Code would require to treat it as one sleeping area - I would be willing to look at less if I had plans in front of me to see if it made sense to have less than 50% of an opening; I need more details about the wall; maybe a contractor needs to look at the wall to provide suggestions*

*Ms. Shaff: there was a fire on the other side of this duplex already in that outermost room & it was smoking related*

*Mr. Kampa: I've owned the house since 1990; my father owned it before me -opening up 2 walls & get them re-finished seems like a huge expense*

*Ms. Moermond: I think we need to have a contractor take a look at it to see what is feasible based on what you have; the room needs to have 2 ways out without going thru another room; have you considered rental rehab money from the city?*

*-your options: either not use that outer room for sleeping or create a larger opening between the rooms*

*-I would entertain a 30%-40% opening without a door*

*-do your research*

*-I'll hold off making a decision until you have some better information*

*-we'll continue this hearing to Jun 19, 2018 LH*

**Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 6/19/2018**

**10**     [RLH FCO 18-66](#)     Appeal of Lisa VanHorn to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 161 WINIFRED STREET WEST.

**Sponsors:**             Noecker

*Lisa Van Horn, owner, appeared.*

*Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff: the home's first Fire Certificate of Occupancy Inspection conducted by Fire Inspector Dan Klein on Apr 27, 2018; there are a few things going on; there was 1 Order for an egress window in the basement & it has been signed-off*

*-the biggest issue is that the basement has been illegally turned into a unit; the owner has had her basement stairs capped over so we have an illegally converted duplex at this point*

*Ms. Moermond: let's talk about the ceiling height for legal bedrooms in the basement; it has egress windows; you are appealing ceiling ht, you said in your appeal*

*Ms. Van Horn: I spoke with Ms. Shaff, who said that as long as I had another inspector come out & inspect those windows, I should be OK with that ceiling height; but ultimately, why I'm here is to ask for an extension for my C of O because I applied for a variance with the city; my original plan was that I would move into the upstairs with my daughter & granddaughter; & the spiral stairwell that goes downstairs, which was*



*not securely attached at the time that I was doing a remodel, so I sealed it so my granddaughters would not fall down the stairwell; originally, we were working on the basement; I wasn't ultimately going to do that; right now, there's not even a kitchen down there - that cap can come off that stairwell but then someone could, potentially, get hurt; I was trying to avoid that*

*Ms. Moermond: so, who is where in the house?*

*Ms. Van Horn: my family members are upstairs with 3 boys; we were gradually working on the downstairs where my best friend's daughter lives*

*Ms. Moermond: is there a separation between her space in the basement & the boys' space in the rest of the house?*

*Ms. Van Horn: she has a separate entrance; she has a bathroom, a kitchen with a refrigerator but it's not like a real kitchen; it's more like a dorm room while she goes to St. Paul College; I live a couple blocks away from there so it's easy to maintain -I mailed the application on Thu; my date would be Jun 18; I have all the other things on my list taken care of already except for that & that's why I was hoping to get an extension until I could get that*

*Ms. Moermond: if, you get that*

*Ms. Shaff: which would include - I'm not sure that you understand this piece but your looking at permits for having it's own full kitchen, fire separation issues between the 2 units, etc; it's not just a matter of somebody moving in*

*Ms. Van Horn: so, ideally then, if she moved out ..... when he comes back, could he potentially give a C of O for just the upstairs if the downstairs is just storage?*

*Ms. Shaff: not with that stairway being capped off*

*Ms. Moermond: we have a few layers going on here; there's the Zoning concern about whether you'd could be approved to be a duplex from the zoning perspective - that has it's own path; it's the Board of Zoning Appeals; it's not court; they would make a determination about whether or not it's legal to do that; then, Ms. Shaff & the fire folks are simultaneously needing to make determinations about whether the bldg itself is constructed in a fashion that is a legal duplex with the proper separations (separate furnaces, etc.) - all that's required for bldgs built to be a duplex safely -I'm not seeing it parced out like that in these Orders; all they're saying is that this is not a legal duplex; if it had the option to become a legal duplex, then next thing that would happen would be Orders saying, "You don't have a proper fire separation between the 2 levels of the house;" these types of questions are not covered in these Orders but they would be forthcoming if you were approved as a duplex; those questions are important right now in terms of the safety of the tenants, who are occupying those spaces; even if you are approved to have this be a duplex, you are still going to have some more work to do beyond what you've already done; so, I'm inclined to say that you need to have that work done & zoning compliance by a particular date or the space vacated -I would not have a concern if the basement would be used as a storm cellar where people could store pickles but you couldn't certainly have people living down there in a separate space*

*Ms. Van Horn: so, if she moves out of the downstairs, I won't have to immediately try*

to fix all that; I could have a C of O just for the 3 bedrooms upstairs & 1 bathroom (?)

Ms. Shaff: I'm uncomfortable with that because it's already been started to make the separate space; the bldg has only been approved to be a single family home & now, it doesn't look like a single family home to me

Ms. Moermond: what I'm not seeing in this set of Orders either is something saying that there needs to be access between the 2 living areas to be converted as sort of a duplex to a single family home; that would be the other path that this would take if the Board of Zoning Appeals denies your request & the next set of Orders would say what you'd need to do to deconvert it back to a single (one of the kitchens would need to go; you'd need to have open access between the upper & lower living areas; etc.)

Ms. Shaff: this is a discussion that we've already had & the appellant said that they would rather pursue making this into a duplex, so ...

Ms. Moermond: OK; you'll need to have things done by Aug 1, 2018 or vacated; there'll be a forthcoming set of Orders, which would be appealable

Grant to August 1, 2018 to come into compliance by deconverting the property back to a single-family dwelling. If the Board of Zoning Appeals grants a variance to allow a duplex, the building must come into compliance with duplex requirements from building and fire codes, etc.

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2018**

## 2:30 p.m. Hearings

### Vacant Building Registrations

- 11 [RLH VBR 18-27](#) Appeal of Noela Suhfor to a Vacant Building Registration and Notice of Condemnation Unfit for Human Habitation Order to Vacate at 1007 OXFORD STREET NORTH.

**Sponsors:** Brendmoen

Noela Suhfor, owner and Attorney Daniel Kennedy, Kennedy & Cain Law Firm, appeared.

Fire Supervisor Leanna Shaff: a complaint came in Apr 23, 2018 of a water shut-off; on Apr 24, Inspector Her Vang went out & posted it as Condemned; the water had been off since Apr 18, 2018; then, it was transferred to the Fire Certificate of Occupancy Program; the following week we transferred it to the Vacant Building Program and VB file was opened on Apr 30, 2018

-inspectors did not gain access; they were acting on the water shut-off & no response from the owner

Supervisor Matt Dornfeld, Vacant Building Program: Vacant Building Inspector Kalis went to the property on May 1, 2018; a tenant answered the door; there were also approximately 6, who he called transient folks living at the property who appeared appeared to be "high" on something - not in their right frame of mind; the interior had a strong odor; there were flies, trash on the front porch, a dog & a cat; there was also loose litter, junk, building materials, discarded furniture, household items strewn throughout the yard; there was an inoperable pick-up truck with a camper on the bed

*that had an extension cord running from the house; there appeared to be a transient living in the back; Insp Kalis said that he would be back on May 4 to vacate the property due to water being shut-off; he did not attempt to go inside because he felt that it was not a safe environment; when he came back on May 4, the police accompanied him and again, there were 6 transients who claimed to not have a place to stay; all of them appeared to be "high" on something; the inspector gave them an hour to retrieve their belongings, which they did without incident (left the scene walking, on bicycles, etc.); he proceeded to have Restoration Professionals secure the property -one of the transients returned & broke into the property; it had to be re-secured on May 14, 2018 per SPPD  
-currently, it's my understanding that the property is vacant & secured; the exterior has been cleaned-up; the camper is gone & we have not received another complaint  
-we have not inspected the interior of the home*

*Ms. Moermond: good afternoon; it was good morning earlier; thank you for re-arranging; what are you looking for today?*

*Mr. Kennedy: history: my client allowed 1 person to stay in the basement; all that person had to do was to keep their eye on things - mow & shovel & pay the utilities; they didn't have another place to stay; there were no other tenants; the family lives in Maple Grove; they come into the city on weekends sometimes; this person, evidently, started inviting others to stay - said they were guests overnight but it appears that they were there a lot*

*Ms. Suhfor: things became uncontrollable & we had to evict him*

*Mr. Kennedy: we actually went thru an eviction process; we filled in Apr; our court day was May 1; on May 1, we got a Writ of Recovery; unfortunately, I put Oxford Avenue instead of Oxford Street so we had to go back & get a new Writ of Recovery & by that time, the city had already intervened & had told the tenants to move & so they moved; actually, they excluded the family from the house during that last part ... had to take some action; they littered the outside as well as damaged some of the inside - they weren't paying any bills - that's the reason the water was shut off  
-it was an unfortunate time when they were trying to be nice to somebody*

*Ms. Moermond: what are you looking for?*

*Mr. Kennedy: we're looking for the Condemnation/Vacant Building status to be lifted; back to the way it was before...*

*Ms. Moermond: no; it was in violation of the code & the owner would be responsible for allowing illegal occupancy of this building*

*Mr. Kennedy: it wasn't an illegal occupancy*

*Ms. Moermond: it was once the building was Condemned; yes, it was; so on May 1, 4, & 14, you would be responsible for allowing occupancy of that structure*

*Mr. Kennedy: but at the same time, we can't by law,.....*

*Ms. Moermond: we could write a Criminal Tag right now--- what I'm saying, "It's on you;" when I think about that, it's how do I treat the situation right now when it was so out of control when it was under your responsibility & I'm thinking how likely is it that this is going to happen again & I don't have a good sense of what the interior*

conditions are when people have been in there camping - not having water - that can get very ugly fast - you have to have toilets that flush"  
-did you hire a contractor to come in..... this is not nice

Mr. Kennedy: they have a contractor in there working; there's other property damage; they are spending money restoring the property

Ms. Moermond: I need to decide whether or not this needs to have a Code Compliance Inspection or a Fire Certificate of Occupancy in order for it to be re-occupied

Ms. Shaff: we've never been through this building & it has quite a .....

Ms. Suhfor: the last time I appealed for the vacant building

Mai Vang: she appealed in 2016 for the VB registration; you granted her release from the VB Program provided she moved into the property by Nov 18

Ms. Suhfor: which I did & it was inspected after

Ms. Moermond: but you're not really living there now; and you weren't during this time period

Ms. Shaff: there are a lot of complaints per code enforcement over the past 2 years; a lot of history

Ms. Moermond: I'm having a lot of trouble with your credibility: looking at the discussions we've had in the past; how the circumstances arose here; the kinds of questions you were asking; the issues you were asking the tenant to take responsibility for - as a landlord, those are things that you might ask somebody to take over; as somebody who lives there, that would be a very unusual ask; your address-you operate all the days of the week out of Maple Grove & you move into the inner city on weekends; this just doesn't add up in terms of this being your primary domicile in an owner-occupied home

Ms. Suhfor: it's not like I don't go there at all; I go there at least once a week but when they locked me out of the building, there's nothing I could do

Ms. Moermond: Ramsey Co Taxation lists you in Maple Grove

Ms. Suhfor: that's my mailing address

Ms. Moermond: this property needs to get to some level of code compliance; either a Fire C of O or a code compliance inspection report & I'm more inclined to go the code compl insp report route

Mr. Kennedy: there's not much on record about the interior

Ms. Moermond: just what you've said

Mr. Kennedy: just the drywall & that's not a code issue, per se

Ms. Moermond: holes in the walls is a code issue

*Mr. Kennedy: it does need some work & money will need to be spent but it isn't a fire hazard or anything else like that; it's not in the record; it seems to me that there's no reason to not allow them to continue to occupy the property now that they've gotten this person out*

*-we didn't know that the property was condemned; we had served them with the eviction but we couldn't actually go into the house*

*Ms. Moermond: was there any notification?*

*Ms. Shaff: we sent a letter to your box number on Apr 24 that said that the Occupancy is Condemned; it was placarded; it says that this is unfit for human habitation; the Occupancy must not be used until re-inspected & approved by this office per St. Paul Regional Water; water utilities had been shut off since Apr 18, 2018; provide water service back on or property is Condemned Vacant Apr 30, 2018*

*Ms. Suhfor: I received the letter - the notice; they locked the doors (I can't understand her)*

*Ms. Moermond: what does someone do in this circumstance? we have a condemned property with people occupying it; as an owner, what are their options?*

*Mr. Dornfeld: I would start by calling the police*

*Mr. Shaff: a time was given by the inspector that they would be there (9:30 am on Apr 30, 2018); they had the opportunity to call the inspector; it was all in the letter*

*Ms. Suhfor: I did speak to Insp Dan Klein.....*

*Ms. Moermond: so, the owner was expected to be present at 9:30 am on Apr 30, 2018*

*Mr. Kennedy: my advice was to file an eviction; I do a lot of Housing Court Law & it's a violation of the law to lock somebody out*

*Ms. Suhfor: I gave them more 30 days to move out but they wouldn't move; I came by everyday asking them what they were still doing there; they wouldn't move*

*Mr. Dornfeld: we were there on May 1 and had them out May 4, 2018; but that was with the police present; certainly, not a situation for anyone without the SPPD present; that's the only reason they left*

*Mr. Kennedy: my client was scared to go there*

*Ms. Moermond: Chap 43 Legislative Code covers a number of situations that would trigger Vacant Building Registration: 1) condemnation; & when it's a water shut-off, we try to move quickly to get things going again to get the property re-occupied; in your case, there's a lot of extenuating circumstances that make that less attractive to me because of the poor management that I've seen - you got yourself into this circumstance - you're operating a disorderly house; you did take steps to do the eviction*

*Ms. Suhfor: if you send somebody a Notice to move & they're not moving & you know that your house is being damaged, what can you do in the meantime to avoid the damage from getting worse? call the cops?*

*Ms. Moermond: you could have shown up at your inspection appointment on Apr 30*

*Ms. Suhfor: that was the letter I received that I spoke to Dan Klein about; I sent him an email on Apr 28 & 29 & I spoke to him on Apr 30 because he didn't respond to me; I let him know that I was going to be at work & I wouldn't be able to make it; could I have another time? when he finally called me back Apr 30, he said that he couldn't do anything - there was no point doing an inspection any more*

*Ms. Moermond: is it secured by other than normal means at this time?*

*Mr. Dornfeld: I haven't been out there recently; as of May 14, there was something placed over the entry way*

*Ms. Suhfor: I did change the locks, front & back doors*

*Ms. Moermond: I just don't trust that you live there; if I did, I'd think that this wouldn't happen again but I feel like this is a rental property & that you're trying to get out from underneath the requirement to have the inspections done as a rental property by saying that you live there & I'm uncomfortable with that  
-when they didn't pay you for the water, you let the water get shut off*

*Ms. Suhfor: they didn't give me the letter from the Water Dept about notification of going to shut off the water  
-I've always paid the water bill - sometimes a little bit late*

*Ms. Moermond: I'm going to take this under advisement & get back to you in a couple of days*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Recommendation is forthcoming.*

**Referred to the City Council due back on 6/20/2018**