

Legislation Details (With Text)

| File #: | ALH 11-4 | 58 Version: 1 | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Туре: | Appeal-Le | egislative Hearing | Status: | Filed | |
| | | | In control: | City Council | |
| | | | Final action: | 4/5/2011 | |
| Title: | Appeal of Special Tax Assessment for 896 DUCHESS STREET for Project #: J1110A, Assessment #: 118034 in Ward 6. | | | | |
| Sponsors: | | | | | |
| Indexes: | | | | | |
| Code sections: | | | | | |
| Attachments: | 1. 896 Duchess.J1110A.pdf, 2. 896 Duchess.Summary Abatement.pdf, 3. 896 Duchess.Work Order.pdf | | | | |
| Date | Ver. Action | • | | | Result |
| 4/5/2011 | 1 Legislative Hearings Referred Under Master Resolution | | | | |
| Appeal of Speci in Ward 6. | al Tax Ass | sessment for 896 | DUCHESS STRE | ET for Project #: J1110A, Asse | ssment #: 118034 |
| Reduce assess | ment from | 1 \$300 to \$150. | | | |
| Cost: \$160.00 | | | | | |
| Service Charge | : \$140.00 |) | | | |
| Total Assessme | ent: \$ 300 | .00 | | | |
| Gold Card Retu | rned by: | | | | |
| Type of Order/F | ee: Order | S | | | |
| Nuisance: failu | re to remo | ove snow from pub | olic sidewalk | | |
| Date of Orders: | January | 6, 2011 | | | |
| Compliance Da | te: Januai | ry 11, 2011 | | | |
| Re-Check Date | : January | 11, 2011 | | | |
| Date Work Don | e: Januar | y 13, 2011 | | | |
| Work Order #: | 11-005038 | 3 | | | |
| Returned Mail?: | : No | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

History of Orders on Property: No

Legislative Hearing Notes (if any) Reduce assessment from \$300 to \$150.

Thomas Huynh, owner, appeared.

Inspector Yannarelly reported that the assessment for 896 Duchess Street is for failure to remove snow from the public sidewalk. Orders were issued January 6, 2011 with a compliance date of January 11, 2011. It was re-checked on January 11, 2011 and found to be in noncompliance. A Work Order was sent to Parks and the work was done on January 13, 2011 at a cost of \$160 plus a service charge of \$140 for a total of \$300.

Mr. Huynh stated that he had just bought the building and he was working on it when he received a letter from the City about the sidewalk. He called in to say he received a letter about shoveling the sidewalk so he went out and shoveled it. The guy said that he would come out and look at it and he would call Mr. Huynh if he had a concern. About ten (10) days later, he was there again working and he saw the City crew there. He asked why they were there. They said to shovel the sidewalk the full width. (Mr. Huynh had shoveled but was unaware that he needed to shovel it full width.)

Inspector Yannarelly explained that Mr. Huynh actually got two (2) Notices. On December 29, 2010, Mr. Fiel entered the snow letter. Five (5) days later, it was still not done, but Mr. Huynh had called and said he would do it that day. On January 6, 2011, Mr. Fiel went back to check and the walk was shoveled only very narrowly, so, he issued a Summary Abatement Notice. On January 11, 2011, he re-checked and the sidewalk had only a very narrow path that was shoveled. Then, he sent the Work Order.

The video was viewed showing the City had done the work, shoveling full width.

Mr. Huynh bought the property in October 2010; he has no history in the record. The previous owner had four (4) in less than a year. The neighbors had complained about him a lot and they have been watching carefully how Mr. Huynh has been taking care of the property. Mr. Huynh doesn't understand why his property was signaled out and not some of his neighbors.

Ms. Moermond stated that Mr. Huynh made a good faith effort so, she will recommend reducing the assessment from \$300 to \$150.

WHEREAS, in the matter of

[title]

the Legislative Hearing Officer has reviewed the appeal and considered the testimony of City staff and the appellant;

WHEREAS, the Legislative Hearing Officer recommends [recommendation]

now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Saint Paul City Council hereby accepts and adopts the Legislative Hearing Officer's recommendation in this matter.