



Legislation Text

File #: ALH 10-360, **Version:** 1

Appeal of Special Tax Assessment for 1626 St Albans St N for Project #: J1104A, Assessment #:118995 in Ward 5

Approve the assessment.

Cost: \$ 316.00

Service Charge: \$140.00

Total Assessment: \$ 456.00

Gold Card Returned by: Jennifer Sawyer

Type of Order/Fee: SA

Nuisance: failure to maintain exterior property

Date of Orders: September 02, 2010

Compliance Date: September 13, 2010

Re-Check Date: September 14, 2010

Date Work Done: September 14, 2010

Work Order #: 10-897510

Returned Mail?: No

Comments:

History of Orders on Property: None

Ms. Moermond recommended approving the assessment.

STAFF PRESENT: Joel Essling, Department of Safety and Inspection (DSI) - Code Enforcement; Paula Seeley, DSI - Code Enforcement; :Joe Yannarely, DSI - Vacant Building; Mai Vang and Jean Birkholz, City Council Offices

Jennifer Sawyer appeared.

Inspector Essling reported that the nuisance was a failure to maintain exterior property. The inspector found a discarded chair, brush and yard waste. The Order was sent September 2, 2010 with a compliance date of September 13, 2010 and was re-checked on September 14, 2010. The work was done on September 14,

2010 at a cost of \$316 and a service charge of \$140 for a total of \$456.

Ms. Moermond asked Ms. Sawyer why she is appealing. Ms. Sawyer said that she misread the information and thought she had until September 15, 2010. She explained that she had a flood in her garage; there was a lot of stuff on her property - she was removing the items from her garage. She had bagged up the bush trim and there was a chair left. She also thinks that the bill to remove one (1) chair and about three (3) bags of brush is extremely high. Ms. Moermond responded that the majority of her bill is an hourly trip charge. Ms. Sawyer noted that it took the guys literally five (5) minutes. Ms. Moermond asked staff to breakdown those costs. Inspector Essling replied that it's a \$260 minimum charge and there's a \$140 administrative fee broken down between the City and the County.

Ms. Moermond viewed the video. Ms. Sawyer stated that she thinks that \$456 is an excessive amount to charge her for that one (1) broken chair and that little bit of yard waste. Ms. Moermond asked Inspector Essling to reiterate exactly what the Summary Abatement Order says about the deadline. Inspector Essling cited the Order: "If you do not correct the nuisance or file an appeal before September 13, 2010..."

Ms. Sawyer said that she is not sure how a broken chair in her yard and a pile of leaves is considered a nuisance. It's in her yard and it's not disturbing anyone else. Ms. Moermond responded that it's an exterior maintenance problem and she had been Noticed on it and was given a chance to rectify it or to appeal. At that time, she could have appealed the Order. Now, the City has done the work and the City gave proper Notice for her to do the work.

Inspector Essling stated that inspectors only respond to complaints. In this case, the complaint says that there had been two (2) chairs sitting there for sixty (60) days. Inspectors don't know whether or not that's accurate; they go by what they see when they go out to inspect.

Ms. Moermond recommended approving the assessment. She welcomed Ms. Sawyer to go the City Council Public Hearing on this, if she chose. A letter of time and date would be forthcoming.