



## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** ALH 11-395, **Version:** 1

---

Appeal of Special Tax Assessment for 1892-1894 FORD PKWY for Project #:J1110A, Assessment #: 118034 in Ward 3

### **Legislative Hearing Officer Recommendation**

Reduce assessment from \$380 to \$100.

### **Tax Assessment Worksheet**

Cost: \$240.00

Service Charge: \$ 140.00

Total Assessment: \$380.00

Gold Card Returned by: NA

Type of Order/Fee: Snow letter and Sa

Nuisance: Failure to remove snow from the public sidewalk

Date of Orders: December 24, 2010

Compliance Date: December 27, 2010

Re-Check Date: December 30, 2010

Date Work Done: January 3, 2011

Work Order #: 10-939882

Returned Mail?: NO

Comments:

History of Orders on Property:

### **Legislative Hearing Notes (if any)**

Reduce assessment from \$380 to \$100.

John Erickson appeared.

Inspector Essling reported that the assessment for 1892/1894 Ford Parkway is for snow and ice removal from the public sidewalk. Orders were issued December 24, 2010 with a compliance date of December 27, 2010. It

was re-inspected December 30, 2010 and found to be in non-compliance. A Work Order was sent to Parks and the work was done on January 3, 2011 for a cost of \$240 plus a service charge of \$140 for a total of \$380. The snow letter was mailed to Steven Hannig, 7th Street in Saint Paul; Occupant; and Julie Hannig, Vixby, Inver Grove Heights. After the initial inspection of the snow/ice, the inspector issued a Summary Abatement, which says essentially the same thing as the snow letter.

Mr. Erickson noted that he lives at this address and the Hannigs are his inlaws. He is appealing because he was out-of-town at the time and he is questioning how the City determines which properties should be evaluated for snow removal. They own several properties within the City of Saint Paul and have never received a snow Notice. Within the past five (5) years, they have received twenty (20). He has always taken care of it until December. It feels as if he is being targeted unfairly. He thinks that if one of his neighbors has a problem with their property, there should be some way he would be able to directly confront them. In the future, he will make sure that someone takes care of the shoveling when they are out of town. Ms. Moermond responded that this is a complaint-based system, and it sounds as though this particular property is being carefully observed by a neighbor regarding snow removal. When the City goes out to inspect, they do not make a determination as to whether someone may/may not be targeted. The City determines whether the complaint was founded. Mr. Erickson suggested that staff look at the history of how many Notices he has actually received and how many times the City did not need to come out and do the work. Ms. Moermond replied that staff will be doing that while they view the video.

They viewed the video which showed too narrow of a width on the sidewalk.

Mr. Erickson questioned the City charging \$380 for what they did. Ms. Moermond responded that most of the cost is a trip charge plus some pretty steep administrative fees. Ms. Moermond asked Mr. Essling about the history on this property. He replied that this is the only complaint this winter about snow removal. In 2009, there was a complaint that resulted in a Work Order, marked "done by owner" on the 1894 side. On the 1892 side in 2009, there was a complaint that resulted in a Work Order, marked "done by owner." There were two (2) other complaints in 2009. He apologized that he didn't have copies for previous years; he would be able to produce them.

Ms. Moermond stated that she is struggling with Mr. Erickson's being out-of-town and his good history. She asked Mr. Erickson to make a commitment to make arrangements for someone to take care of this when he goes out of town in the future. Mr. Erickson responded that he will make that commitment.

Ms. Moermond will recommend reducing the assessment from \$380 to \$100.