

Deficiency list for 358 Arbor Street prepared for the appeal of the “Deficiency List”

1. While we’ve had discussions about whether or not this is a CO building. I’m not having this argument at this time. The actual code listed says that it’s a “reasonable time” to allow entry into a rental property be provided. I have never stood up an inspector. I have had to reschedule appointments that the inspector chose to ignore. (please see attached emails ) The October 22, 2025 appointment was attempted to reschedule. Please see attached email.

The December 22, 2025 inspection was never scheduled for a specific time. The inspector failed to notify me of any time he just showed up.

The January 23, 2026 inspection was also rescheduled however, Rental housing inspector also chose to ignore emails to reschedule.

2. The Lower units outstanding deficiencies were not listed on prior inspections. Because the goal posts keep moving it is not reasonable that any final inspection and or revocation of a CO is appropriate. There was no mention of “heavy contents” in any prior orders. There was also no mention of a percentage of how much “content load shall be minimized by 50%” in any prior orders. Please see item 5 for an argument on whether or not “content load” meet the requirements of SPLC34.10(5) or SPLC 34.10(1)

3. “Areas of paint showing deformity” is not a thing. I have no idea what that means and is a made up phrase. I suggest perhaps the inspector stop using AI to write orders.

It is my intention to scrape and paint the entire structure this spring, however a June 1, 2026 reinspection might help find a time to paint where it will cure with the temperatures above 35° for the recommended two weeks. Frost out in St. Paul is May 15. Much scrapping has already been done.

4. The inspector completely misses the point about smoke detectors in the bedroom. He refers to chapter 34, which refers to chapter 39, which refers to state code which says for a dwelling unit a single smoke detector meets their requirement. (See attached State Code) There is no code that there has to be a smoke detector in any bedroom so whether or not it’s a bedroom doesn’t matter if it’s a bedroom or not, There is no requirement for smoke detectors in bedrooms only a single smoke detective per unit. So where the inspector says that the smoke alarm in the dining living room area is too far away to provide appropriate coverage it’s just not true. A smoke detector

anywhere in the unit meets the requirements and the requirements for carbon monoxide detector are within 10 feet of a room used for sleeping purposes. He does not mention that there's not proper carbon monoxide coverage.

Also, whether or not there's a bed that's "messed" and whether or not our son sleeps there occasionally doesn't make any difference. It's not a legal bedroom and there's no requirement for smoke detector inside the bedroom or a carbon monoxide detector.

A combo smoke carbon detector is called for nowhere in the code, particularly inside bedrooms.

5. The inspector says that there is evidence of old staining from what he is guessing is old urine and cat feces, again is not against the rules. As his evidence of this, he shows pictures of stains that we have no idea how they were caused, no wet spots, no feces on the floor, and he shows a picture of a cat box with feces in it, which is the job of a cat box.

A maid Service was hired to clean that floor the day before the inspector arrived. Testimony can be provided.

He further says that the unit is unclean and to prove this he shows a picture of two garbage bags, not full, on opposite ends of the house to provide for any garbage that's created and then pictures of possessions stored in a way that I guess he finds unacceptable. There is zero evidence of any insect or rodent infestation or I'm guessing he would have pictures provided. Apparently the inside of a garbage bag somehow does not meet Saint Paul's high standard of cleanliness. He's not showing pictures of garbage on the floor. He's showing pictures of garbage in bags. Clean Bright white garbage bags that the seams are not even pushed out on.

He further said that there's "heavy content load" which again isn't a thing. It is possessions of the Tenant and she gets to own them and she gets to store them in anyway she sees fit. "heavy content load shall be minimized by 50%" is random and completely outside of the cities authority. He isn't even instructing the garbage needs to be taken out because except for two bags that weren't yet full, the garbage was out. He's saying she owns too many possessions for his taste. This is not dead rats in urine bottles, this is a ridiculous random standard that can not be met.

Thank you for your time and attention.