

03-5-4

I want to appeal  
decision.

CITY OF MILWAUKEE  
RECEIVED  
'03 MAR 31 PM 3:18  
OFFICE OF  
CITY ATTORNEY

Thank you

Julia CSASAR  
P.O. Box 510262  
Milwaukee, Wisc.  
53203

March 27, 2003

CITY OF MILWAUKEE  
2003 MAR 27 PM 3:30  
RONALD D. HARRIS  
CITY ATTORNEY

Administrative Review  
and Appeals Board  
200-E Wells St. City Hall  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

Property Location:

2973 N. Downer Ave.

CITY OF MILWAUKEE

2003 JAN -2 PM 2:19

RONALD D. LEONHARD  
CITY CLERK

OFFICE OF  
CITY ATTORNEY

03 JAN -2 PM 4:05

CITY OF MILWAUKEE  
RECEIVED

Violations: "Guardrail for westside porch" (back of house)

April, 2002 Received an unknown 'bill' from court. Contacted Municipal court, was told it was for violation, for not appearing in court, and with a fine of \$320. If a summons was sent, it was never received

April 2002 Went to court - on my own - to clarify situation. A letter of explanation given to the Judge was accepted concerning guardrail for the flat top membrane roof

The Judge gave court date, and said to speak to an Attorney there.

The Judge excused the \$320 fine and removed arrest order.

May 7, 2002 The presiding Judge was given the same letter of explanation concerning guardrail around the membrane flat top roof

The Judge dismissed this 'case'.

Inquiry was made on the same day, same place. That a dismissal means - it is over and done

April 2002 Along with tenant agreement to lock door to roof, lock was installed. The inspector was informed of the locked door to roof, immediately.

As nothing was heard since April, assumed everything was fine.

Tenant's rental lease does not include flat top roof. No usage of any kind, such as chairs, tables etc. Even heels on shoes can damage membrane, causing water to seep under membrane

October 25, 2002 received a notice from Mike Greylag  
assistant supervisor Department Neighborhood  
Services.

October 31 phone call acknowledgment made to him pertaining  
to an inspection October 16, 2002 - first notice ever  
received. Was never notified of any inspection  
being done, nor for what violation. Subject was avoided  
stated "we're not taking you to court, we're putting it  
on your December tax bill."

In October fee of \$300, and said November 12, inspection  
will be \$300, and \$1175 will be for December  
No notice sent

In that respect do not understand the reasoning of  
above figures he quoted

said department sent letter/order which were ignored.  
These were never received

mention violation: garage, boards, fence, paint. (completed 2001)

November 27, 2002 Call made to acknowledge November notice  
he sent - not in "will return next week." Did not  
call again. December notice not received

Have unlocked door - had "railing" installed at house line -  
tenant has key

Reason for this guardrail violation is that the  
inspector - with department people - wan to make  
membrane flat top roof into a "porch". This would be  
a construction undertaking: needs of a roofer  
carpenter, fence/railing person.

As any roofer will tell, that membrane roofing is not  
for furniture usage, moving chairs on it - causing  
dimples/damage.

Roof has been replaced twice in the past 8 years at a  
cost of several thousands of dollars.

Recent damage to membrane, caused accumulation of  
water seeping under membrane - eventually did  
damage to my ceiling below - causing plaster to  
collapse, causing damage to rug drapes, furnishings  
Another expensive repair bill.

Tenant - long term - has had a low rent - with all utilities  
when long period with rent of \$430 was raised to \$500 -  
January 1, 2001 - tenant wanted a porch because of  
increase. Tenant was very unhappy - and talked  
to department people

Hence, all this commotion because of a railing. Tenant  
is not/can not use roof anyway - it is not included  
in rental lease - except for any happenings -  
as tenant agreed/knows.

My appeal to you - please - to remove fee, unwarranted  
violation from tax roll and tax bill

High December tax bill - but the inspection fee of \$1275  
added - is questionable.

This is my home — what has been and is being  
done — is very unfair — it seems obvious that  
intentions are to continue inspections/fees  
Although it is a high rent area — for others — with heart  
in this house it was/is low rent — but is still  
relatively maintained nicely — by me.  
Why are inspectors/supervisors causing uncalled for  
hardship.  
What departmental people are demanding — far exceeds  
income in building  
To re-do roof that was just completed and to make  
it into small porch. Tenant wants —  
Please accept this letter to review and answer  
Thank you

Julia Casar

P.O. Box 510262

Milwaukee, Wisc. 53203

December, 2002