



City of Saint Paul

15 West Kellogg Blvd.
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Minutes - Final

Legislative Hearings

Marcia Moermond, Legislative Hearing Officer
Mai Vang, Hearing Coordinator
Joanna Zimny, Executive Assistant
legislativehearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us
651-266-8585

Tuesday, November 26, 2024

9:00 AM

Room 330 City Hall & Court House/Remote

9:00 a.m. Hearings

Remove/Repair Orders

- 1 **RLH RR 24-17** Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 887 CHARLES AVENUE within fifteen (15) days after the May 1, 2024, City Council Public Hearing. (Amend to remove only) (Public hearing closed and laid over from October 9, 2024)

Sponsors: Bowie

Grant 180 days pending submission and approval of updated and more detailed schedule by no later than COB Friday, December 6, 2024.

Kyle Runbeck, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: hoping to have a conversation to wrap this case up. I've looked at your materials along with Department of Safety & Inspections staff, and I think we're pretty close. What I'd like to do is put this in front of Council for a vote December 11. I would so love to recommend 6 months to do the work. What I need you to do is give me a plan with firm start and end dates. Instead of "and beyond", you need to say more specifically how you will get the work done in these 180 days. The last hurdle is submitting a work plan to get the work done in six months and your contractor is teed up ready to go.

Runbeck: I was just leaving it open since there is uncertainty about walls need to be opened up. It is hard for me to guess at this point without the inspectors coming through. I can just guess and that's basically what it would be. A guess.

Moermond: you don't want to put your \$5,000 Performance Deposit at risk. So, if you need to talk to your contractors, do that, but I don't want you to lose that money. Show me you can get it done in six months, which I think your contractors are ready to pull permits, six months should be more than enough time. Then you get your \$5,000 back again automatically. I want you to have a plan that shows me you can get there.

Runbeck: understood. I appreciate your patience. I'll get it done. I need that in our office by December by Friday December 6.

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/11/2024

- 2 [RLH RR 24-44](#) Ordering the rehabilitation or razing and removal of the structures at 925 MAGNOLIA AVENUE EAST within fifteen (15) days after the December 4, 2024, City Council Public Hearing. (Refer back to Legislative Hearing Agenda for January 14, 2025)
- Sponsors:** Yang
- Refer back to LH January 14, 2025 at 9 am. Grant 180 days pending submission of affidavit and updated bids if needed after CCIR is issued.*
- Brain Balsaitis, owner, appeared*
- Moermond: it seems to me we have a lot taken care of, but we have a bit more to go.*
- Staff update by Supervisor Joe Yannarely: no issues at the property.*
- Moermond: do we have update on the Code Compliance Inspection Report?*
- Yannarely: no one has been there.*
- Moermond: so this is not on you, it is just delaying everything. Have you had a contractor do a preliminary bid?*
- Balsaitis: no, I was waiting for the Code Compliance Inspection Report.*
- Moermond: what I want to do is this, the first remove-repair hearing is January 14, but if you submit materials, updating the plan, bids, and the affidavit those are the only outstanding things. If you want to get it in we can review and are in agreement you can get permits the next day. So even though we're pushing it to January 14, you can pull permits earlier. Hopefully we'll have that Code Compliance kicked out by the second week in December.*
- I'm not worried about the quality of your plan and your ability to get it done. I don't know you'd benefit from coming downtown again.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 12/4/2024**

10:00 a.m. Hearings

Making Finding on Nuisance Abatements

- 3 **RLH RR 24-50** Making finding on the appealed substantial abatement ordered for 706 CONWAY STREET in Council File RLH RR 24-15.
- Sponsors:** Johnson
- The nuisance is abated and the matter resolved.*
- No one appeared*
- Moermond: 706 Conway, the nuisance condition is abated. Code Compliance ?*
- Hoffman: Code Compliance was issued yesterday, November 25.*
- Referred to the City Council due back on 12/18/2024**

11:00 a.m. Hearings

Summary & Vehicle Abatement Orders

- 4 **RLH SAO 24-81** Appeal of Elizabeth Eirwood to a Summary Abatement Order at 317 DALY STREET.

Sponsors: Noecker

Grant to December 20, 2024 for compliance.

Elizabeth Eirwood, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: November 5 Summary Abatement Order was issued to remove and dispose of wooden stairs, wood debris and other miscellaneous debris from rear of property near alley. Compliance date was November 12. Photo in the Summary Abatement Order.

Moermond: a long board. Set of steps. A railing in the photo. ‘

Eirwood: it had only been out a couple of days when the Summary Abatement Order was sent. It isn't permanent. I am fixing the stairs on the front and back of house. We've had issues with the neighbor harassing me so I am only able to work when I have a private security detail with me. I have them scheduled for 3 more days. Any of the debris I've taken off and replaced will be picked up, I have one of those Bagster bags. I'd rather have it done all at once. It won't fit in my car to take it myself.

Moermond: you said December 18? Here's the thing. I will recommend the Council gives you until December 20th. Getting it done means having everything gone, so moving it into a Bagster sitting with wood in it doesn't mean it is taken care of. So that has to be gone too.

Eirwood: absolutely, ok.

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/11/2024

1:00 p.m. Hearings

Vacant Building Registrations

- 5 **RLH VBR 24-69** Appeal of Patrick Cusick to a Vacant Building Registration Fee Warning Letter at 517 IOWA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Kim

Deny the appeal.

No one appeared

Voicemail left at 1:06 PM: this is Marcia Moermond from St. Paul City Council trying to reach you again about your appealed Vacant Building registration for 517 Iowa

Avenue East. We haven't been able to get ahold of you this week or last week. I'm going to recommend the City Council denies the appeal. This will go to Council December 11. We will send you an email confirmation this recommendation.

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/11/2024

6 [RLH VBR 24-72](#) Appeal of Kristina Schultz to a Vacant Building Registration Notice and Order to Vacate at 150 & 152 PAGE STREET WEST.

Sponsors: Noecker

Layover to December 3, 2024 at 1:00 pm. PO to submit work plan for addressing deficiencies by no later than 11 am on Monday, December 2, 2024.

*Kristina Schultz, owner, appeared via phone
Dalton Wells, contractor, appeared via phone*

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: is a duplex. Prior to our involvement it was owner occupied for many years. We received a complaint on May 30 it was being used as an illegal triplex. It was responded to by Inspector Almsted who talked to the realtor since it was a recent purchase. They told him it was going to be owner occupied and the building is functioning as a duplex. I got involved at that point. Went out and looked at the property and wrote orders. It didn't have a Fire Certificate of Occupancy. June 6 I spoke with Ms. Schultz and she dropped off a provisional application. From the beginning I was up front with Ms. Schultz about the issues and expected compliance times. It was at some point converted to a triplex. It wasn't supposed to be one. Plumbing issues, unpermitted plumbing in the building including another bathroom in the basement. Occupancy separation issues between the two units. Exterior issues, birds living in the walls. Sunken areas in the front. A lot of work done without permits. Another kitchen added to the basement illegal unit. I was at the property a few times over the summer writing orders, every time I'm there there is something different unfortunately. Appellant finds new things as she is working, improper materials or not knowing how to do that work. Gave a deadline of Labor day, but I was out on medical. October 31 I revoked the Certificate of Occupancy for long-term noncompliance and work without permits and referred to the Vacant Building program.

Moermond: and the letter is dated November 8?

Shaff: that is correct, the letter before said compliance or vacated by November 1.

Moermond: we had the complaint of the triplex and could you tell me, was it a triplex when you inspected?

Shaff: it was converted to a triplex. 150 side had two units; an additional one added in the basement.

Staff report by Supervisor Matt Dornfeld: made a Category 2 Vacant Building November 12, 2024 per inspector Hesse. Not much to add to that report. We opened a Category 2 Vacant Building per that revocation referral.

Moermond: it looks like ownership is Page Me, LLC, is that you?

Schultz: it is. I was just hoping for my time. I just started my business in January so funds are limited. I kind of bit off more than I can chew. I have a contractor working

on things now. I took a bathroom out, converted it back into a duplex and have a contractor on the line also that will help me do the rest of the work.

Moermond: the kitchen still needs to be removed?

Schultz: kitchen and bathroom have been removed. Deck has been worked on. I've done flooring. I filled the bird holes. It is a long list. I've been devoting my life to fixing this up since this all started. It has been very costly for me. I don't want to stop now when I'm almost finished.

Walsh: we're working on our civil agreement. I haven't started yet; I wanted this meeting first before we sign and proceed.

Moermond: up until this point Ms. Schultz has been doing the work, but now you're engaging Mr. Walsh?

Schultz: yes. I also hired a plumber for the permits for the bathroom. I'm new to all this and it has been a learning process. I didn't even know what Department of Safety & Inspections was. I'm a single mom trying to start my business and jungle my two little girls. I've been overwhelmed.

Wells: she's been doing some of the work but I've met with Ms. Shaff and talked to her about an overall remodeling permit and I'll take over inspections at that point.

Moermond: can you put together a bid, with a work plan and money to pay it and we can look at an extension. Can you two put something together?

Schultz: absolutely.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 12/3/2024

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy

- 7 **RLH VO 24-33** Appeal of Jerry A. Brashier to a Revocation of Fire Certificate of Occupancy and Order to Vacate at 511 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST. (Refer to January 7, 2025 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Noecker

Refer to LH January 7, 2024 at 1:30 pm. Engineering analysis for consideration of extension required for items 1, 3, 4 5 & 7 by no later than COB January 3, 2025. Grant to Feb 1, 2025 for items 2 and 6 (Item 10 completed 11/26/24). Item 8 to be completed by January 6, 2025.

Jerry Brashier, owner, appeared

Moermond: so, we have two cases on today, one is the intermodal container and my recommendation won't change on that. If you want a different deadline for that, my recommendation has not changed.

Let's get to the materials you submitted. We were looking for a plan and some bids to get us rolling. I have the word expensive in it, but no bids.

Brashier: I'm still waiting on a bunch. They're all over the map. Anderson was supposed to come yesterday, but they rescheduled for next Monday. A lot of people are out far on bids.

Moermond: ok and Ms. Shaff, am I remembering correctly there were windows installed without permit?

Shaff: yes, the appellant stated he did replace some windows but that he was scared he was going to get in trouble.

Moermond: what we really need is the permit to be pulled for that work.

Brashier: no, I thought we were waiting for this to go forward. Forgive me if that is wrong. I can do it today if you want.

Moermond: so, the plan numbering isn't in alignment with the order numbering.

Brashier: its there but its all over a dates and time frames.

Moermond: the first item is exterior foundation. The first item on yours has to do with exterior rear electrical fixtures.

Brashier: see how it says A 2, that's the second category, but it's the first one in the time frame requesting to February 1, 2025 to get it done.

Number 1 is under subheading number 2. Request to August 1, 2025. Items 1 and 3.

Moermond: you have WHY here, tell me more.

Brashier: my bids were becoming between \$8,000 and \$22,000. I told Joanna I sent you my musings. I was just questioning why there is such a discrepancy, what are they seeing that someone else isn't. Why they vary that much.

Moermond: Ms. Shaff, item one the exterior the ask is through August 1, 2025. Are there safety issues with falling brick?

Shaff: it is so hard to say. There are so many missing pieces and tuckpointing. It is really soft in places. I'm surprised it hasn't failed but I don't know where it will. There's been a lot of deferred maintenance.

Moermond: that is evident.

Shaff: it will eventually.

Moermond: this is a brick veneer?

*Brashier: the foundation is one aspect, but the tuckpointing is a different contractor than the foundation repair.
Number 5 is the costliest aspect. Number 1 is substantially less which is why I have different timelines. My bids are from 2022, and I've reached out to them for new bids. They have to come out and reassess. As soon as I get them I will try to get you everything you want.*

Moermond: why haven't you done it yet?

Brashier: I've reached out for the bids. They have to come and do their calculations.

I've talked to windows, foundation, pointing, tuckpointing, repointing, even a chimney organization.

Moermond: that's a lot of contractors with no bids.

Brashier: which is why I was doing the gantt chart. To show the calendars to get all the bids

Moermond: what gantt chart?

Brashier: a time-frame chart. A gantt chart—

Moermond: I know what a gantt chart is. Do I have it here?

Brashier: no. If you read the beginning of the letter I submitted it says what I was trying to do and why I "forgoed" it because I don't have any bids still so it makes no sense. But I only had 2 weeks to try and get bids.

Shaff: this was approved with corrections at one point with a lot of these things noted.

Moermond: that was winter? Cold weather?

Brashier: which one are we working on?

Moermond: the exterior items that would have been....Ms. Shaff do you have your orders?

Shaff: I'm pulling it up. At that time, a year ago, October 21, 202---wait a minute. Almost a year later.

Brashier: but the foundation and tuckpointing weren't called out as problems at that time. If you look at the original orders they weren't cited as problems. Not until October of 2024, now it has come into call. But they didn't exist a year ago.

[recess]

Moermond: exterior foundation we don't have a bid yet.

Brashier: I called people and did measurements myself. I called a couple companies and they said between \$8,000 and \$22,000. Trying to get someone out and they said they'd get us on the schedule to get an estimator out. So, I only have ballpark numbers for the foundation. Tuckpointing and repointing from 2022 with IMR and the other company. Those were just the top of the windows and up, so it misses 90% of the rest of the building on those.

Moermond: Number 1, 6 and 10—why is 6 a February 1?

Brashier: I thought it was super basic, I need a custom vent cover made. I contacted them once a week to order. I found them on amazon.com.

Moermond: how long does the custom work take?

Brashier: it's a good question. I wouldn't think that long. If I need to I'll get out there with a heat gun and do it myself, but I just want to make sure it is done right and done once. Reaching out to fabricators of said product, I don't know how long because no one has got back to me. Based on what their website said I thought it would be

"signed sealed and delivered" as Stevie Wonder would say, but it hasn't been like that yet.

Moermond: for the smoke detector affidavit you have February 1?

Brashier: I've done numerous times, 3 times since December 26, 2023.

Moermond: why is this still on the list Ms. Shaff?

Shaff: we haven't received one.

Brashier: Mr. Chute came with one to be filled out on the first inspection, and I filled it out right then. I can do it today. I just was trying to lump them together.

Moermond: we're giving him the form and this should be returned to Daryl Chute?

Shaff: it can go to me at this point.

Moermond: so that's done. We have a couple August dates. I'm a bit concerned about the back decking and floor boards and beams and joists in number 3. That puts it out 10 months.

Brashier: I did replace everything he questioned initially, on the October inspection there were more and different boards. Ms. Shaff came out and cited the landing as well as a couple other boards. They're different than the other ones. Those were taken care of 100%. These are different.

Moermond: so, we have these, and you want to August 1. Ms. Shaff, I'm wondering about the safety element of this. I know we can't predict when things fail.

Shaff: it is clearly rotten and coming apart. It isn't necessarily weather dependent. I also have concerns with the structure itself. The stairs and the deck.

Moermond: is this necessary exiting from the second level?

Shaff: I haven't been inside but I am guessing it is. It is clearly being used.

Brashier: everything we're currently talking about wasn't found until this October.

Moermond: my question is what is the safety I have to balance.

Brashier: all the boards I am happy to put new ones in. I wrote in here, I can understand all the concerns, I just need to know the extent. A few boards, I already put screws in the ones she was concerned about popping. They'd come loose since the last inspection. Ms. Shaff pointed out the landing and thought there was deflection in the stairs and pointed out the underside, whoever built it, the entire structure (posts, beam, deck), we're in the realm of \$30,000. That's replacement. I can certainly do that myself. I've been a union carpenter for many years, if I can't build a deck we have bigger problem. But it is a lot of money in materials. It is time, demo, I've had shoulder reconstruction. It depends on the scope of work. If it is just the loose boards, that's been done. She did cite the landing as looking rough. I totally get it. I did not know it doesn't meet code.

Moermond: soft, cracked, water damage and uneven.

Brashier: uneven I assume are the ones I put screws in. Soft crack, if you run through

it with a power washer, it just has a tendency to showcase the warping or bending.

Moermond: are you a certified building official?

Brashier: no.

Moermond: Ms. Shaff is and she's citing those things.

Shaff: the floor boards are rotten. You can screw it all day long but if the structure underneath is rotten it is still rotten. This is deteriorated wood.

Moermond: the first thing I want to know is if this is mandatory exiting under the fire code for this level.

Shaff: are there entrances to all the units from the front of the building?

Brashier: yes ma'am.

Moermond: so, no primary exiting from rear. Next has to do with square footage for the rear exit?

Shaff: possibly. I would have to get into a lot. I'd have to go through the building again if that is what you're asking.

Moermond: does this get an extension and condemned for a period of time until it is fixed. If it is a necessary exit that isn't a strategy, if it isn't that is a strategy. The other piece is if there was a structural engineer who took a look and said it was ok, they're putting their initials on the state of this decking. City has made a call but if you bring in something that says differently we'd have staff review that.

Brashier: this wasn't my work; it came with the building.

Moermond: I'm not saying it was. Trying to make and prove it is safe. If it isn't necessary exiting then we have different options. Condemning it is a temporary solution. With stairs there there is an expectation that it be functional.

Brashier: are they no longer functional?

Moermond: Ms. Shaff is saying the stairs are rotted.

Brashier: oh, the stairs?

Moermond: she says floor boards. Ms. Shaff has already made the call they aren't properly installed. If you want it to continue it, you need to show it is ok. Wood isn't the same 10 years ago as it is now.

Brashier: right, we went from ACQ to CCA, etc., etc. Can't even use the same fasteners.

Moermond: if you have someone who can put their engineering license on it being solid.

Brashier: it may be more cost effective to just put new boards on. Ms. Shaff can you clarify the scope of work?

Shaff: it is in the order itself. Let me be clear. You are the building owner and I am

finding issues and it is your responsibility to fix it and make it right. It isn't the City's or mine.

Brashier: I'm here with you 100%.

Shaff: it is up to you to find someone to put their initials on it being structurally fine. If you can put a plan together and the building official say its fine. We can't design it. It is your job as the building owner to present us with a Code Compliant building.

Brashier: that sounds fair.

Moermond: I don't have solid information the floor boards are solid or properly supported. I need that as part of my analysis on whether an extension is appropriate.

Brashier: safety is paramount.

Moermond: I know it wasn't written before. I'd like you to have a chance to get someone out there.

Brashier: truly I want to put a new deck on, but the finances are difficult. I want it safe and healthy and good, but ideally I'd tear it off and put something nice up. Otherwise, what time frame are we looking at?

Moermond: that's what I'm struggling with. That's the question of mandatory exiting comes in. If it is, it is a lot shorter leash on it.

Brashier: there are four units in the building and I occupy two.

Shaff: 2 apartments on the second floor and they both have an exit out the front?

Brashier: yes.

Shaff: then we shouldn't have a problem.

Moermond: I'd like to give an extension to August 1 on condition the stairs are taken out of operation until the job is done. Some sort of taping needs to be done to prevent their use. If a structural engineer isn't saying its ok, then we say it isn't ok. Then you have time to fix.

Brashier: I'll try to do both.

Moermond: and whatever you get, we want our engineer to sign off on it.

Shaff: wouldn't it be a good idea to have them look at the integrity of the brick as well?

Moermond: I think that is practical but I'm going to focus on the exiting. If the argument is that it doesn't need to be done because it is fine, then yes it is an engineering consult to say its fine.

Shaff: right, or what the fix is.

Moermond: right, same principle applies to foundation and walls. I would not be willing to go as what you are proposing here. For items 4 and 5, you want December 30, 2027.

Brashier: that's please.

Moermond: I've never given a multi-year extension like that. I'd definitely want a structural engineer to evaluate that. Those are serious things, items 1 and 2 under 4. That can't be a 3-year job.

Brashier: there was a windstorm and hail damage and my insurance company for the metal coping, the tin on top of the parapet walls, the claim went through and Bayport roofing has held off on it now. I went up because I didn't want it to be just sitting there while I was waiting and grabbed a break and bent—it isn't the correct age; it isn't the correct any of it—its just something rather than nothing while I wait for the insurance and Bayport to finish things on their end to get up there and do the work.

Shaff: how long has that been going on?

Brashier: it has been too long. Early spring was when it happened. At the end of the day, I want things safe and to make sure things are done and done right.

Moermond: if you have a contractor and insurance set up to do the roof, a 3-year wait seems unreasonable.

Brashier: just the coping. The parapets would be a whole different animal. The parapets and repointing and tuckpointing. I talked to Charles During the rep from Bayport and he said if you need to work on that to keep him in the loop because they want to put in brand new coping on walls that have to be replaced, then I'd have to pay for it twice. The coping is just the top of the walls.

Shaff: to keep the water out.

Brashier: Bayport said not to put up new coping on walls you may have to tear down.

Shaff: so, you also talked to Bayport about the condition of the walls.

Brashier: no, this is all new, after talking with you.

Moermond: you don't have a bid or professional having looked at number 5, except for what you have from 2022 about the tuckpointing?

Brashier: what was the question?

Moermond: the basic question is why on earth would it take 3 years if you have insurance and a contractor there and your answer was that if the parapet needs to be rebuilt?

Brashier: exterior walls I looked at as the tuckpointing. The repointing and the parapet walls. That is about \$300,000 when you get bids. \$300,000, not that it matters to anyone at the City—

Moermond: that's not fair.

Brashier: I didn't mean to be disrespectful I just meant, we're talking safety.

Moermond: and that's where I'm at. We should be splitting those out but I think the roof leaking is more important than the tuckpointing.

Brashier: the roof isn't leaking.

Moermond: this says visible gaps between panel and structure.

Brashier: there's no roof leaks of any kind.

Shaff: we're talking about at the top of the parapet walls.

Brashier: oh, the metal coping. The metal coping, there are no gaps up there.

Shaff: from what we could see from the ground there clearly are.

Brashier: it is a newer EPDM roof, that was contingent upon me buying the building, the bank had me put a brand-new roof on. The EPDM roof overlaps the parapet and overhangs. The coping I put up temporarily after we had our big wind hair storm, the temporary non-correct gauge coping I put up is what you are talking about? Then yes, the coping I put up has gaps. Is it leaking? No, no. There is still an EPDM roof under that coping. There are NO roof leaks whatsoever. Zero problems with roof integrity. The coping is just not the correct gauge, on top of the parapets.

Shaff: that may be something for the engineer to tell us also.

Moermond: I'm really looking for the engineer to say something because if the coping isn't installed correctly the panels are not lining up. I've seen building with water that got in between the brick fascia and the wood structure and the wood fails.

Brashier: maybe the best thing to do is just take the parapets away. Just get rid of them.

Moermond: that's up to you.

Brashier: I like the look, but if is going to cause me grief—there are certainly no leaks in the roof. If the parapets don't look right, then just get rid of them.

Moermond: what you're calling coping and they're calling panels is what is being spoken to here.

Brashier: when they said panels I thought they meant the cosmetic wood on the back, that the tuckpointers asked me to remove for the bid for the tuckpointing. The term for the metal or clay tiles on top of the parapet wall, the construction term for that is coping. Can be clay tile coping, steel, various wood coping. That's why I was confused when we were talking panels.

Shaff: the best course of action would be to have an engineer look at the walls, the coping roof assembly. The appellant went so far as to ask me if I thought it would be a good idea to just peel all the brick off. I'm at the point where it would be good to have an outside---we need a code compliant building. If it is called out, it needs to be code compliant, or prove that we're wrong.

Moermond: I'm leaning in the direction of doing that also. The engineering reports I've seen we can have it so they give specifics about what needs to be done and by when in their professional opinion.

Shaff: typically, we get a report that tells us what the repair would be.

Brashier: I just want to make sure everyone knows; I want to give you what you want.

That's where I said, I know the building envelope is strong. The structural integrity of the building—

Shaff: we want a minimally code compliant building at the end of the day.

Brashier: I want to exceed that.

Moermond: windows installed without permit, let's get that permit taken care of. I don't see why that can't be pulled and finalized by end of year.

Brashier: that shouldn't be a problem. I haven't pulled a permit in years. I'm a qualified employee, as we know, the technical term. I'm capable of obtaining a contractor's license for any organization. That's what being a contractor means in the State of Minnesota as I'm sure you know better than me. I got that license in the 90's when it was a very different process. Since then, I've just been the job site superintendent for many companies. You know the drill. But yes, pull the permit. Moving on.

Moermond: we have the February 1 deadline on the damaged electrical fixtures in the back and the west side basement level, the vent cover missing and the dryer ducts. You were going to get a custom piece. I would look for an engineer's report, I think someone can still get out there in December.

Brashier: this is all new to me and I don't know the timeline.

Moermond: we're at an impasse in parts, so calling in a contractor/engineer is the way to go so if the City backs off of its position it can say "this engineer said". Let's stick with the February 1 deadline on those 2 items. We have already the smoke detector affidavit. We will want to review that engineering report no later than—have something in by no later than January 3. Hopefully they can give solid information and we'll use that for part of the basis for extensions and whether they are appropriate.

I think we're talking about all the pieces that have extensions going into 2026 and 2027. With respect to the rear deck that has an August 1 proposed deadline, but if its unsafe we need to make sure it is roped off. If you want it as egress for your tenants, that would be the basis for having an engineer look at it.

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/11/2024

8 **RLH CO 24-10** Appeal of Jerry Brashier to a Correction Notice at 511 MINNEHAHA AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Noecker

Grant to January 1, 2025 for compliance.

[Note: this was referred back with RLH CO-24-33 but no further discussion of matter; see previous hearing minutes]

Referred to the City Council due back on 12/11/2024

9 [RLH VO 24-35](#) Appeal of James Swartwood to a Correction Notice-Reinspection Complaint (which includes condemnation) at 735 COOK AVENUE EAST.

Sponsors: Yang

Rescheduled to December 3, 2024 at 1:30 pm (at PO's request).

Moermond: we received communication from James Swartwood that he wanted to have another week to get his last estimate in.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 12/3/2024