



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, January 18, 2022

8:30 AM

Remote Hearing

Hearing will start at 10:30 a.m.

10:30 a.m. Hearings

Special Tax Assessments

- 1 [RLH TA 21-492](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 575 BRAINERD AVENUE. (File No. J2201E, Assessment No. 228300) (To refer to January 18, 2022 Legislative Hearing)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Layover to LH February 1, 2022 at 10 am (rescheduled per owner's request).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/1/2022

- 2 [RLH TA 21-481](#) Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 575 BRAINERD AVENUE. (File No. J2204E, Assessment No. 228303)

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Layover to LH February 1, 2022 at 10 am (rescheduled per owner's request).

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/1/2022

- 3 **RLH TA 22-6** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1608 CARROLL AVENUE. (File No. J2205E, Assessment No. 228304)

Sponsors: Jalali

Approve the assessment.

No one appeared

Tried calling at 10:45 am and left a voicemail: I am trying to reach Megan Kissinger, this is a Moermond from St. Paul City Council. This is rescheduled from January 18 when you were unavailable. We'll try you back in 5 to 10 minutes.

Tried calling at 11:00 am – Becca answered & transferred to Megan Kissinger. Megan

didn't answer and a voicemail was left at 11:01 am: this is our third attempt to try to reach you about this. I'm going to ask you submit something in writing for those assessments, we have 2 excessive assumption fees for a total of \$279. You should have received an email from my office, and you'll get another one. Please reply to that email with the nature of your appeal.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/23/2022

- 4 RLH TA 22-30** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 1227 MINNEHAHA AVENUE WEST. (File No. J2212A, Assessment No. 228511)

Sponsors: Jalali

Delete the assessment.

No one appeared

Moermond: in doing the background for today's hearing on the cleanup at 1227 West Minnehaha Mai Vang identified the property the Parks crew cleaned up was 1220 Minnehaha. So they did the work there, obviously that was the wrong address. We confirmed there were no orders for 1220 Minnehaha and no assessment forthcoming for 1220 Minnehaha. The proper address didn't get a cleanup and the City is eating these costs. We're asking Mai Vang send an email to the Supervisor about this.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2022

- 5 RLH TA 22-34** Ratifying the Appealed Special Tax Assessment for property at 577 PASCAL STREET NORTH. (File No. J2212A, Assessment No. 228511)

Sponsors: Jalali

Continue the PH to September 28, 2022. If no same or similar violations reduce assessment from \$442 to \$221 and make payable over 3 years. If approved in full make payment over 3 years.

Theola McNeill, owner, appeared via phone

[Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Lisa Martin: a Summary Abatement Order was issued October 21, 2021 to remove and dispose of a mattress from rear of property. Compliance was October 28. Still there upon reinspection. Work was done October 29 for a total assessment of \$442.

Moermond: looks like we have 2 mattresses that were removed. Why are you appealing?

McNeill: I was unaware they took those mattresses because I actually paid someone to take them. I thought they wanted the whole back property items removed. I was out of town in Portland until the 23. I didn't even see the piece of mail until I got in. I didn't even know they removed it.

Moermond: October 23 and 24?

McNeill: that's when I saw the notice. I called them and said I would have it cleaned up. I didn't know they took the mattresses.

Moermond: yeah, it looks like you didn't have it done on deadline.

McNeill: no, I didn't. I understand the assessment. I didn't know it was for the mattresses. I wasn't in town when it happened. I can't afford that much money. I'm on a fixed income and just found out my husband has a brain tumor. We've been dealing with that the last few weeks. Social services are involved. This is a terrible time for me to have a \$500 assessment. I know the City needs money too. It is just a bad time for me, that's all. Is there any way it can be less? I did pay someone to clean up the whole backyard.

Martin: there isn't a history at this property.

Moermond: let's keep it so there are no future problems. This goes to Council March 2. I'll ask them to continue the matter to September 28. If there are no more violations we'll cut the assessment in half and make it payable over 3 years.

McNeill: that would be fine.

Moermond: so make sure snow is shoveled and things are picked up. Looks like you haven't had a problem in the past.

McNeill: I won't have a problem, I promise. I appreciate you helping me out now, I really need the help.

Moermond: I hope things improve for you ma'am.

Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2022

Special Tax Assessments-ROLLS

- 6 **RLH AR 22-6** Ratifying the assessments for Property Clean Up services during October 1 to 13, 2021. (File No. J2211A, Assessment No. 228510)
- Sponsors: Brendmoen
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2022**
- 7 **RLH AR 22-7** Ratifying the assessments for Property Clean Up services during October 15 to 29, 2021. (File No. J2212A, Assessment No. 228511)
- Sponsors: Brendmoen
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2022**
- 8 **RLH AR 22-8** Ratifying the assessments for Equipment and Labor for Clean Up services during August to October 2021. (File No. J2213A, Assessment No. 228512)
- Sponsors: Brendmoen
- Referred to the City Council due back on 3/2/2022**

1:00 p.m. Hearings**Vacant Building Registrations**

- 9 [SR 22-11](#) Review Request for Appeal of Shekita Moore to a Vacant Building Registration Notice at 201 GENESEE STREET.

Sponsors: Brendmoen

Layover to LH January 25, 2021 at 1 pm. Property rep to submit work plan by noon January 21, 2021. If work plan approved, property to be reinspected the week of January 31, 2021.

Kristina Serrano, property management, appeared via phone

Moermond: we had a chance to talk to the tenant last week, she can't join us this week. She's requesting additional time to stay in the property. We've already given a couple extensions and from what I can tell you haven't done any repairs. She hasn't paid rent for a couple months and that hasn't triggered any action. Looking to you for some background on where the owner and property management are at on this?

Serrano: the company consists of me and the owner. We have struggled with finding independent contractors that will follow through with the job. We have to use independent contractors because larger companies view the maintenance as too small of a job. We've had a big issue there. We've had contractors that accepted the job, don't follow through. It has been a struggle that way too. With all these properties they do have mortgages, we pay some of the utilities, so without the rent coming in it makes it so we can't pay. I do any maintenance work I can by myself. I do plan to do more. The water damage in her unit isn't the water damage you think. There was a hole cut in the ceiling to make sure there wasn't a leak and the plumbing was good. They weren't closing the shower curtain. The caulking does need to be redone around the tub and it needs to be patched. It isn't unlivable or a serious issue within the unit. I have been sick, I haven't been able to go. Now I'm better. I did talk to Shekita yesterday to schedule a time to come out. She started a new job and is going to call me back, so waiting to hear back from her so I can get back in there.

Moermond: and what is different now than it was before? Your certificate was revoked in September. We had a hearing early November. What is different now than it was then that now you will take care of it?

Serrano: honestly, my health. I can do it myself. Outside issues we may need an extension due to weather but some can be completed too. So the difference is doing it myself versus having a contractor.

Moermond: and you haven't started?

Serrano: no, I just contacted her to schedule a time to get it done.

Moermond: Ms. Shaff, any comments?

Shaff: we have plenty of other property owners that have to hire contractors to get things done. This is just an extreme amount of time and we've, quite frankly, are going

through this with other properties you have. A lot of deferred maintenance. Things get dragged out and don't happen. I can't see where giving more time would make any difference other than delay the inevitable.

Moermond: Ms. Serrano, what kind of guarantee can you give me here? I can understand the exterior stuff. But the interior stuff has been in play for so many months. I'm troubled. The tenant has been taking action. It is like you don't care whether they have a place to live or not. That's the way it would read to me. I'm sure you're aware of the Vacant Building fee and it becoming a Category 2 and going through the Code Compliance Inspection process. It is penny wise and pound foolish to use the approach you've been using.

Serrano: I understand the lack of confidence. The issue was the same with all of our units, not being able to find reliable maintenance. I have done some of the maintenance and unfortunately I've been getting sick, but now I am feeling better. I will definitely do this. I can keep you updated as each task is done. Honestly, our properties, we don't make a lot of money when people pay the rent on time. The company was started for people who have barriers in finding houses. Like Shekita, she has barriers and plus section 8. Because it was a different county, the section 8 workers didn't do their part so she could move. Most of our tenants do have barriers. That's why the owner started this company. This isn't a company that just doesn't care about their tenants. When people didn't pay their rent pre pandemic, we didn't put evictions on people. We lose money, but this isn't a for profit company. It is to help people who have barriers. The owner experienced this as well.

Moermond: and I'm having trouble with targeting people who have barriers, not keeping their houses in repair, and then they have barriers moving elsewhere. There is a fine line between exploitation and assistance. Receiving rent and not doing repairs under the guise of doing assistance doesn't really wash for me. If you can get your Certificate of Occupancy reinstated I can give an extension on some of these exterior things. Ms. Shaff, are there more recent orders than September?

Shaff: no, it doesn't appear so. Not other than the revocation. We haven't been able to get anything done. Isn't Daryl Lewis a contractor?

Serrano: not that I'm aware of.

Shaff: seems to me he has done a lot of work on these over the years. I've known him many years.

Serrano: he's had health issues and a lot of "travesty" in his family. Losing people for different reasons. It isn't an issue of people not caring. Life has happened. The pandemic has been a big issue. We are affected as individuals too. I know it can be hard to tell between a company that is struggling and trying to help and being exploitive. I understand that piece.

Shaff: I have to stop you there. This isn't the first time we've gone around and around on a property. Because tenants are in compromised positions doesn't mean they should live in compromised housing. This is the same story I've received month after month on many properties.

Moermond: What's your ability to put together a work plan in the next few days? To do these in a tight timeline?

Serrano: I can get started right away.

Moermond: do you still have the September 21 orders?

Serrano: I am sure I have it on file somewhere.

Moermond: we'll get you a fresh set. I need to see that proposal and work plan by Friday. That should have all of the interior items done in 2 weeks. The exterior, weather dependent items, I will entertain an extension on. The ones that are not weather dependent I need done too. Lots of these don't need 70 degree items to handle. I can decide next week whether there should be an extension based on that plan. It is on you now.

Serrano: what should the proposal look like?

Moermond: take this set of orders and indicate when you'll do them. We'll have an inspector come to check if they are done and if they are not, a vacate date will be put into effect. It is a one shot deal.

Serrano: I'll have that to you by Friday at the latest.

Moermond: I'll share that with the inspector and hopefully they can schedule an inspection for you the week of January 31.

Shaff: this file is being reassigned to me.

Moermond: February 15 will be the vacate date. Joanna Zimny will send the orders out to you today so you have them to work off of.

Serrano: thank you for your time.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 1/25/2022

10 RLH VBR 22-6

Appeal of Ann Tran to a Vacant Building Registration Requirement at 754 SHERBURNE AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thao

Waive the VB fee for 90 days (to April 6, 2022). Make property a Cat 1 VB.

Ann Tran, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: looks like we've had this in hearing a couple of times before. Today we're talking about Vacant Building status. [Moermond gives background of appeals process]

Staff report by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: back in August they were given until November 12 to get their Fire Certificate of Occupancy reinstated. They got an extension to December 31, 2021. They failed to meet that deadline, so it was referred to Vacant Buildings.

Dornfeld: we opened a Category 2 Vacant Building on January 5, 2022 per that revocation report by Inspector Hoffman.

Moermond: can you see the permit activity on this property?

Shaff: there is open ventilation permit pulled January 11, 2022. Also one pulled November 23 of 2021. Electrical and plumbing permits still open, as well as a remodel permit still open.

Moermond: where are you at on this Ms. Tran?

Tran: this isn't fair. We understand in general the idea behind the Vacant Building fine to deter absent landlords from having properties that aren't fit to occupy. That isn't the case here. We are remodeling. It is extensive. We are doing plumbing, electrical, mechanical, tile in bathroom, new cabinets in kitchen. When it is done it will be a lot of money. We paid for permits. We're buying things from St. Paul businesses. We're improving the neighborhood. When it is complete we will rent to tenants who enjoy the high quality place to live. It isn't vacant. It is being remodeled. We shouldn't be fined for remodeling. How is that fair? It isn't fair. No one is going to remodel a building; it takes more time and costs more than planned. Just like the City's projects sometime take longer and cost more than they think. With the pandemic things are taking longer and people are unavailable. Have you heard of the drywall shortage? I'm not asking for anything special. I'm asking for time to do a proper remodel without being fined for remodeling a building. That is not fair.

Moermond: and to be complete about this. This was a rental property when the orders were written revoking the certificate. The tenant moved out the day before our last hearing when we spoke. It needs to have a Fire Certificate of Occupancy. It hasn't had one or been occupied since that time. You did get an extension taking into account Covid and supply chain issues. What is your timeline for finishing?

Tran: I need 90 more days, to the end of April.

Moermond: you are in the Vacant Building program, but I'm going to waive the Vacant Building fee for 90 days. That takes you to April 6. If it goes longer we can look at prorating it when it is processed as a tax assessment. We'll cut it down to size if need be. Because this is an investment property that was occupied by a tenant and the certificate was revoked while I tenant was living there. I do want to give you that chance to get it fixed without that fee. It doesn't make sense to have it be a Category 2 since you have permits filed. We'll make you a Category 1. Before you rent it again you need your Fire Certificate of Occupancy reinstated. You have some time to do that with no fee.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/2/2022

1:30 p.m. Hearings

Orders To Vacate - Fire Certificate of Occupancy

2:00 p.m. Hearings

Fire Certificates of Occupancy

- 11 [RLH FCO 21-185](#) Appeal of Daniel Burgess, 3M Aviation, to a Fire Certificate of Occupancy Correction Notice at 680-690 BAYFIELD STREET.

Sponsors: Noecker

Layover to LH February 8, 2022 at 2 pm for final discussion.

Daniel Burgess, 3M, appeared via phone

Moermond: we are following up with you about the orders on Bayfield. I think we have an answer for you today. I inquired with the Building Official about his thoughts on what happened with the building permits back in the day when they were connected. What he did was to look at the photos and talk to the Fire Inspector. They agree that what would work would be for you to do your best to patch the holes where possible, and they would accept the remaining conditions as is. That's the best outcome possible. You could meet with Mitch on site to see what needs to be done or come up with a plan. What kind of deadline would be reasonable?

Burgess: the west hanger, 690, that one is relatively easy. I would think a couple months. The one closer to the river has more challenges. It would be beneficial to have Mitch come out to see what is acceptable to close it up. That space is a little different.

Shaff: that sounds reasonable. I think he would be a good resource as the site to go through what would work and is acceptable threshold for repair.

Moermond: let's get you and Mitch connected the next few weeks. A couple months extension on 690 is acceptable. We'll talk again February 8, can Mr. Imbertson get out before then?

Shaff: yes, he should be able to.

Moermond: I'd like to revisit this and put it to bed February 8, I think you'll have landed on a timeline by then. We can put an extension in place then. Connect with Mr. Imbertson.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/8/2022

12 RLH FCO 22-4

Appeal of Bill Xu to a Fire Safety Inspection Appointment at 376 FULLER AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thao

Grant the appeal of the Fire C of O Appointment letter. Next reinspection cycle to begin May 2025.

Bill Xu, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: we left things off of trying to figure out what the grade would have been and where we go from there. Ms. Shaff, you went back in the record to see what grade the building was, because you thought it wasn't an A grade. That was told to Mr. Xu by front desk staff incorrectly. What did you find?

Shaff: most deficiencies have a point value attached. I went through the November 2019 letter and the assigned point values, and they equaled 36. What happens is we use a divisor by unit in order to get the scores within Chapter 40's parameters. So divided by 3 is 12. A buildings are 0 through 5 points. B 6 through 10. C buildings being 11 through 41. After that it would be a D. This building came out to be a class

C, which requires a Certificate of Occupancy inspection 2 years later. As we talked about in the last hearing, this isn't after you get it all done. It is from the inspection. It may take you a while to get done, as reflected in the record, but the clock started ticking way before that for the next 2 year inspection.

Xu: what is the formula divided by 3? What does that mean? It is a 5 unit building.

Shaff: then I am totally wrong. So that would be 5 and some change.

Moermond: are the City records correct as to the number of units?

Shaff: I could be totally wrong and my apologies.

Moermond: yes, Stamp indicates 5 units. So we have an inspection appointment letter that went out to schedule an inspection in January of 2022. He finished his last inspection cycle in 2019. So six years would be 2025?

Shaff: it actually started May of 2019.

Xu: I purchased October 2019

Shaff: right, but it goes with the old owner. You purchased partially through an inspection cycle. It doesn't restart. If we waited until everybody got everything fixed everyone would be an A no matter how bad it started.

Moermond: so the next inspection cycle would be May of 2025 for an A?

Shaff: yes.

Moermond: so I will grant Mr. Xu's appeal and note that his next cycle will begin May of 2025.

Xu: I agree, thank you so much.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/2/2022

13 [RLH FCO 22-1](#)

Appeal of James Sundberg to a Fire Inspection Correction Notice at 1055 LAUREL AVENUE.

Sponsors: Thao

Layover to LH February 8, 2022 at 2 pm for discussion of new Fire C of O orders.

Jim Sundberg, owner, appeared via phone

Moermond: this is Marcia Moermond calling you back about your appeal. It is a complicated answer about the kitchen sink.

Staff update by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: the kitchen sink cannot serve the bathroom also. There needs to be a separate sink for sanitation issues. What we find going back is that there is far more to it. Basically to be considered a dwelling unit the code talks about having its own area for kitchen for eating and preparing food. As we talked last time you supply a fridge, but the microwave, hot plate, etcetera was supplied by the tenant.

Sundberg: sometimes.

Shaff: in order for this to be its own unit it needs permanent facility for preparing food. We are looking for a kitchen in the unit separated from the bathroom and the bathroom having its own sink.

Moermond: so what we have is a situation where this is neither an apartment nor a room in a boarding house. If it were an apartment unit it would have its own bathroom and kitchen facilities. In a boarding house it would have access to bathroom and kitchen facilities that are shared. This doesn't meet either of those definitions. It is closest to being its own unit but lacks a kitchen. Providing a kitchen isn't in the orders you received. You have an order on a kitchen sink. So what you are talking about hasn't been written to deal with. He only has the kitchen sink to deal with at the moment. What strikes me is we're asking for a kitchen sink without a kitchen. So he wins on that but ultimately kind of loses because he needs to provide a kitchen for the unit. What are the component parts to constitute a kitchen or kitchenette?

Shaff: having its own sink, having a refrigerator, and having a range/oven. Those permanent appliances. The bathroom would need to be separated from the kitchen.

Sundberg: it is now, separate from the living room.

Shaff: it needs a kitchen and a separate bathroom.

Moermond: ultimately it may need an architect.

Sundberg: this is about 200 square feet. What do you expect to put in a box that big? It has never been that way. You have the drawings of the layout. It is impossible to do what you are asking. It has been this way for 20 years. It has only been advertised as a sleeping room with a separate bathroom. Never been promoted as having a kitchenette. We provide a small dorm sized fridge. No microwave, oven, or range. That's how it has been done 20 years. The most recent inspection was 2015 and it was never brought up. I had 3 prior inspections and it hasn't been brought up. It is unreasonable to expect a property that has been this way for 20 years to provide this when it has never been implied it has this. There is some sort of grandfathering that would be reasonable. Every tenant has accepted it as is, with appropriate rent. I understand the kitchen sink has to be separate from the bathroom. Where does code say it has to have a kitchen in the unit? I would be hard pressed there isn't another situation like this in renovated duplexes throughout the City. I think this is an unreasonable request for the property. Why would this come up after 20 years? I'm not sure how many times it was inspected prior to our ownership. I understand if it has a kitchen why it would need to be separate. I just don't understand why it needs a kitchen.

Moermond: I don't have an order saying you have to have a kitchen. I have an order saying you need a kitchen sink. Which is incomplete. That implies a whole bunch of things. I am thinking the department is going to amend its orders, and I'm not sure what those reissued orders will look like. I'm not sure if I do if I would look at it or someone else would. I understand it has been operating this way, you've done so in good faith. No one is trying to take advantage of anyone. It is neither an apartment nor a rooming house. That is where the problem lies. Both those cases have kitchen access. It isn't a dormitory, that's for sure. I'd like the Department to clean up its orders so its expectations are clear and we can talk about what specifically is being looked for and what deadline we put on it. I'll keep the appeal open while they do that.

The code is actually really clear on it. I don't know circumstances of other buildings. This should have been caught over time, the fact they didn't doesn't mean it isn't a problem. This isn't grandfathered in because of an error like this. Ms. Shaff, what are the department's plans in terms of orders?

Shaff: I'll bring this to Supervisor Neis and we will revise the orders to reflect what would be required and expect it to be out by the end of the week.

Sundberg: if I am reading what Ms. Shaff is saying, you're going to ask for us to add a kitchenette in an area that it is physically impossible to do so. The bed and desk or dresser reduce the area by 50%. For sure 30%. You need a counter, a sink. You have to have so many feet away. You're putting that room out of service, it doesn't seem fair. I'll be appealing to City Council.

Shaff: and that's why we're here. That's what this forum is for. I understand. It isn't personal.

Moermond: and I haven't landed on my recommendation yet. I'm saying I know what the Department needs to do and they haven't put that order in front of me. I have an open book on this right now, so you have a chance to add more information at this level and of course at the Council level after that. There are steps. We can pause, grant your appeal, and they issue new orders. You win but you lose.

Sundberg: what do you mean by that?

Moermond: you have no kitchen right now. Even if I give that requirement to you, you still lose because they're going to come back with orders you need a kitchen. With the other orders coming down the pike you still have that to deal with. Unfortunately that wasn't in the first set of orders so it wasn't clear what the nature of the discussion should have been.

Sundberg: if you are going to require that. What can I do that I haven't done already that is going to change the City's outlook?

Moermond: I can't tell you what your argument should be. I can say that I would look at what the costs are, perhaps talk to a designer and find out affordable options. I honestly don't know.

Sundberg: honestly, you are saying I need permits and approval if this were to be required.

Moermond: yes, the installation of a stove would require a permit. Adding or changing where your plumbing fixtures are would require permits. That would be part of it too. The third piece is if you do need to do this is when the deadline would be on it. You have just received this information and I want to give you a chance to think through how you want to handle it. How about we talk again in 3 weeks' time about your thoughts on this?

Sundberg: ok.

Moermond: that's February 8 to have that conversation. Then I have a chance to react to the new orders as well.

Sundberg: can you react to the orders prior to February 8?

Moermond: I need to do it on the record.

Sundberg: ok. But you'll have an opinion then?

Moermond: of course. I'm sorry it has taken the turn it has. We'll keep trying and we'll talk again February 8.

Sundberg: if I anticipate that rewritten request, does that mean it has to get done? Or is that your decision?

Moermond: it is what I recommend to Council and it is the Council's decision. It is still an open question.

Laid Over to the Legislative Hearings due back on 2/8/2022

**14 RLH FCO
21-192**

Appeal of Pramol Mathew to a Re-Inspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 776 REANEY AVENUE.

Sponsors: Yang

Grant to August 1, 2022 for compliance, on condition the garage remains unused and secured from entry.

Pramol Mathew, property manager, appeared via phone

Moermond: we have had a chance for the structural engineer to go by and I know you've talked to professionals on your own as well. What I'm going to do is tell you I asked the engineer to look at it and ask Ms. Shaff to summarize those findings.

Staff update by Supervisor Leanna Shaff: Mr. Karpen said the walls are out of plumb and leans to the north and is in need of repair or replacement. It has added additional stresses to the walls. It will fail, it is hard to say when, but it doesn't appear anyone is in imminent danger but snowfall and additional stresses may worsen conditions quicker.

Moermond: what have you learned and what are you interested in doing?

Mathew: I talked to two contractors. To repair is out of question because the wood is so old and brittle. Even if you take the load of the roof off, with the siding the whole thing will crack. It would be costly too. They would pull a permit to remove the structure for about \$5,000. For me to remove and put in a new one, the owners are an older couple struggling with Covid and no rent. There is no way to rebuild it, but I'll talk to them about getting it down.

Moermond: I would get a couple of bids on the demolition. We have a list of licensed demo contractors, that may be a good reference for you. We'll include that with your follow up letter. I'm not hearing imminent failure. I heard yes, it will. I'm ok with an extension to deal with it. I'm going to say to August 1, 2022 to address it. I suspect the work can be done for less than \$5,000 though the market is a bit different these days.

Mathew: I am waiting for one contractor who said he would frame it inside, remove siding, put it into plumb. I may be able to do that. With a permit. It would cost at least \$15,000 to do a new garage. If I can save it then I am open to that. I will do anything with a permit of course.

Moermond: this started in August of 2021. We'll go to August 1, 2022 for you to fix it and bring it up to code or to remove it. I have nothing against either route. We just need to have it brought out of its state of failure.

Mathew: thank you for the additional time.

Moermond: We should note the extension is condition upon the garage continuing to be unused.

Referred to the City Council due back on 2/2/2022

15 [SR 22-4](#)

Review an Appeal of Enrique Monjarrez and Erin Delaney (Monjarrez), Trustees, to a Reinspection Fire Certificate of Occupancy With Deficiencies at 785 STRYKER AVENUE adopted by Council on October 13, 2021.

Sponsors: Noecker

Received and filed.

Received and Filed