

October 15, 2018

Aaron Hanauer  
Senior City Planner  
City of Minneapolis-CPED  
250 South 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Room 300  
Minneapolis, MN 55415

RE: Demolition of Historic Resource-213-215 9<sup>th</sup> Street S

Dear Mr. Hanauer,

On behalf of the eight owners of the property at 213-215 9<sup>th</sup> Street South, I would like to apply for a hearing with the Heritage Preservation Commission for a demolition of a historic resource. As you know there are a number of unfortunate circumstances that have led us to this request.

My family has owned the Oakland Apartments at 213-215 9<sup>th</sup> Street South 1962. The 22 unit apartment building remained consistently rented, but due to the older nature of the building the rents were around \$350 per month. The yearly taxes on the property around \$12,000.00 per year for the land only.

On October 9, 2016, a fire on the third floor severely damaged the third floor and the roof. The rest of the building sustained severe water damage. The building was officially condemned on December 21, 2016. We have received multiple letters of intent and Purchase agreements on the property, all of which have fallen apart.

On February 17, 2017 the City of Minneapolis order the building be razed as a nuisance property with multiple code violations including a need for new roof, new windows and new interior surfaces. When the building contractor applied for the demolition permit the City of Minneapolis determined the property was a historic resource because of its association with architect Harry Wild Jones. We continued to market the property for sale in 2018, but the City started to fine the property \$6,000.00 a year as a nuisance property. We met with the City staff because one agency was asking us to demolish and the other was discussing historic designation and we were conflicted.

The Demolition of a Historic Resource application asks us to explain the following:

1. *The destruction is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property; or*
2. *That there are no reasonable alternatives to the destruction. In determining whether reasonable alternatives exist, the commission shall consider, but not be limited to:*
  - a. *The significance of the property;*
  - b. *The integrity of the property; and*

*c. The economic value or usefulness of the existing structure, including its current use, costs of renovation and feasible alternative uses.*

**Is destruction necessary?**

The building was partially destroyed in the fire and has been vacant since the fire. The City of Minneapolis has determined that the building is unsafe, and it is condemned. We are currently being fined for not razing the building.

**No reasonable alternatives to demolition.**

1. We have marketed the building for the current tax value of the land only and have not received any offers.
2. CPED staff Aaron Hanauer provided the historical information about the significance of the building and it is attached.
3. The current economic value of the building is \$0, but the taxes on the land \$12,000.00. The building is vacant and there is no use. The costs of renovation have not been fully determined, but the insurance company paid \$550,000.00 for full value of the building. Several prospective buyers estimated the rehabilitation of the property at 2.5 to 3 million.

Sincerely,

Meyer Gonyea Partnership