MINUTES
HEALTH AND BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION
March 5, 2026

After determining that a quorum was present, the Health and Building Standards Commission of the City of Denton, Texas convened in a Special Called Meeting on Thursday, March 5, 2026, at 3:00 p.m. in Training Rooms 1 and 2 at the Development Service Center, 401 N Elm Street, Denton, Texas at which the following items were considered:

PRESENT: Chair Nicholas Stevens, Vice Chair Joshua Ingram, Commissioners: Zachary Cathcart Eric Dafoe, Kyle Minter, and Casey Straughn

ABSENT: Commissioner Doug Ferguson

REGULAR MEETING

Chair Stevens opened the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

A. U.S. Flag
B. Texas Flag

2. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

A. HBS25-017 Consider approval of the January 8, 2026, minutes.

Chair Stevens motioned to approve the January 8, 2026, meeting minutes. Motion seconded by Vice-Chair Ingram. Motion carried.

AYES (6): Chair Stevens, Vice-Chair Ingram and Commissioners: Cathcart, Dafoe, Minter, and Straughn
NAYS (0): None

3. PUBLIC HEARING

A. HBS25-017 Hold a public hearing to consider the issuance of an order to declare a structure substandard and require said substandard structure be secured, repaired, removed and/or demolished. The structure is located on Denton County parcel 36863, addressed as 1415 Meadow Street.

Chair Stevens stated the hearing procedure order:

1. The Chair will swear in witnesses and then open the public hearing.
2. The City will present their case.
3. The property owner, lienholder, or mortgagee may present testimony.
4. Interested parties may present public comment/testimony.
    a. If interested parties testify, then:
        i. Property owner, lienholder, or mortgagee may rebut.
        ii. Staff may rebut.
5. The Board may ask follow up questions of witnesses that weren't previously answered.
6. The City will close their case.
7. The Chair will close the public hearing.
8. HABSCo will deliberate on the City's request(s), and the Chair will open the floor to motions.

Chair Stevens swore in the witnesses.

Chair Stevens opened the public hearing at 3:05 p.m.

Ms. McMahon, Deputy City Attorney called Will Owens, Plan Examiner I, as a witness to go ahead and provide testimony. McMahon asked Owens if he was present during the October 3, 2025, inspection. Owens stated yes he was present. McMahon asked if he had reviewed the power point that her and Amber Rodgers are going to present next. Ownes stated yes. McMahon asked if it was accurate to the inspection. Owens stated yes. McMahon asked Ownes if based on the inspection would it be feasible to repair the structures. Ownes stated no, that the structures in such a state of disrepair that any attempt to repair is not feasible. Ownes stated that as we will see in the slides the nature of the flooring and siding and that the weather has infiltrated the structure they are not salvageable.

Ms. McMahon, Deputy City Attorney called Amber Rodger, Building Official, as a witness to go ahead and provide testimony. McMahon asked Rodgers if she has been out to the site. Rodgers stated that yes, she visited the site yesterday and she had not previously been out as it had been on Billy Ewton, Assistant Building Official, radar, but she did make a site visit yesterday so that she had eyes on the property. McMahon asked if she had confirmed that those conditions hadn't changed since the previous inspection. Rodgers stated that is correct.

Rodgers presented the history of the property. Rodgers stated the house was originally built in 1962, owned by current owner since April 2019. There are two structures on the parcel, the house sits more towards the front and at the back there is a large accessory structure. Work had been completed without permits in July of 2019, that is one of the first times Building Safety got involved with the property. Building safety received a complaint of work without permit so a Stop Work Order was issued and tried to get the owner in compliant. A permit was applied for shortly after the Stop Work Order was issued where staff then went some years of back fourth with revisions to the permit. Community Improvement Services has worked 19 cases since 2021. Building Safety has completed 19 inspections since 2019. McMahon requested Rodgers to provide the big picture related to the case. Rodgers stated initial inspection was done July 2025 after we

realized the house was sitting with no work continuing and had received a complaint for a dangerous building because it was an unsecured structure. Rodgers stated that staff has done some notices of violations that have been sent certified mail in which staff received signatures back from the property owner on all return receipts. Also the owner was scheduled to appear in court on January 13, 2026, but was a failure to appear, that is when staff moved forward with bringing this case to HABSCO.

McMahon requested Rodgers to discuss the notice and title work. Rodgers stated the title work was done at the end of summer 2025 when staff had started working it from the complaint received in July. There were no other lien holders that were found. After the title work was done and Building Safety had attempted to make contact with Mr. Mesta and was not successful, staff reacted out to a known family member, they weren't comfortable providing his information to staff, they offered to pass along staff's information to him. Rodgers continued that staff has still not been able to make contact with him until November 4, 2025, when Community Improvement Services, did speak to him, regarding some liens they were about to fill on the property for grass and weeds and trash debris cleanup. On October 15, 2025, a notice of violation was sent via certified mail to Mr. Mesta that he needed to provide some attention to the property in which he was given until October 29, 2025, to secure a permit. On November 12, 2025, staff was able to confirm that no attempt had been made. McMahon provide a summary of the information provided and Rodgers confirmed.

McMahon stated that staff will now go through each standard the City has determined to the structures on site are dangerous and substandard.

Rodgers provided the findings by showing pictures and discussing the following standards:

A. The building is dangerous because the following standards from Code of Ordinances 17-182 are present:
    1. The building or structure was constructed or maintained in violation of any provision of the city's building codes, fire code or any other applicable ordinance or law of the city, county, state, or federal government and such violation renders the building or structure dangerous to the life, limb, health, property, safety, or welfare of the general public or the occupants of the building or structure.
        - The buildings have not been maintained in some time, the exterior sheathing is extremely weathered, and siding is missing from the gable.

    3. The foundation or the vertical or horizontal supporting members are so damaged or deteriorated as to create a hazard or safety concern.
        - The roof framing and exterior walls have suffered a fair amount of weathering as well due to water infiltration.

    4. The non -supporting coverings of walls, ceilings, roofs, or floors are so damaged or deteriorated as to create a hazard or safety concern.
        - All interior and exterior sheeting has deteriorated from the lack of weatherproofing over the years.

6. The structure or any part thereof has been damaged by fire, water, earthquake, wind, tornado, vandalism, or other causes to such an extent that it has become dangerous to the public health, safety and welfare.
    - The structures have suffered water damage due to the lack of weatherproofing/proper exterior wall and roof coverings, as well as vandalism from being an unsecure structure over the years

7. A portion of a building or structure remains on a site when construction or demolition work is abandoned.
    - Renovations work started in 2019, no permits were ever secured for the work and the project was abandoned.

8. A door, aisle, passageway, stairway, fire escape or other means of egress is not of sufficient width or size, or is damaged, dilapidated, obstructed or otherwise unusable, or so arranged so as not to provide safe and adequate means of egress in case of emergency or need.
    - All windows and doors are missing and currently boarded over with plywood to discourage illegal occupancy

9. The structure, because of its condition, is unsafe, unsanitary, or dangerous to the health, safety or general welfare of the city's citizens including but not limited to all conditions conducive to the harboring of rats or mice or other disease carrying animals or insects reasonably known to spread disease.
    - Holes in the roof, floors, and walls make this structure an easy target for rodents, pests, and insects.

10. The structure has been found to contain visually apparent mold growth of greater than one hundred (100) square feet in the dwelling unit and will require demolition if the remediation of such mold growth would exceed fifty (50) percent of the value of the structure.
    - The walls and floors have several areas of mold from the exterior wall and roof coverings allowing the infiltration of water.

11. Whenever the building or structure has been so damaged by fire, wind, tornado, earthquake, or flood, or has become so dilapidated or deteriorated as to become:
    1.An attractive nuisance to children;
    2.A harbor for unauthorized occupants, criminals, or trespassers; or as to
    3.Enable persons to resort thereto for the purpose of committing unlawful acts
    - Trash and debris left behind from unauthorized occupants can be seen in the top picture

13. The building or structure has any portion, member or appurtenance, ornamentation on the exterior thereof which is not of sufficient strength or stability, or is not so anchored, attached or fastened in place to be capable of safely resisting wind pressure, snow, ice, or other loads.
    - The structures would not be capable of providing resistance to ice, snow, or rain. Sections of the roof are missing.

Will Ownes, Plans Examiner I, provided specific testimony to this standard. Ownes stated that both him and Billy Ewton, fell through the floor at that point in the structure. McMahon clarified that they were both okay but had to use caution and walk on joists. Ownes confirmed that is correct.

14. The electrical system, plumbing system, or mechanical system is totally or partially damaged, destroyed, removed, or otherwise made inoperable, unsafe, hazardous, or unsanitary.
    - The electrical, plumbing, and mechanical systems were removed from the main structure.

15. The building or structure has been determined to be vacant, using the following factors: the percentage of overall square footage of any building on the property or floor to the occupied space, the condition and value of any items in the property and the presence of rental or for sale signs on the property; provided that multi - family residential property containing three (3) or more dwelling units shall be considered vacant when the majority of all of the dwelling units become unoccupied and a majority remain unoccupied. A property shall not be considered vacant which is being currently marketed by the owner or a licensed real estate professional hired by the former or current occupant of the property, and to which the water service has not been shut off.
    - The structure is vacant and has been for several years.

Commissioner Minter asked what permit was pulled in 2019. Staff stated it was for residential alteration. Commissioner Minte asked if there were any plans with the residential alteration. Rodgers stated it honestly went back and fourth, when they first submitted they submitted for residential alteration just to remodel the structure. There was some time between resubmittals, staff had requested additional information in July and revision until October of 2019when revision were received it was a completely different set of plans and something that was larger than a duplex. But staff noted that it was multifamily use they were wanting to do at that time. Staff notified them in October 2019 that in order to change the use from single family to multifamily it would be a different type of permit application and there would be some development processes to go through. In April of 2020 staff received revisions to reinstate the residential permit and for him to move forward with the residential alteration. Comments were sent to the applicant after receiving the revisions in April 2020 and did not receive anything back from him until December of 2020. Again, his submittal wasn't exactly complete in which staff asked for additional items which were received in February 2021 which staff still needed a bit more information. Staff was then able to

approve the permit in March 2021, but the permit fees were never paid and the permit eventually expired.

Vice-Chair Ingram asked it the owner is local. Staff stated he is not local but is in the state. Vice-Chair Ingram asked if his correspondence has been almost none. Rodgers stated since the summer of 2025 almost none.

Chair Stevens asked if there was communication from the owner regarding this meeting. Rodgers stated that a notice of Public Hearing via certified mail and received back that someone at his address signed for it just a few days after it was mailed, but never received any contact.

Commissioner Dafoe if there was any other information related to the accessory structure as the dialog and most information was related to the primary structure. Rodgers noted a picture of the inside of the accessory structure, but stated the main focus when staff was inspecting was the primary structure.

Vice-Chair Ingram asked if staff knows what the accessory structure is intended for. Rodgers stated it looks like it would have been a garage. Rodgers noted the picture that shows where the garage door was.

Chair Stevens asked based on the posting, are we including both buildings. Rodgers stated it would be both structures.

Commissioner Straughn asked what the procedure is for the property itself. Rodgers stated that the owner staff reached out to is the property owner.

Vice Chair Ingram asked about the perimeter of the land. Rodgers stated it is fenced with a chain link fence, which is in okay condition but that a section is dilapidated. Vice-Chair Ingram asked if the fence would be part of the demolition. Rodgers stated she doesn't believe so. Josh Ellison, Neighborhood Services Manager, stated that the fence would remain.

Commissioner Minter asked if the city has determined the cost implications of the demolition, if the owner does not proceed doing it himself. Rodgers stated if the City has to move forward with the demolition, Josh Ellison, with Community Improvement Services has received one quote of what the demolition of both structures and we are currently waiting on a few other vendors to get a quote back from and then that cost would be liened against the property. Rodgers stated the current quote is $23,000.00 for both structures.

Vice-Chair Ingram asked which quote the city usually goes with. Rodgers stated the lowest quote.

Commissioner Minter asked if Staffs recommendation is for the owner to demolished within 30 days, and he pulls a permit to demo in 29 days would there be consideration to extend the time. Charlie Rosendahl, Interim Director of Development Services, stated the process wise is if you were to issue an order for 30 days to demolished staff would then go out to check on day 31 and if still is not demolished then staff would go to court to get a warrant to demolish the structure.

Vice-Chair Ingram asked how long it takes to get a demolition permit. Rosendahl stated in this case staff would issue it on the same day if they had all the right information. Rodgers stated worst case scenario it is 5 days.

Vice-Chair Ingram asked what the timeline would be from vendor to demolish. Ellison stated the are usually a day and it to far out to estimate the time.

Chair Stevens asked if the owner was doing demolition themselves, would staff be lenient on the 30 days. Rosendahl stated that staff would have to come back to HABSCO. Susan Keller, First Assistant City Attorney, stated if they went on the 29th day to get the permit and they said they are coming in three days. Stevens stated that is correct. Keller stated yes, she would imagine leniency would be granted.

McMahon stated before city even proceeds with the demolition we would get a warrant from the Judge, that talks about how staff has waited out the appeals period, property owner hasn't done anything, and staff has done all due diligence please let us proceed. Which would also include a drive by the property to check of what is happening and a check for any permit applications. McMahon continued that for this instance, we would come back to give an update to the Commission but also wouldn't proceed with a City initiated demolition.

McMahon stated that why discussion was occurring, her, Keller and staff did confirm that while the notice of the hearing did talk about multiple structures the agenda posting did not, as Chair Stevens accurately pointed out. McMahon advised therefore the safest course of action is for us to halt the proceedings here and bring the case back at the April 9, 2026, meeting.

Vice-Chair Ingram asked about the verbiage for the fencing, stating that it is not part of the demolition. Keller stated that staff can certainly look at if that is something that needs to be included.

Chair Stevens closed the Public Hearing based on the request from the city and with no action taken, this item will be reset for a later date.

3. CONCLUDING ITEMS

Chair Stevens motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by Vice-Chair Ingram. Motion carried.

AYES (6): Chair Stevens, Vice-Chair Cathcart and Commissioners: Dafoe, Ingram, Minter, and Straughn
NAYS (0): None

The meeting was adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

X _____ 4/13/26

Nicholas Stevens
Chair of Health and Building Standards Commission

Date

X _____ 4/13/26

Cathy Welborn
Administrative Assistant III

Date