City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale

Section I. Property Information

PROJECT COORDINATORS COMPLETE SECTION I.
ENTIRE FORM MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO MARKETING PROPERTY.
PLEASE ATTACH MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ALL ADJACENT PARCELS

Submitted by: Rebecca Law Phone #: 5064 Date: 3/10/2008 REVIEW TO BE COMPLETED BY: **3/24/2008**

1. Address: 1829 Newton Ave N Property Identification Number (PIN): 16-029-24-32-0001
2. Lot Size: 43' x 45.4' ; area = 1,952 sq ft
3. Current Use: vacant land
4. Current Zoning: R1A
5. Proposed future use (include attachments as necessary): Sideyard for an adjacent owner
6. List addresses of adjacent parcels owned by CPED/City:

   None
7. Project Coordinator comments: This parcel may be added to the Sideyard Sales Pilot Program this Spring. The best option would be to sell the land to the adjacent owner of 1833 Newton (also vacant land) and reunite the original platted lot. However, the current owner of 1833 has delinquent property taxes and selling to him would violate City policy. The 1833 parcel was previously tax-forfeited land and looks to be well on the path to forfeiture again. Does Single Family have any interest in buying the 1833 parcel and combining it with our 1829 land to create a full buildable lot?

PROJECT COORDINATOR: EMAIL FORM TO PAUL.MOGUSH@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section II. Zoning Review

8. Lot is ☒ Buildable ☐ Non-Buildable for **any** structure. Explain: If sold to an adjacent property owner, the land must be merged in accordance with section 531.100 (b) of the Minneapolis Zoning Ordinance. Any other development may require variances to the setback and building width regulations of the zoning code.
9. Will any land use applications (rezoning, variances, etc) be required to achieve the **proposed** future use noted in item 5? Yes ☒ No ☐ If yes, what applications? For merger of common ownership lots, paperwork can be done with Hennepin County. A single-family home would require at a minimum administrative site plan review.
10. Comments: _____

Completed by: Joe Bernard Date: 3/13/2008

ZONING STAFF: EMAIL FORM TO PAUL.MOGUSH@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Section III. Community Planning Review

11. Adopted small area plan(s) in effect for parcel – please list:

    None
12. Future land use/designation(s) identified in *The Minneapolis Plan* and other adopted plans: Not designated in TMP
13. Is future land use proposed in item 5 consistent with future land use plans?

    Yes ☒ No ☐ If no, why not? _____
14. Does the City own adjacent parcels that could be combined with this parcel to create a larger development (see item 6).

City of Minneapolis
CPED - Public Land Sale

Yes ☐ No ☒ If yes, explain development scenario possible by combining City-owned parcels. _____

15. Is parcel identified in adopted plans as a catalyst/essential site for future development? Yes ☐ No ☒

If Yes, what type of development? _____

Comments: *From a land use policy and regulatory perspective, combining the properties for a single family home makes sense regardless of ownership. For what it's worth, I resonate with Rebecca's suggestion that it may not make sense to put it in the sideyard program when the neighboring property is not in stable ownership.*

Completed by: Tom Leighton Date: 3/21/2008

COMMUNITY PLANNER: EMAIL FORM TO PAUL.MOGUSH@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Planning Director Review - by: Barbara Sporlein Date: 3/24/2008

PLANNING DIRECTOR: EMAIL FORM TO PAUL.MOGUSH@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US, NANCY.THURBER@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US, AND THE PROJECT COORDINATOR.

Multi-Family Housing Staff Comments – by: *Kevin Walker* Date: *3/24/2008*
Comments: *Multifamily has no interest in this site.*

Single Family Housing Staff Comments – by: *Elfric Porte, II* Date: *3/25/2008*
Comments: *I am supportive of the disposition strategy.*

Real Estate Development Services Staff Comments – by: *Connie Fournier* Date: *4/2/2008*
Comments: *REDS defers to Single Family on decision to purchase 1833 Newton.*

Business Development Staff Comments – by: *Kristen Guild* Date: *3/24/2008*
Comments: *Business Development does not need this parcel in its inventory for economic development purposes.*

Economic Development Director Review - by: Cathy Polasky Date: 4/3/08

PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX:

☒ **PROCEED** to market the property as proposed
(Project Coordinator: Contact Community Planner at the time land sale is to occur for presentation to Planning Commission)

☐ **HOLD** this property for further discussion
(Project Coordinator: Route a new form following staff discussion)

Housing Director Review - by: Tom Streitz Date: 4/15/2008