



Request for City Council Committee Action from the Department of Community Planning & Economic Development

Date: March 26, 2015
To: Council Member Lisa Bender, Chair of Zoning and Planning Committee
Referral to: Zoning and Planning Committee
Subject: Referral from the February 23, 2015 City Planning Commission Meeting
Recommendation: See report from the City Planning Commission

Prepared by: Lisa Kusz, Planning Commission Committee Clerk (612-673-3710)

Approved by: Jason Wittenberg, Manager, CPED – Land Use, Design and Preservation

Presenter in Committee:

2. Franklin Street Bakery Parking Lot, BZZ-6993, Ward: 6, 1919 10th Ave S, Janelle Widmeier, Sr Planner, 673-3156.

Community Impact (use any categories that apply)

Other: See staff report(s) from the City Planning Commission

Background/Supporting Information Attached

The attached report summarizes the actions taken at the City Planning Commission meeting held on February 23, 2015. The findings and recommendations are respectfully submitted for the consideration of your Committee.

Report of the City Planning Commission of the City of Minneapolis

2. Franklin Street Bakery Parking Lot (BZZ-6993, Ward: 6) 1919 10th Ave S ([Janelle Widmeier](#)).

A. Rezoning: Application Master Properties, LLC, on behalf of Franklin Bakery, LLC, to rezone the property of 1919 10th Ave S to add the TP Transitional Parking Overlay District to allow a temporary parking facility.

Action: Notwithstanding staff recommendation, the City Planning Commission recommended that the City Council **deny** the rezoning petition to add the TP Transitional Parking Overlay District to the property of 1919 10th Ave S, based on the following findings:

1. The proposal is a misuse of procedure. Purchasing the property, tearing down a residence, and establishing the parking lot before obtaining the necessary approvals is not appropriate. Businesses should not assume that they can purchase adjacent residential properties and establish parking.
2. Commercial uses up next to residential uses without a buffer would not be compatible.
3. The site is insufficient in size. If a larger and more detailed expansion proposal was under consideration, the rezoning could be considered.
4. The request is solely for the interest of the property owner, and not in the public interest.

Aye: Bender, Gagnon, Kronzer and Tucker

Absent: President Brown, Forney, Gisselman and Slack