

Chapter 249
Findings of Fact, Conclusions and Recommendation

Regarding: 2218 – 4th Street North

Whereas, the above-referenced property has been identified by the Department of Inspections as constituting a nuisance in violation of Chapter 249 of the Minneapolis Code of Ordinances; and whereas, a public hearing was held before the Public Safety and Regulatory Services Committee of the City Council on

Date: June 21st, 2006 Time: 2:30 P.M. In accordance with said ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Minneapolis makes the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Neighborhood vacancy rate is: 8% for Single-Family and **9.7%** for Muti-Family. **Further comments are on the Zoning/Planning Departments Report, e-mail response, Chapter 249 Findings.

(Per Cecilia Bolognesi, Zoning/Planning)

B. Historic Significance: No adverse effect if removed. 1 ½ story Arts and Crafts style frame bungalow built in 1925. This property does not appear to be eligible for local landmark based on architecture of historic associations

(Per Greg Mathis, Zoning/Planning)

C. Neighborhood Impact: According to 3 of the neighborhood impact statements received into evidence, this building has a negative impact on the neighborhood and its ability to attract future residents. 1 neighborhood response stated the building had a positive impact. However, of the 82 statements sent, 2 responded to indicate rehab, 1 recommended demolition, and 1 indicated either rehab or demo. No other responses were given.

Neighborhood Association: Hawthorne Community Council was notified and **did not respond.**

D. There is not evidence that the property can be put to use by either the neighborhood or existing owners.

E. Comprehensive Land Use: Low Density Residential

Special/Combined Uses: No

(Per Jason Wittenberg, Zoning/Planning)

F) The building was initially boarded on: **June 6, 2005**

Refer to File "History of Address" regarding Structural, Housing or Environmental violations.

G) Owner **did not** provide statement of cost to rehabilitate building as required by Code of Ordinances 249.40.

Owner **has not** provided a Notarized Owner Authorization to Demolish

H) Building has Assessor's rating of **3-Average**. Assessor last inspected on 6/2/2004. **Zoned R2B**. Special council permits conditional uses or variances do not exist at this address.

(Per Stephen Poor, Zoning)

(con't)

Findings of Fact

- I) **Rehab funds are available. Is in CDBG area**
- J) **The estimated cost to rehab the property is: \$209,800.00 - \$228,900.00**
- K) **Estimated Cost of Demolition is: \$18,600 - \$21,400.00 Plus Asbestos removal.**
The estimated after rehab market value is: \$153,000
Inspections Division recommends Demolition CPED Recommends Demolition

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The subject property constitutes a nuisance. Your Committee recommends _____ and all or any accessory buildings at the above address.

Dated: _____