



# CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS

CITY COUNCIL  
CHAMBERS  
420 NORTH POKEGAMA  
AVE.

## Meeting Agenda Full Detail City Council Work Session

---

Monday, May 23, 2011

Conference Room 2A

---

Immediately following the closed session

**CALL TO ORDER:** Pursuant to due notice and call thereof a Special Meeting/Worksession of the Grand Rapids City Council will be held on Monday, May 23, 2011 immediately following the closed session in Conference Room 2A, 420 North Pokegama Avenue, Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

**CALL OF ROLL:** On a call of roll, the following members were present:

### Discussion Items

1. 11-1544 Update on Mt. Itasca - John Denny
2. 11-1550 Continued discussion of revised findings of fact pertaining to Deer River Hired Hands text amendment.  
Attachments: Revised findings of fact
3. 11-1452 Review 5:00 p.m. meeting agenda and discuss any other business as noted.

### ADJOURN

**Attest:**

**Shawn Gillen, City Administrator**



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 11-1544      **Version:** 1      **Name:**

**Type:** Agenda Item      **Status:** CC Worksession

**File created:** 5/16/2011      **In control:** City Council Work Session

**On agenda:** 5/23/2011      **Final action:**

**Title:** Update on Mt. Itasca - John Denny

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:**

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

### Title

Update on Mt. Itasca - John Denny



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 11-1550      **Version:** 1      **Name:** Findings of Fact  
**Type:** Agenda Item      **Status:** CC Worksession  
**File created:** 5/18/2011      **In control:** City Council Work Session  
**On agenda:** 5/23/2011      **Final action:**  
**Title:** Continued discussion of revised findings of fact pertaining to Deer River Hired Hands text amendment.  
**Sponsors:**  
**Indexes:**  
**Code sections:**  
**Attachments:** [Revised findings of fact](#)

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

### Title

Continued discussion of revised findings of fact pertaining to Deer River Hired Hands text amendment.

### ***1. Will the change affect the character of neighborhoods?***

**Yes.** The requested text amendment change would allow for a recycling center to be operated anywhere in the City of Grand Rapids which is zoned as “Public Use”. It is important to note that there is an extensive inventory of properties currently zoned as Public Use in the City of Grand Rapids. It is also essential to note that a large number of these properties are located contiguous to, or directly within, residential areas. Although many Public Use properties are owned by the City of Grand Rapids, thus their use or sale in an effort to develop a recycling center would require City permission prior to creation; many public use zoned properties are not owned by the City. For example, school properties, church properties, and the Itasca County Fair Grounds are all properties that are not owned by the City and could be developed as recycling centers without City consent. It is of large concern to the City Council to contemplate a recycling center’s operation within a Public Use zone as such a use is incompatible with the residential nature of the neighborhoods that they share.

The operation of a recycling center has been deemed to be an industrial/general business activity in nature. These seem to conflict with the character of residential areas that border or co-exist with the City’s current inventory of Public Use zones.

### ***2. Would the change foster economic growth in the community?***

**No.** The proposed use that lead to the text amendment request at hand spurs from a concept of developing a recycling center upon property owned by the City of Grand Rapids, in a building constructed and until recently utilized by the Grand Rapids Public Utilities Commission. This use could easily be accommodated in other land use zones presently available in the City. There could be negative economic consequences in areas located to a Public Use zone, if the requested text amendment were to be ratified by the City Council.

Many neighbors of the subject property addressed above attended a public hearing on this issue and articulated their concerns that property values may certainly decrease in the area adjacent to the subject property. Decreases in property values could also occur in any areas that are close to Public Use zones if the text is amended

### ***3. Would the proposed change be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the ordinance?***

**No.** The *Grand Rapids Municipal Code* specifically at *Section 30-423* states that the intent and purpose of the City’s zoning scheme is an effort to accomplish the following.

*(2) Dividing the city into zones and districts restricting and regulating therein the location, construction, reconstruction, alteration, and use of structures and land.*

Allowing a recycling center to be operated within non-industrial or general business zones does not foster the separation of separate zones in that it intermingles two incompatible uses in one single district.

*(3) Promoting orderly development of the residential, business, industrial, recreational and public areas.*

The request does not promote residential, recreational, or potentially business uses in areas that may be closely situated to Public Use zones if the request is allowed.

*(7) Providing for the compatibility of different land uses and the most appropriate use of land throughout the city.*

The Council does not feel that the operation of a recycling center in Public Use zones is compatible with other allowable uses in Public Use zones, or to areas which border Public Use zones. Additionally, *Grand Rapids Municipal Code* specifically at *Section 30-511* states that the intent and purpose of the City's establishment of zoning districts are established for the specific purposes of maintaining consistency in zoning. By allowing any recycling center in a Public Use zone the City Council feels as if they could be violating the spirit and intent of the ordinance by allowing incompatible uses to co-exist.

***4. Would the change be in the best interest of the general public?***

**No.** For all the reasons listed above the City Council does not feel that the operation of a recycling center in a Public Use zone would foster the best interest of the general public. It could very well lead to degrade the integrity of the very zoning regulations established by the Council to protect the public.

***5. Would the change be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?***

**No.** There is no direction in the Comprehensive Plan to allow such an expanded use in Public Use zones.

Taken directly from the text of the present Comprehensive Plan, the Plan holds as its "Guiding Principles" the following:

*Guiding principles reflect the expressed needs and desires of the people of the community and were used as a framework to guide the development of the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, they can be carried beyond the plan to provide guidance to decision-makers.*

- ◆ *Growth is targeted to serve community values and enhance the quality of life*
- ◆ *Change is harmonized to preserve the community's character and environment*
- ◆ *Promote economic vitality to provide jobs, services, revenues, and opportunities*
- ◆ *Grand Rapids is a healthy family community with strong neighborhoods*
- ◆ *Grand Rapids is the commercial and service center for the surrounding region*
- ◆ *Community participation is a permanent part of growth and development*
- ◆ *The Comprehensive Plan is followed, updated every three years, and progress is reported to the public.*

The City Council feels that allowing a traditionally industrial/general business activity such as a recycling center to be operated in Public Use zones could detract significantly from the principles that have guided the City's development over the last many years. The City would like to foster economic development and see businesses like Hired Hands flourish in the City of Grand Rapids, as they offer a valuable service to the City's residents. However, the City Council does not feel that such a use is compatible in Public Use zones.



## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

**File #:** 11-1452      **Version:** 1      **Name:**

**Type:** Agenda Item      **Status:** CC Worksession

**File created:** 4/7/2011      **In control:** City Council Work Session

**On agenda:** 6/27/2011      **Final action:**

**Title:** Review 5:00 p.m. meeting agenda and discuss any other business as noted.

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:**

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

### Title

Review 5:00 p.m. meeting agenda and discuss any other business as noted.