

TO: Minnesota Municipal Board
1021 Bandana Boulevard East
Suite 225
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Re: MMB Docket Number A-5937 Jordan; Pearson Petition 120 acres
Proposed Annexation to the City of Jordan; Objection by St. Lawrence
Township

Gentlemen:

The Town Board of St. Lawrence Township, Scott County pursuant to a resolution duly adopted by the town board on June 25, 1998 hereby
(Date)
objects to the proposed annexation of the following described property to the City of Jordan for the following reasons: The North half of the Southeast Quarter (N $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$) and the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 13, Township 114, Range 24, Scott County, Minnesota

Property owned by Eugene V. Pearson and Marion Pearson

Reason for Objection: See Attached Exhibit "A"

Date June 25, 1998

Signature

Lee L. Kornder
Chairman Board of Supervisors

Attest:

Lee Z. Hilligoss
Clerk

EXHIBIT "A"

ST. LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP
SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA
REASONS FOR OBJECTING TO
ANNEXATION OF
PEARSON PROPERTY
TO CITY OF JORDAN;
MMB DOCKET NUMBER: A-5937

1. Annexation for high density residential development will produce a negative fiscal impact of more than \$250,000 in future losses based on Jordan's incomplete economic analysis and financial plan.
2. Inadequate levels of governmental services to support the needs for water and sewer services. A major expansion of Jordan's sewer system will be required; water storage capacity is marginal.
3. The plans for providing needed governmental services to the subject area are tentative and questionable as to funding.
4. Inconsistent zoning and planning makes the proposed development in the subject incompatible with adjacent land uses.
5. Jordan has not followed it's comprehensive plan requiring transitional land use planning and formulating appropriate zoning standards to accommodate the distinction between urban and rural uses.
6. The intended high density residential development violates previous agreements between Jordan and the Township arrived at during past joint planning process resulting in reduction of potential commercial development and abandoning strategic time tables for commercial and residential priorities.
7. The Township and Jordan had previously agreed to much lower residential densities for the subject property which addressed safeguards for environmental hazards, protection of property and citizens, farm operations, water drainage, traffic problems, and other risks credited by high density residential development.
8. Topography and boundary issues are being compromised by the proposed residential development in the subject area.
9. No impact analysis has been made as to relationship and effect on the Jordan School District.
10. Annexation of all or part of the property to the City of Jordan would not better serve the interests of the residents of the property and would not be in the best interest of the proposed annexation property; it also appears that the proposed annexation property is not now or is not about to become urban or suburban in character and the City of Jordan is not required to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.