

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

REC'D. BY JUN 29 1998
MMB

Re: MMB Docket Number A-5956 Janousek et. al. Petition

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: Southeast Quarter of the Southeast Quarter, Section 13, Township 114, Range 24, Scott County, Minnesota; owners are: Steven Janousek, Mark Yahnke, Tracy Yahnke, Shaun Yahnke, Donald Yahnke, Lisa Hessing

Reason for Objection: See Attached Exhibit "A"

Date June 25, 1998

Signature

Ed L. Korndor
Chairman Board of Supervisors

Attest:

My 2 Heligosa
Clerk

REC'D. BY
MMB JUN 29 1998

EXHIBIT "A"

ST. LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP
SCOTT COUNTY, MINNESOTA
REASONS FOR OBJECTING TO
ANNEXATION OF
JANOUSEK -- HESSING -- YAHNKE PROPERTY
TO CITY OF JORDAN;
MMB DOCKET NUMBER: A-5956

1. Incompatible with the present pattern of physical development, planning, and intended land uses in the subject area and the City of Jordan including residential, industrial, commercial and agricultural land uses; Township considers the adverse impact of the proposed annexation on those land uses, in particular with reference to the Pearson property of 120 acres being petitioned for annexation simultaneously with intended development of 183 residential units.
2. Inconsistences between proposed development and existing/ proposed land use controls.
3. Existing levels of governmental services being provided by the City of Jordan for the subject area along with the proposed annexation of the Pearson property are inadequate for sewer and water service.
4. Plans and programs by the City of Jordan for providing needed governmental services to the subject area are not fully developed or capable of integration.
5. No analysis has been made of the fiscal impact on the City of Jordan, the subject area and the Township particularly with reference to the local tax rate of the school district and township.
6. No official study of the relationship and effect of the annexation on the affected school district.
7. The increase of revenues for the City of Jordan bears no reasonable relation to the monetary value of benefits conferred upon the annexed area.
8. 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.