3

BEFORE THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Joseph Robbie Robert W. Johnson Terrance S. O'Toole

Chairman Vice-Chairman Member

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF CERTAIN FREEHOLDERS FOR THE DETACHMENT OF PROPERTY FROM THE VILLAGE OF SOUTH HAVEN, COUNTY OF WRIGHT, STATE OF MINNESOTA, PURSUANT TO MINNESOTA STATUTES 414.06

ORDER

The petition of requisite freeholders of the Village of South Haven to detach certain lands from said Village came regularly on for hearing before the Municipal Commission of the State of Minnesota on February 11, 1964, at 10:00 A.M. in the South Haven Village Hall at which time evidence was taken and testimony heard.

The Commission having carefully considered all of the evidence, and all of the files and records, finds that the requisite number of property owners have filed the petition; that the property is unplatted, and used and occupied exclusively for agricultural purposes; that the property is adjacent to a boundary and is within the boundaries of the municipality of South Haven; that the detachment will not unreasonably affect the symmetry of the settled municipality; and that the land is not needed for reasonably anticipated future development:

IT IS ORDERED: That the lands lying and being in the County of Wright and State of Minnesota, described as follows to-wit:

All parcels of land in Sections 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 22 all in Township 121 North Range 28 West; excepting therefrom the E2 of NEt of Sec. 17, N2 of NEt of SEt of Sec. 17, NWt of Sec. 16, W2 of NEt of Sec. 16, N2 of NEt of Sec. 16 and N2 of N2 of SWt Sec. 16

be detached from the Village of South Haven, Wright County, Minnesota to become a part and parcel of Southside Township, Wright County, Minnesota, the same as if it had been originally a part thereof.

Dated this 19th day of March, 1964

MINNESOTA MUNICIPAL COMMISSION 51 State office Building St. Paul 1, Minnesota

Irving R. Keldsen Secretary

FINDINGS OF FACT

I.

The petition for detachment contained the signatures of the requisite number of property owners.

II.

The property proposed for detachment is unplatted and is used and occupied exclusively for agricultural purposes.

III.

The property is within the boundaries of the municipality and is adjacent to a boundary.

IV.

The detachment (as amended by the Minnesota Municipal Commission) will not unreasonably affect the symmetry of the settled municipality.

V.

The land is not needed for reasonably anticipated future development.