OA-1017-3 Howard Lake City Resolution No. 04-44

# DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

### STATE OF MINNESOTA

#### BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF

### STRATEGIC AND LONG RANGE PLANNING

\_\_\_\_\_

IN THE MATTER OF THE ORDERLY ANNEXATION	)
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF HOWARD	)
LAKE AND THE TOWN OF VICTOR PURSUANT TO	)
MINNESOTA STATUTES 414	)

ORDER

WHEREAS, a joint resolution for orderly annexation was adopted by the City of Howard Lake and the Town of Victor; and

WHEREAS, a resolution was received from the City of Howard Lake indicating their

desire that certain property be annexed to the City of Howard Lake pursuant to M.S. 414.0325;

and

WHEREAS, M.S. 414.0325 states that in certain circumstances the Director of Strategic

and Long Range Planning may review and comment, but shall within 30 days order the

annexation of land pursuant to said subdivisions; and

WHEREAS, on February 11, 2005, the Director has reviewed and accepted the resolution for orderly annexation;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: That the following described property is hereby annexed in accordance with the terms of the joint resolution to the City of Howard Lake, Minnesota, the

same as if it had originally been made a part thereof:

The South Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 4, Township 118, Range 27, except the West 320 feet of the south 812 feet thereof and ALSO EXCEPT the South 320 feet of the East 454 feet of the West 865 feet thereof, Wright County, Minnesota.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2005.

.

For the Director 658 Cedar Street, Room 300 St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

bristikely. Scotillo

Christine M. Scotillo Executive Director Municipal Boundary Adjustments

## MEMORANDUM

In ordering the annexation contained in Docket No. OA-1017-3, the Director finds and makes the following comment:

Planning in the area designated for orderly annexation must be provided for by one of three provisions set forth in Minnesota Statutes Section 414.0325, Subd. 5. The joint resolution does not make reference to which of the three statutory provisions the parties have agreed on to govern planning in the designated area.

Paragraph 22 states the agreement shall expire on and be of no further force and effect after December 31, 2013. End dates or ending mechanisms are problematic in that they appear to run afoul of the act of conferring jurisdiction to the Director. Once jurisdiction is conferred by submission of this agreement to this office, it cannot be taken away by written consent of the parties.

The authority to impose the type of charge identified in paragraph 14 of the agreement, is questionable. The issuance of this order makes no determination as to the legality or validity of these provisions of the agreement. Any issue that may arise relative to the application or interpretation of these sections will be the sole responsibility the signatories to the agreement.

The parties are encouraged to consider this comment in light of any further amendments that may be otherwise necessary to this agreement for orderly annexation.