

RESOLUTION NO. 763

RESOLUTION SETTING SPECIAL ELECTION

BE IT RESOLVED that the following question be submitted to the voters of the City of Montevideo at a special election to be held in the City of Montevideo on May 31, 1978:

"Should the City of Montevideo be authorized to issue on-sale liquor licenses to hotels and restaurants while maintaining the right to operate its on-sale municipal liquor store?"

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a special election is hereby called for May 31, 1978, for a vote upon the foregoing question, the hours for voting shall be from 12:00 noon until 9:00 p.m.

Passed and adopted this 1st day of May, 1978.

Bo. J. Larson  
President - City Council

ATTEST:

Thomas B. Simolice  
City Clerk

STATE OF MINNESOTA  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
FILED  
JUN 6 - 1978

Joan Anderson Brown  
Secretary of State

# 31509

O.D.



*City  
of  
Montevideo*

TELEPHONE 612-269-6575


P. O. BOX 311

MONTEVIDEO, MINNESOTA 56265

STATE OF MINNESOTA )  
COUNTY OF CHIPPEWA ) SS  
CITY OF MONTEVIDEO )

I, LaVonne B. Sundlee, acting City Clerk in and for the City of Montevideo, do hereby certify that the attached Resolution No. 763 was duly adopted at the regular City Council meeting of May 1, 1978, and which original Resolution No. 763 is on file in my office.

Dated: June 5, 1978

  
LaVonne B. Sundlee, City Clerk

#31509

BEFORE THE MUNICIPAL BOARD  
OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Gerald J. Isaacs	Chairman
Robert W. Johnson	Vice-Chairman
Thomas J. Simmons	Member
Douglas Krueger	Ex-Officio Member
Rosemary Ahman	Ex-Officio Member

-----

IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT RESOLUTION  
BETWEEN THE CITY OF ROCHESTER AND  
CASCADE TOWNSHIP FOR THE ORDERLY  
ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN LAND OF  
THE CITY OF ROCHESTER

FINDINGS OF FACT,  
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,  
AND ORDER

-----

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before the Minnesota Municipal Board pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 414, as amended, on February 21, 1978, at Rochester, Minnesota. The hearing was conducted by Chairman Gerald Issacs pursuant to Minnesota Statutes 414.01, Subd. 12. Also in attendance were County Commissioners Douglas Krueger and Rosemary Ahman, ex-officio members of the Board. The City of Rochester appeared by and through Gerald Swanson and Lyndon Gesselle appeared for Cascade Township. Testimony was heard and records and exhibits were received.

After due and careful consideration of all evidence, together with all records, files and proceedings the Minnesota Municipal Board hereby makes and files the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. That the joint resolution for orderly annexation was adopted by the City of Rochester and the Township of Cascade and duly filed with the Minnesota Municipal Board.

2. A resolution was filed by one of the signatories to the joint resolution, Rochester, on November 22, 1977 requesting annexation of certain properties within the orderly annexation area. The resolution contained all the information required by statute including a description of the territory subject to annexation which is as follows:

That part of the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of Section 16, Township 107 North, Range 14 West, lying west of Trunk Highway U.S. 52, containing 56 acres, more or less.

3. Due, timely and adequate legal notice of the hearing was published, served and filed.

4. Geographic Features

a. The area subject to annexation is unincorporated and abuts the City of Rochester.

b. The total area of the City of Rochester is 16.75 square miles. The total area of the territory subject to annexation is 56 acres.

c. The degree of contiguity of the boundaries between the annexing municipality and the proposed annexed property is as follows: approximately 22%.

d. The natural terrain of the area, including general topography, major watersheds, soil conditions, rivers, lakes and major bluffs is as follows: suitable for crops.

5. Population Data

a. The City of Rochester

- 1) Past population growth: 53,766 in 1970
- 2) Present population: estimated at 57,400
- 3) Projected population: 85,130 by 2000

b. The area subject to annexation

- 1) Past population growth: 0
- 2) Present population: 0
- 3) Projected population: 0

6. Development Issues

a. What, if any, are the comprehensive plans for the development of the property proposed for annexation and/or the annexing municipality, including development projected by the state planning agency. Rochester's Land Use Plan anticipates industrial development.

b. What land use controls are presently being employed.

1) In the City of Rochester

- a. Zoning: yes
- b. Subdivision regulations: yes
- c. Housing and building codes: yes

2) In the area to be annexed:

- a. Zoning: yes, by County
- b. Subdivision regulations: yes, by orderly annexation agreement, the City regulations.
- c. Housing and building codes: yes, by County

c. Does the City require future growth space? yes If so, will the area subject to annexation provide the City of Rochester with necessary growth space?  
yes

d. The present pattern of physical development is:

- 1) In the City of Rochester: all types of development is occurring.
- 2) In the area subject to annexation: undeveloped with plans for industrial development.

7. Governmental Services

a. Presently, the Township of Cascade provides the area subject to annexation with the following services:

- |                                      |                             |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1) Water: no                         | 5) Street Improvements: yes |
| 2) Sewer: no                         | 6) Street Maintenance: yes  |
| 3) Fire Protection: yes, by contract | 7) Recreational: no         |
| 4) Police Protection: no             |                             |

b. Presently, the City of Rochester provides its citizens with the following services:

- |                           |                             |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1) Water: yes             | 5) Street Improvements: yes |
| 2) Sewer: yes             | 6) Street Maintenance: yes  |
| 3) Fire Protection: yes   | 7) Recreational: yes        |
| 4) Police Protection: yes |                             |

c. Presently the City of Rochester provides the area subject to annexation with no services.

d. Plans to extend municipal services to the area subject to annexation include the following: All services can be extended within a reasonable time.

e. There are existing or potential pollution problems which are: none

f. That the City of Rochester is capable of and it is practical for it to provide to the area proposed for annexation the listed municipal services within the next three years:

8. Fiscal Data

a. In the City of Rochester, the assessed valuation trend is rising, and the present bonded indebtedness is \$6,885,000.

b. In the area subject to annexation, the assessed valuation trend is rising (74,800), and the present bonded indebtedness is 0.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Minnesota Municipal Board duly acquired and now has jurisdiction of the within proceeding.

2. The area subject to annexation is now or is about to become urban or suburban in nature.

3. The City of Rochester is capable of providing the services required by the area described herein within a reasonable time.

4. The mill levy of the annexing municipality on the area proposed for annexation should be increased in substantially equal proportions over a three year period.

5. An order should be issued by the Minnesota Municipal Board annexing the area described herein.