

# Jessenland Township Survey

(Land Use Planning for Development, Recreation, Services, Agriculture and Quality Growth)

This is a Community Based survey designed to provide the residents of Jessenland Township a chance to voice their opinions concerning Planning and Zoning in Jessenland Township. The Township has been implementing its own planning and zoning since 2001 so this survey will also provide the residents an opportunity to look back over the past 5 years and reflect and comment on how the Township has handled planning and zoning issues.

Please take a few minutes to fill out this survey, and send it back in the enclosed postage paid envelope, so that your Township government can plan for the future.

**Head of Household** please respond to *Resp. A* or *Respondent A*  
**Spouse or other Adult resident** please respond to *Resp. B* or *Respondent B*

Please Answer the following Questions:

*Head of Household (Resp. A.)*

*Spouse or other Adult resident (Resp. B)*

Age\_\_\_\_\_

Age\_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status: **Married** **Single**  
                           49          7

Marital Status: **Married** **Single**  
                           46          1      **TOTAL 95/8**

Do you **Own** / **Rent** your home  
                   57      1

Do you **Own** / **Rent** your home  
                   46      1      **TOTAL 103/2**

Where do you work? (circle one)  
 a. At home 10  
 b. In Township 3  
 c. A local community (specify) 9

Where do you work? (circle one)  
 a. At home 10      **TOTAL 20**  
 b. In Township      **TOTAL 3**  
 c. A local Community (specify) 19      **TOTAL 28**

d. Within 10-20 miles 9  
 e. Mankato area 1  
 f. Minneapolis metro area 17  
 g. Retired 11

d. Within 10-20 miles 9      **TOTAL 18**  
 e. Mankato area 1      **TOTAL 2**  
 f. Minneapolis metro area 5      **TOTAL 22**  
 g. Retired 5      **TOTAL 16**

**Q1.)** Please Rank in order your preference for land use in Jessenland with 1 being your first preference and 6 as your last preference.

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>
Recreation	9	6	36	9	10	1
Residential	18	36	19	9	6	5
Agricultural (includes feedlots)	65	13	8	1	7	2
Highway Business (not including Home based)	0	5	17	37	12	8
Industrial/Manufacturing	2	8	10	15	32	9

Other (specify): Don't like any of them.; left natural for wildlife; none of the above; small airport; small airport; 'none' for highway business or industrial/manufacturing; 'none' for highway business or industrial/manufacturing; 'agricultural' – row crop only, not feedlots; 'agricultural' – but not including large feedlots; more ag feedlots; no feedlots; agricultural (no feedlots); agricultural without feedlots; no feedlots;

Resp A: \_\_\_\_\_ Resp. B: \_\_\_\_\_

**Q2a.)** Please indicate the type of recreational opportunities you would use if available.

On the blank, write **Y**, **N**, or **N/O** for each [Yes, No, No Opinion]

	<u>Resp. A: Yes/No/No Opinion</u>	<u>Resp. B: Yes/No/No Opinion</u>	<u>TOTAL Y/N/N.O.</u>
a.) Baseball/Softball Field	14/27/8	9/19/7	23/46/15
b.) Ice Skating Rink	16/27/8	14/17/5	30/44/13
c.) Bike Trail	25/22/4	23/11/4	48/33/8
d.) Walking/Hiking Trail	37/14/1	29/8/2	66/22/3
e.) Snowmobile Trail	25/23/3	16/18/2	41/41/5
f.) Playground Equipment	13/33/4	11/21/4	24/54/8
g.) River Canoe Route	25/23/4	12/19/5	37/42/9
h.) Snowshoe Trail	16/27/7	12/19/5	28/46/12
i.) Hunting	39/10/4	19/15/1	58/25/5
j.) Fishing	40/7/4	23/11/1	63/18/5
k.) Golf Course	15/32/4	11/23/2	26/55/6
l.) Tennis Court	10/34/5	11/18/5	21/52/10
m.) Swimming Pool	12/31/5	13/19/4	25/50/9
n.) Soccer Field	8/33/6	6/23/5	14/55/11
o.) Hockey Rink	10/35/4	4/27/3	14/62/7
p.) Skateboard Park	5/40/4	3/27/3	8/67/7
q.) Activities for Seniors	23/20/6	13/19/5	36/39/11
r.) Boat Launch/Water Access	31/15/4	21/13/2	52/28/6
s.) Cross Country Ski Trails	16/29/5	14/18/3	30/47/8
t.) Auto/Stock Car Racing	9/38/3	3/28/3	12/66/6
u.) Rodeo	18/27/4	15/15/3	33/42/7
v.) ATV/Dirt Bike Trail System	16/29/3	12/22/1	28/51/4
w.) Youth Ranch	10/33/7	6/21/6	16/54/13
x.) Horseback Riding Trail	16/27/7	14/16/4	30/43/11
y.) Other	1/10/6	0/7/4	1/17/10
z.) Comments: not able to do any; no opinion; ATV/Dirt Bike Trail System-destroys the environment ; Would people use these recreational opportunities if they have to travel on gravel roads; golf course – if it's on our land			

**Q2b.)** How would you fund the above recreational opportunities? [Circle one]

Respondent A: Private Money 27      Public Money 20      None 5      No Opinion 10

Respondent B: Private Money 19      Public Money 13      None 5      No Opinion 8

**TOTALS                      46                      33                      10                      18**

**Comments: use public money as in user fees, how about private and public money together; private money should be user fees; private money should be user fees**

**Q3.)** Do you think more housing may be needed in Jessenland Township? [Circle One]

Respondent A:      Yes 19                      No 38

Respondent B:      Yes 12                      No 30

**TOTALS                      31                      68**

**Comments: not needed but if someone wants to build its O.K.**

**Q4a.)** If yes, where would you like future residential development to be located in Jessenland?

Respondent A and B:

- existing home sites
- on wooded land
- in designated areas, not removing natural resources, ie.trees
- along existing roadways
- northeast edge
- northeast corner
- bluffs, wooded areas-minimal tillable land consumed, in designated areas that are not near feedlots-2 mile minimum?  
Research would be needed to back this up or come to a number.
- bluffs
- around Silver Lake
- anyone wishing to build on available land
- anyone wishing to build on available land
- clustered together
- former abandoned building sites
- along the valley and wooded property
- on non tillable acres
- on non tillable acres
- old farm sites, wooded ravine areas
- old farm sites, wooded land and land not able to be used for farming
- on scenic land
- on non tillable land
- small developments that are required to meet the 3:1 permanent conservation easement requirements
- throughout the township
- western side of township
- no opinion
- not in Jessenland
- river bottom
- in wooded or non ag land
- around Silver Lake
- all over
- I would like to see a community built, not spread through the country side as Scott County is doing.
- no
- no
- n/a
- n/a
- on the scenic byway
- on the scenic byway or on highways by Anderly Add.
- dn

**Q4b.)** Where would you like future development to be discouraged?

Respondent A and B:

- A ag land
- A ag land
- on hill sides
- on farm land
- next to river (flooding), farmland
- yes
- in the floodplain of the Minnesota River and on prime agricultural land
- in the country
- over farmland, developers and a few landowners are getting rich at the expense of everyone else
- nowhere
- wood land area, shore land
- on prime ag land
- on ag land
- ag land areas
- no opinion
- east of hwy. 93
- agricultural ground, bluff area, river bottoms
- all areas
- farm land
- farm land
- flood plains
- flood plains
- the river valley!
- wooded areas
- farm land
- farm land
- on farm land
- on farm land
- on farm land
- on farm land
- on farm land
- ag land
- farm land
- along bluffs
- creeks and woodlands
- on tillable acres
- on tillable acres
- ag land
- ravines and steep side hills
- amidst active dairy, beef or hog farms
- try to conserve the agricultural and wildlife areas
- preferably not all on the Scenic Byway!
- everywhere
- near feedlots and widely dispersed
- everywhere
- woodland
- farm land
- in Jessenland Township
- on tillable farm land and any where near feedlots
- near feed lot areas
- near feed lots
- Co. Rd. 6
- Co. Rd. 6
- township wide
- yes
- dn
- river bluffs

- river bluffs
- bluffs
- everywhere
- on wooded land
- in the river bottoms
- rural agricultural land
- rural agricultural land

**Q5a.)** What is the smallest lot size suitable for a single family home in Jessenland Township?

[Please check one one of the below]

	Resp. A:	Resp. B:	TOTAL
a.) 1 unit per 40 acres	19	15	34
b.) 1 unit per 20 acres	5	4	9
c.) 1 unit per 10 acres	9	10	19
d.) 1 unit per 5 acres	12	6	18
e.) 1 unit per 2 acres or less	10	8	18
f.) Don't Know	2	1	3

**Q5b.)** What do you think of Jessenland Township's current building setbacks from roadways and lot lines? Current setbacks are generally 200 feet from roads and 60 feet from lot lines. [Circle one of the below]

Respondent A: Too Restrictive 13 Just Right 28 Not Restrictive Enough 9 Don't Know 7

Respondent B: Too Restrictive 8 Just Right 18 Not Restrictive Enough 5 Don't Know 9

**TOTAL A & B:** **21** **46** **14** **16**

Comments: 'Don't Know' – how about variance from lot lines

**Q6.)** In general, how do you feel about the following types of development?

On the blank, write **F, O, N/O** [Favor, Oppose, No Opinion]

	Resp. A: F/O/N.O.	Resp. B: F/O/N.O.	TOTAL
a.) Agricultural	53/1/1	40/0/2	93/1/3
b.) Commercial/retail services	16/29/11	9/26/6	25/55/17
c.) Home based business	36/3/16	27/5/11	63/8/27
d.) Light manufacturing	28/23/5	15/18/6	43/41/11
e.) Feedlots	21/25/10	17/20/6	38/45/16
f.) Comments: to clarify - corporate backed feedlots that impact the community in a negative manner; favor small family farms, no corporate farming			

**Q7.)** How important is row crop agriculture to the local economy?

[Please check one of the below]

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know
Respondent A:	51	5	1	0
Respondent B:	36	3	0	1
<b>TOTAL A&amp;B:</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

Comments: Why was this listed separate when it is grouped as agricultural in Q1; if not taxed for school referendums (checked off 'not important')

**Q8.)** How important is livestock agriculture to the local economy?

[Please check one of the below]

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know
Respondent A:	35	17	4	0
Respondent B:	29	8	3	1
<b>TOTAL A &amp; B:</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1</b>

**Q9.)** Which of the following types of businesses or industries would you like to see expand or locate in the township?

[Please check all that apply]

	Resp. A:	Resp. B:	TOTAL
a.) Commercial/retail	13	6	19
b.) Home-based business	24	19	43
c.) Light manufacturing	24	13	37
d.) Contractor Yards	7	6	13
e.) Animal Feedlot/Agriculture	23	15	38
f.) Value-added agricultural processing	22	9	31
g.) None of the above	28	22	50
h.) Other (please specify) : agriculture okay-not big feedlots; ag not feedlots; ag – not feedlots; farming; organic farming			

**Q10.)** What type of development would you favor in commercial areas?

[Please check all that apply]

	Resp. A:	Resp. B:	TOTAL
a.) Gas Stations	15	6	21
b.) Convenience stores	21	11	32
c.) Mini-mall	8	4	12
d.) Small retail outlet	12	8	20
e.) Large retail (grocery store, etc)	8	5	13
f.) Eating establishments	19	12	31
g.) Emergency Clinic	16	9	25
h.) Professional offices	12	5	17
i.) Residential	11	8	19
j.) Lodging	12	9	21
k.) None of the above	28	22	50
l.) Other: (please specify): Jessenland doesn't have any commercial zones			

**Q11.)** If we were to have future commercial development where should it be located in Jessenland?

On the blank, write **Y**, **N**, or **N/O** for each [Yes, No, No Opinion]

	Resp. A: Y/N/N.O.	Resp. B: Y/N/N.O.	TOTAL
a.) County Road 6/ Scenic By-way	7/27/5	7/21/4	14/48/9
b.) County Road 12	6/24/9	2/22/7	8/46/16
c.) State Road 19	19/13/9	12/12/8	31/25/17
d.) County Road 19	3/19/12	1/21/7	4/40/19
e.) County Road 27	1/22/14	0/17/11	1/39/25
f.) County Road 16	0/21/13	0/17/11	0/38/24
g.) Other (please specify): very selective areas or none; 9 ton roads; but not to take away from Scenic Byway ('Yes' to Scenic Byway); no where; no where			

**Q12.)** How would you rate the following public services?

On the blank write **E, G, F, P, D/K** [Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Don't Know]

	Resp A: E/G/F/P/DK	Resp B: E/G/F/P/DK	TOTAL
a.) Law enforcement	6/37/10/3/2	3/23/10/1/1	9/60/21/4/3
b.) Fire protection	17/27/8/0/3	11/18/5/0/2	38/45/13/0/5
c.) Planning and Zoning	3/17/18/16/3	4/7/15/10/2	7/24/33/26/5
d.) Township and Government	3/27/16/8/2	3/17/13/6/0	6/44/29/14/2
e.) First responders (paramedic/ambulance)	16/22/7/0/8	10/18/3/0/7	26/40/10/0/15
f.) Streets and roads	2/33/17/4/0	0/24/11/4/0	2/57/28/8/0
g.) Snow removal	6/33/12/9/0	1/21/11/6/0	7/54/23/15/0
h.) Animal control	2/22/10/8/14	0/15/9/3/11	2/37/19/11/25
i.) Garbage collection	0/31/8/4/7	0/20/3/2/7	0/51/11/6/14
j.) Recycling services	1/23/8/11/8	1/16/2/9/6	2/39/10/20/14
k.) Other (specify): garbage collection and recycling services not a public service; All homes should be required to have garbage service. Recycling should be mandatory; All residents should be required to have garbage service and recycling service should have to be provided.; 'snow removal' – too much gravel plowed off the roads; 'recycling services' – would be nice to have drop off at township hall; 'snow removal' – tear up our yard;			

**Q13.)** Do you feel that land use controls in the Township are:

[Chose One and place it's letter on the line]

	Resp A:	Resp B:	TOTAL
a.) Too restrictive	17	9	26
b.) Not restrictive enough	20	15	35
c.) Just right	14	15	2
d.) Comments: not sure			

**Q14.)** How should zoning administration and enforcement be funded? Which of the following methods would you support? On the blank please write **Y, N, D/K** [Yes, No, Don't Know]

	Resp A: Y/N/DK	Resp B: Y/N/DK	TOTAL
a.) Increase fees to users of the service	36/4/4	28/3/4	64/7/8
b.) Township as a whole should fund	14/15/6	7/14/6	21/29/12
c.) Other (please specify)	0/0/1	1/0/0	1/0/1
d.) Comments: county; turn over to county; if it supposedly benefits everyone, why do applicants finance a disproportionate share; Make people pay their bills for Sheriff time, attorney fees, etc.; and fines for misuse; We already have zoning by Sibley County. Jessenland zoning is duplication.			

**Q15.)** How important is it to have an ordinance that regulates the following?

On each blank, please write **V, S, N, or D/K** [Very Important, Somewhat Important, Not Important, Don't Know]

	Resp. A: V/S/N/DK	Resp. B: V/S/N/DK	TOTAL
a.) The establishment and construction of any new animal feedlots of over 500 total animal units	42/6/6/0	33/2/5/0	75/8/11/0
b.) The expansion of an existing animal feedlot which will have a cumulative total of over 1000 animal units	45/6/3/0	35/4/3/0	80/10/6/0
c.) The building or expanding of any feedlot of over 300 animal units within a quarter mile of another feedlot of the same animal species	39/5/8/1	30/3/8/1	69/8/16/2
d.) The stockpiling (holding for more than 24 hours) of manure, municipal sludge, compost, etc.	30/12/11/0	25/6/9/0	55/18/20/0
e.) The spreading of manure, municipal sludge, compost, etc., without incorporation within 24 hours	30/10/13/0	25/6/9/0	55/16/22/0
f.) The establishment of any junkyard or salvage yard	39/12/4/0	32/8/4/0	71/20/8/0
g.) The establishment of any new industrial facility	37/10/2/1	32/5/2/0	69/15/4/1
h.) The establishment of any commercial facility	37/12/3/1	30/6/3/1	67/18/6/2
i.) The establishment of any mobile home park	41/10/1/0	33/7/2/0	74/17/3/0
j.) All explosive testing	38/8/6/1	30/4/6/1	68/12/12/2
k.) Driveway slope	24/18/10/2	21/9/11/1	45/27/21/3
l.) Lot size	25/20/7/1	23/11/6/1	28/31/13/2
m.) Any dwelling less than 200 feet from the center line of any roadway	1/3/0/0	1/3/0/0	2/6/0/0
n.) Any dwelling less than 200 feet from any neighboring property	23/19/11/0	21/12/8/0	44/31/19/0
o.) Building setbacks (lot lines, from buildings, from roads)	25/25/3/0	21/17/2/0	46/42/5/0
p.) Any new land use or any change in land use	33/16/3/0	31/9/2/0	64/25/5/0

Comments: Junkyards are important. Best to have all garbage in one area, rather than in many.

**Q16.)** Are you in favor of further restricting residential developments?

On the blank please write **Y, N, D/K** [Yes, No, Don't Know]

Respondent A: Y/N/DK	Respondent B: Y/N/DK	TOTAL
35/15/7	23/9/9	58/24/16

**Comments: depends on location**

**Q17.)** Should the township continue to require developers set aside green space?

On the blank please write **Y, N, D/K** [Yes, No, Don't Know]

Respondent A: Y/N/DK	Respondent B: Y/N/DK	TOTAL
49/5/2	35/3/3	84/8/5

**Comments: 'Yes', but it should have to be land similar to that being built on, not land that can't be built on.**

**Q18.)** What do you like most about living in the township? SEE ATTACHMENT

**Q19.)** What do you like least about living in the township? SEE ATTACHMENT

**Q20.)** Please list any additional comments you might have about comprehensive land use planning, commercial development, residential development, recreation, town services, agriculture, and growth in Jessenland Township.  
**SEE ATTACHMENT**



Q18.

- seeing the wildlife, not having too close of neighbors
- wildlife and peaceful place to live
- quiet most of the time. Walking in the country's space, seeing the deer and birds and no one living right next door.
- peaceful, country living
- being away from traffic
- none
- it's home, spent my whole life here
- country living with the rural sounds, smells, etc.; nice neighbors
- been here many years and we love it
- being in a rural area
- country life
- peaceful
- We like the quiet and peaceful spot we have, nature is best – flowers, trees-animals, no close neighbors
- Nice, quiet farming community. Would like to see it stay that way.
- My wonderful neighbors. They truly understand what it means to live in the country. Having space.
- That it is still mostly rural
- the rural atmosphere, seeing wildlife in natural setting
- It's a very beautiful township. A lot of recreational parks and trails, country living, privacy
- 'country living', quiet
- open space
- the trees, creeks, wild flowers; peace and quietness; the corn and bean fields; the wild animals, birds
- location-close to the cities, close to Mankato-yet rural
- the peace and quiet
- no traffic jams, quiet settings, farming area
- quiet
- privacy
- the people are friendly, twp. government does a good job in spending the monies that are levied, the families and friendly people
- country living
- country living
- still fairly rural
- is still rural
- woods, ravines, wildlife, Silver Lake, Scenic Byway, These are the things that will bring people to Jessenland to live and hence these should be valued and protected.
- rural, nature, animals/birds
- rural area-scenery, wildlife, non-residential development-spaces between homes, active attempts to control development
- natural beauty
- wildlife, river, small town
- peace and quiet
- the view, peaceful, privacy
- When I get home from work it is peaceful, tranquil. I don't hear or see any neighbors staring at me.

- rural, quiet setting, hunting opportunities
- close to MN river, ability to drive to MPLS for work
- farming
- amount of wildlife area available-river bottoms, ravines, etc. that are not developed
- fair taxes
- it is a good township
- quiet and good access to any highway
- open space, beautiful woodland, less people, scenic beauty
- privacy, quiet
- open space, clean air, good people
- still rural
- having a high quality to my rural lifestyle with reasonable services and taxes
- nice area
- it is quiet and no businesses, no traffic

Q19.

- no paved shoulder on county roads
- stinky feedlots, manure, junk yard like residence
- taxes
- approaching housing
- people destroying woodland and building in hillsides
- no support to stop existing water pollution
- the people that don't like ag or feedlots move back to Minneapolis
- poor snow removal, too many gravel roads
- housing, buildings
- fertilizer, herbicides, pesticides, getting into water table
- ice-snow removal, prices of goods
- encroachment, building too close to existing neighbors
- lack of enforcement of current ordinances, What good are more rules if current ones aren't enforced.
- philosophy of some residents who believe they can do what ever they want because they live in the country
- allowing wild geese to pollute Silver Lake and destroy agriculture crops, all the geese, coyotes
- country living
- country living
- I like it a lot.
- residential building=too many in one year
- the high water on the road
- gravel roads
- nothing
- abusers of existing ordinances
- the roads not getting plowed as quickly as other county's roads
- loose dogs running around
- the 'rif-raf' being allowed in @ the developments who then complain about "the smells", roads aren't straight and cardinal
- people going up high with pickups and cars without mufflers plus resonators and full throttle, even big trucks do not bother
- taxes-too high, snow removal-very slow
- taxes
- been here many years and we love it

- people moving in from other areas and trying to change the rules to their liking, farmers and livestock producers have been in the township a long, so we should not be trying to force them out with more rules
- tax base is getting too high
- dishonest supervisors, barking dogs
- knee jerk reactions by the township boards, the desire to add more laws and restrictions
- non-ag, non native resident infiltration of P&Z; double paying for all land use issues; ridiculous regulations for manure spreading, while commercial fertilizer and pesticide application is unchecked
- no traffic control, the road conditions-the trucks driving at such high speeds, the junk and salvage yards need to be cleaned up, something definitely needs to be done about motorcycles driving 100mph+ on Co. Rd. 6
- people who move to the country and complain about farming and animal agriculture, they should move back to the cities, it's the farmers livelihood
- too much traffic and noise, especially big semis and gravel trucks
- people putting up hog feedlots across from your house and telling you it will have no problems
- our taxes are higher than other townships
- seeing a few farm sites look like a salvage yard
- living on a gravel road that gets a moderate amount of traffic at a high rate of speed (+/-50mph)
- feedlots
- the township making rules on livestock when was turned over to the county, the double dipping of permits

Q20.

- keep P&Z in place, toughen restrictions, plan ahead
- I am concerned about new feedlots effect on the land and water and people.
- I'm just concerned about pollution, that's why I'm more for recreational activities.
- If you want residential development it should be in the form of incorporated towns.
- Would it matter anyway? In this township people can build pole sheds and live in them.
- If township land use regulations are to continue, voters/taxpayers will need to see a benefit. There is growing sentiment to vote for repeal of township p&z because of costs, bureaucracy, and lack of visible advantage to twp. p&z. Permits are too high, process is slow and cumbersome, and end results seem the same as other county regulated townships.
- It has become apparent to our household that the P&Z board has their own agenda. Our intent of wanting a localized board was to have more influence on decisions. However the board continues to follow their own agenda's and to propose changes based on the requests of the townships new requests. It seems we could use our money and time more efficiently looking for future revenue opportunities that would lower or maintain our current tax rate. The proposed changes seem to discourage development that would increase revenue and attract more residents. In addition, some of the members of p&z board have displayed actions of disrespect and bias in issues. Overall the actions are very discouraging, its time for a change. Members that take into consideration that we are a rural community and should have more latitude in our life styles would be desired. A common sense approach would be nice.
- end township zoning
- I did not like the way the agriculture/feedlots issues were presented in the survey, animal agriculture is agriculture, Q1, Q6, Q9. It looked like you were trying to make animal agriculture look bad. Kinda goes hand in hand with the answer to Q19.
- We strongly believe and feel very impartial that one does not need 40 acres of land to build a home on. And we strongly believe planning and zoning should be left to the county.

- I feel some of these questions depend on the individual situation. Every side has concerns and exceptions which have to be considered. Some of these questions are foolish. It's like asking someone if he has stopped beating their spouse!!! I feel with your past history it would be best if you just let the county handle P&Z.
- Would like to see less emphasis on residential development and more focus on farmland, wooded areas, etc.
- New residential developments should be clustered tightly together on ½ acre lots or so, in order to minimize land taken up and costs of providing services. Zoning should be more strictly enforced.
- I think it is starting to happen faster and faster and it's a shame that the scenic byway is going to be filled with homes all around it. It was peaceful to drive down without the thought of it lined with homes.
- When discussing development...this is still an agricultural area (crops, livestock) when residential developments complain of farms/smell/noise...it should be defined more clearly to future buyers/owners where they are moving and what is prominent in the area.
- fear of losing agricultural control on board
- Don't remember being informed about (hotel) building on county park road being built. Would like notice of all such dwellings being constructed. Is that even occupied??
- Let P&Z go back to county
- Keep residential developments out. We need to preserve rural setting.
- Jessenland should not be turned into one big development. It's important to keep land as rural as possible.
- It seems "your" survey covers most of concerns. Very good survey.
- I'd like to see the township remain rural. However, reality is just across the river in Belle Plaine. P&Z needs to be prepared. It is probably not possible to stop residential development but it should be a slow, planned growth. Save the ravines and wooded areas-in the end that will be Jessenland's jewel. Developments should be small and be required to have lots of green space. Jessenland's P&Z will become more and more important. Don't go backwards!
- Keep the lights off! Let's see the stars, not the neighbors yard-use a switch, we don't need to see you 24hrs. a day.
- No building within 500ft. of neighbors property line.
- I'd be ok with new residential lots of one per 10 acre but no more than four per quarter (160 acre).
- Enforce non-agri. next to ditches, creeks, lakes. Grass barrier next to water can be used for animal grazing or bale.
- less housing, less developments, more recreation, trail along river, a new planning and zoning committee
- So many homes are built on good farmland. We have to keep in mind that farming is a career for farm families and by developing the land and by placing restrictions on their development we will lose them and will cause an economic ripple and effect. We need to find a balance between ag and housing.
- We don't think it's fair or legal that people have to pay double fees when applying for building permits-variances, etc.
- Jessenland countryside is beautiful but is continuing to become degraded by junkyards and gravel pits. Have a look at the scenic byway (#6)-it's disgusting. It is and always will be a floodplain-why would anyone be allowed to build a house and septic there when they know it will become flooded? I have real concern regarding feedlots. On one hand the area is predominantly ag but the impact to the area surrounding the lot is so negative-and there is nothing neighbors can do. The timing of our outdoor activities depends on when the neighbor's lagoon is emptied for all of us to enjoy...

-I realize growth is inevitable. Just look at Belle Plaine and New Prague for instance. However, we need to have board members with a clear vision of our environment. I'd hate to see the valley and surrounding lands turn into a collection of over built "three acre" developments like north and east of New Prague in Dakota and Scott County. We need a carefully managed plan for growth. Don't suppress growth, but please keep it within reason. Think about septic systems, erosion, aquifer issues and the like.

-A-ag. livestock should have the same rules as the state. The township isn't telling any- one else when or how to do job or livelihood.