

| Commentor | Source           | Comment   |
|-----------|------------------|---|
|           | 10/30 Open House | Concerns about lack of healthcare facilities and an aging population in the county. Would like to see some healthcare infrastructure built.   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Comment was made about concerns that there isn't enough business and industry in the county to keep people here. Would like that to be a higher priority.   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Goal 5.4 Clarification delivering accessible "civic services" attempting to define that term online is confusing and undesirable if interpreted as online.  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Less than 1% of the County residents responded to the survey. How can this be a valid representative of all Le Sueur County?  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | The population of Le Sueur County is not 99% caucasian.   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Bring businesses to Le Sueur County to help build tax base. Use the industrial space already zoned. Please do not use tax incentives to bring businesses into county. How can this be fair to other businesses not provided tax breaks with residents' money                            |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Is the rumor true that the county wants to buy the road runner building for storage? (It takes a possible business opportunity away from a potential buyer)   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Regarding Chapter 5, will taxpayer funding be used to "maintain emergency shelters for pets and vulnerable populations"? Please describe "vulnerable populations".  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Everything on these boards makes Land Use guide seem very innocent and innocuous. If the commissioners feel this is so safe for the residents, I suggest they don't sign the document and use it as a "guide" rather than a mandate -- which is what signing off would be -- a mandate. |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Services should be privatized and not run or controlled by county government  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | County Commissioners, do not sign Vision 2050 Le Sueur County Comprehensive Plan. Use it as a guide only so that any changes are optional and not mandatory.  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | No stack and pack housing.  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | The anticipated growth in population must be coming from illegal immigration (other migration) versus organic family growth because the birth rate is decreasing and the older generation is passing away.  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | It shouldn't be the government using taxpayer money to build housing.   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Why are they using ag land to increase the tax base?  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | What are they spending the increased tax revenue on?  |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Who should the lawyers contact?   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Please review the plan zoned as Residential around Sabre Lake   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | Please review the plan zoned as Residential around Sabre Lake   |
|           | 10/30 Open House | In future land use, keep zoning use around cities as low density Ag. It is extremely difficult to work with parcels that are built out or have been developed. Allowing B & I around towns creates areas with no advantage to annex into the City.                                      |

|    |                           |  |
|----|---------------------------|--|
| AL | Draft Plan Online Comment | <p>A big concern with the Land Use Plan, is that we have spent more tax payer dollars than seems necessary to an outside agency, when we have county staff that could have updated our earlier plan. It seems that local staff, with their background, their direct knowledge of the county property, familiarity with citizens, improvement needs could save nearly \$200,000 for our budget. There were lots of county staff names acknowledged at the start of the document but just how much input did they have and how much time given to this project? I was shocked to learn how influential Bolton &amp; Menk are nationally. This presents concerns that their input/considerations reflect issues being pushed by The United Nations and/or proponents of One World Government. Terms like sustainability, climate-resiliency, 2040 &amp; 2050 goal setting suggest less input by the citizen property owner, leaning toward government control. One of the significant rights of the American citizen has been the 'right to own property' in the pursuit of freedom since 1776. Washington State Supreme Court Justice Richard B. Sanders presents this definition of property rights: "Property in its thing consists not merely in its ownership and possession, but in the unrestricted use, enjoyment, and disposal. Anything which destroys any of the elements of property to that extent destroys the property itself. The substantial value of property lies in its use. If the right of use be denied, the value of the property is annihilated, and ownership is rendered a barren right. " I quote Justice Sanders, as I fear many aspects of this plan may provide government with use of decision-making, possibly without protection of property rights. Why must property owners apply for permits for any action on their own property? What difference does it make where people work or live? We offer space, lakes, quiet, a slower pace in our county and that will always be attractive to some. Are we going to push for multi-family landscapes to increase housing, that the citizen does not find acceptable? It would seem that legislative restraints may present significant factors in promoting new business or higher salaries locally. Increasing local taxes cannot continue to promote unpopular government plans. One last comment on Transportation Goals 6.3.1 and 6.4.1 after hearing last summer, of D.O.T.s suggestions for highway 99 changes through LeCenter. Road connections Can be smooth without requiring accommodations in every instance for walking, biking, transit and freight" The level of traffic and the use of the neighborhood being entered or exited should determine transportation infrastructure. These detailed references are just a few thoughts that concern me about a comprehensive plan that allows too much influence on private citizen choices. Sincerely</p> |
| LR | Draft Plan Online Comment | <p>I have a feeling we are being manipulated and lied to. There are no clear cut answers and that's the government's way of screwing us. Just leave us alone and don't screw things up.</p>  |
| L  | Draft Plan Online Comment | <p>1) It is hard to sell me on an idea when the basics are incorrect. Sakatah Park is still spelled incorrectly on the information board. Maybe if one is not from the area it seems like a small thing. 2) an important point in the "American Dream" is if you own the property, you own the rights to make a profit from that property as long as does not impinge on another's right to use their property in like manner. I am concerned about this factor and it is what sets America apart from other nations.</p>  |
| J  | Draft Plan Online Comment | <p>I don't know if this is in your scope or not, but I feel that there needs to be a stop to any increase in hog farming or expansion. The smell is getting out of hand and it will soon be affecting our property values, if not already. We live on the west end of West Jefferson and there are many days when we can hardly stand to be in our yard or on the lake.</p>  |
| LR | Draft Plan Online Comment | <p>Leave the county as it is. Stop manipulating and leaving out the truth. I don't know why you have to screw things up. With all the junk places out here the county doesn't clean up, who would want to move out here?</p>   |

|  |                     |   |
|--|---------------------|---|
|  | Le Center Comments  | <p>If there's a potential for adverse effects on future city development by the County designating zoning districts around Le Center, I don't think that's the direction to go. Keeping those fringe areas as Agricultural makes the most sense for future annexation and growth.</p> <p>I also wanted to note that the city's future land use maps (the ones referenced in this exercise) are roughly 25 years old. They may not accurately reflect the city's current development vision. They might still align in some areas, but until we complete a comprehensive plan update, we won't know for sure.</p> <p>So overall, I think your approach is good with keeping the surrounding areas Agricultural and let each city determine how and when to expand based on updated planning efforts.</p> <p>Thanks for reaching out to us on this.</p>   |
|  | Montgomery Comments | <p>Thank you for sharing the information.</p> <p>In short, I like that the county is looking to focus more development around cities where there is the infrastructure to better accommodate this development, especially commercial and industrial.</p> <p>The concern we discussed with having the county land use mirror the city land use would be potential unintended consequences, and that would be development that could occur without having the parcels brought into the city via annexation.</p> <p>It is my understanding that a parcel zoned industrial, commercial, or residential in the county could be purchased by an entity, and then they could go about constructing their buildings and what not, without annexation. This may be less likely with a housing project as a single parcel would need to be split and if it's in the 1-mile radius, the city's subdivision requirements come into play. This could present issues for future expansion for the city.</p> <p>Take the Boat Doctor for example. If the county's zoning matches the city, any future expansion of this business could be done without having to annex the parcels. The business would then have some in the city and some out. Furthermore, there may be an incentive for the business to petition to detach from the city now that the county zoning is compliant with their business operation.</p> <p>To your point, to prevent this potentiality, it might be better to leave the areas immediately adjacent to the city zoned as Ag. Then, if a business is looking to locate or expand, one of the first things that will be needed is to go through the annexation process, and when that is done, then the city's zoning designation would apply.</p> <p>Thank you again for letting us comment on the draft.</p> |

|  |                     |   |
|--|---------------------|---|
|  | Montgomery Comments | <p>I am concerned about zoning around the city that would permit increased development without annexation. I would think keeping large agricultural parcels adjacent to city limits would allow for future expansion of the city and more orderly development. Mirroring city zoning adjacent to city limits without annexation can easily make it extremely difficult for the city to expand and develop in the future.</p> <p>Some examples are the residential developments on the SW corner of MN 13 and MN 21 and the properties along CSAH 3 north of Montgomery, as well as the Montgomery Sawmill. Currently, there is not advantage for these properties to annex into the city and, if they choose to in the future, it will be extremely difficult to provide city services without the proper dedications and infrastructure.</p> <p>Allowing increased rural residential development around the cities will also greatly prohibit future expansion. If residential density is increased in the ag district, there will be increased residential development adjacent to cities. I can see cases where a developer will come in and create a larger rural residential development instead of annexing into the city and installing the necessary infrastructure to put in an urban residential subdivision. This exact reason is why we have required platting adjacent to city limits when individuals want to split their property, requiring areas to be designated as Outlot so they cannot develop in the future without annexation (i.e., J and J Kukacka Farm plat and the Holetz property directly to the north).</p> <p>I am not sure of the best answer, but I would think it would be better to keep large ag parcels adjacent to cities with less rural development, allowing for annexation and orderly subdivision of the properties.</p> |
|--|---------------------|---|

|  |                                    |  |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
|  | New Prague Comments                | <p>The county requirements for any development (residential, commercial, etc.) would be a lot different than what the city requirements would be and exactly what you say could happen – development would occur outside of city limits and as the city grows into the “rural” developed areas, the size of the lots and type of development likely will be cost prohibitive to extend utilities to versus the smaller city lots that could occur with the development on city utilities.</p> <p>I can tell you that on our Scott County side of the City, Scott County put “urban expansion reserve” areas around New Prague (and all other cities) in the area that closely matched our future growth boundary.<br/> <a href="https://www.scottcountymn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/9323/2040-Planned-Land-Use-Map---Official?bidId=">https://www.scottcountymn.gov/DocumentCenter/View/9323/2040-Planned-Land-Use-Map---Official?bidId=</a></p> <p>It’s certainly restrictive, allowing only 1 home per 40 in most of the area and for the urban business reserve, I believe the only allow lot splits of 40 acres or more. Essentially not much “county” development happens in this area and exactly like you say, it prevents too much non-city development from occurring.</p> <p>I see the good and bad with this as it does limit property owners in what can develop in these areas unless they annex...and in some cases it can cost millions to get city infrastructure to them in order to annex...therefore making their property sit largely undeveloped for many years...but again, that’s pretty much the goal. I don’t think the township likes it as it limits their growth of the tax base around the city, but again, we have an Orderly Annexation Agreement for some of the growth area anyways.</p> <p>I certainly would support some sort of “urban expansion reserve” area. I’m not sure it necessarily needs to be a 1 per 40 limit...and maybe it’s something less but requiring ghost plats and conformance to future city roads in plats to show “city” development if utilities are provided to the area in the future. At the same time, I think the city can support limited development for commercial/industrial on those areas along TH13/21/CSAH 29 that are already there and could be expanded. I just know we can’t get sanitary sewer there for a long time due to cost constraints so there’s probably a happy medium there somewhere.</p> |
|  | New Prague Comments<br>(Continued) | <p>Anyways, that was sort of a rambling e-mail, but yes, ideally, it would be nice to have development limited in our growth area to lessen the headaches down the road, but also recognize the cost/timing of some of the development in our growth area might mean that it could be a long time until development can occur and that some interim type development, showing ghost platting and fitting with future city roads, might not be a bad idea either.</p>   |

**Thank you to all individuals and local agencies that took time to attend the public open house and review drafts of the Comprehensive Plan throughout the project. We greatly appreciate your comments. All comments have been provided to Le Sueur County Staff and were taken into consideration when refining the plan for County Planning Commission and County Board consideration.**