



**Regular Planning Commission
Meeting Agenda
Monday, October 5th, 2026 @ 6:00 PM**

Commission Chair: Simon Stricker

Commission:
Joby Goerges
Roman Siltman
Corey Derksen
Debbie Siltman

City Clerk/Zoning Administrator:
Cassandra Delougherty
**City Community Development
Administrator:** Katie Kostohryz
City Attorney: Joe Langel

City of Jenkins
33861 Cottage Avenue
Jenkins, MN 56474
(218) 568-4637

Join Zoom Meeting
<https://zoom.us/join>
Meeting ID: 353 029 2895
Password: 56474
Dial by location: (312) 626-6799 (US Chicago)

NOTE: PRINTED MATERIALS RELATING TO AGENDA ITEMS ARE AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION IN A THREE-RING BINDER ON TABLE BY COUNCIL CHAMBER ENTRANCE.

1. CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
2. ROLL CALL
3. APPROVAL
 - a. AGENDA
 - b. MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 8TH, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING (ORD AMNDMT O-26-53)
4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
 - a. AGRICULTURAL USES AND AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES
 - b. ACCESSORY USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES
 - c. INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN RESIDENTIAL DWELLING §150.005 DEFINITIONS AND §150.038 LAND USE MATRIX
 - d. PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54 AMENDING DEFINITIONS AND LAND USE MATRIX
5. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. CITIZEN CONCERN/COMPLAINT POLICY AMENDMENT
 - b. CITY STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY ROAD WIDTH REVIEW
6. MISCELLANEOUS/COMMUNICATION
 - a. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
7. ADJOURNMENT

JENKINS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING

MEETING MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 8TH, 2026 6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER – PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AND THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE WAS RECITED.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: COMMISSION CHAIR SIMON STRICKER; PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ROMAN SILTMAN AND DEBBIE SILTMAN; CITY CLERK/ZONING ADMINISTRATOR CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY. NOT PRESENT: PLANNING COMMISSIONERS JOBY GOERGES AND COREY DERKSEN.

ABSENT: COMMISSIONER DEBBIE SILTMAN

APPROVAL

MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA & MINUTES FROM AUGUST 3RD, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING (ORD AMNDMT O-26-52) MADE BY D. DILTMAN SECONDED BY R. SSILTMAN.

PUBLIC HEARING

PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-53 CITY-INITIATED REZONES

I. OPEN HEARING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED AT 6:04 PM.

II. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

NO PUBLIC COMMENT WAS RECEIVED. THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED AT 6:04 PM.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATION

CITY CLERK/ZONING ADMINISTRATOR DELOUGHERTY PRESENTED THE STAFF REPORT ON PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-53, A CITY-INITIATED REZONING OF 10 PARCELS CURRENTLY ZONED AGRICULTURAL (AG) THAT NO LONGER MEET THE MINIMUM 10-ACRE LOT SIZE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT. THE REZONING WAS DESCRIBED AS A HOUSEKEEPING MEASURE, PARTICULARLY IN LIGHT OF RECENT ORDINANCE CHANGES PERMITTING ANIMAL UNITS IN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS—PROVISIONS WHICH ARE TIED TO PARCEL SIZE AND DO NOT APPLY TO AGRICULTURALLY ZONED PARCELS BELOW THE MINIMUM ACREAGE THRESHOLD. THE PACKET INCLUDED INDIVIDUAL PARCEL INFORMATION, CURRENT USES, EXISTING

STRUCTURES, AND THE AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING REQUIRED UNDER STATE STATUTE. STAFF NOTED THAT NONE OF THE 10 PARCELS CURRENTLY HAVE AN EXISTING PRIMARY AGRICULTURAL USE.

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-53, THE CITY-INITIATED REZONE OF 10 AGRICULTURALLY ZONED PARCELS NOT MEETING MINIMUM LOT SIZE REQUIREMENTS TO RURAL RESIDENTIAL (RR), AND TO FORWARD THE RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL, WAS MADE BY R. SILTMAN AND SECONDED BY D. SILTMAN. MOTION CARRIED.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

REVIEW OF AGRICULTURAL USES AND AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES

REVIEW OF DEFINITIONS PROVIDED BY COMMISSIONER SILTMAN

DELOUGHERTY SUMMARIZED THE CURRENT STATUS OF THIS ONGOING DISCUSSION. THE CITY ATTORNEY'S RECOMMENDATION, SOUGHT AT THE CITY COUNCIL'S REQUEST, WAS TO STRIKE "AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE" FROM THE LAND USE MATRIX ENTIRELY, CITING THE TERM'S LACK OF A DEFINITION IN CITY CODE §150.005 AS A SOURCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE AMBIGUITY THAT MADE CONSISTENT ENFORCEMENT UNRELIABLE.

IN RESPONSE TO THAT RECOMMENDATION, COMMISSIONER SILTMAN HAD PROPOSED REPLACING THE BROAD CATEGORY WITH SPECIFIC, NARROWLY DEFINED STRUCTURE TYPES—HAY SHED, GRAIN SILO, AND BARN—EACH WITH CLEAR, LIMITED PURPOSES. THE COMMISSION EXPRESSED GENERAL SUPPORT FOR THIS APPROACH, AGREEING THAT REMOVING THE AMBIGUOUS GENERAL CLASSIFICATION WHILE INCORPORATING CLEARLY DEFINED SPECIFIC STRUCTURES INTO BOTH THE DEFINITIONS SECTION AND THE LAND USE MATRIX WOULD PROVIDE A MORE ENFORCEABLE AND PREDICTABLE FRAMEWORK.

THE COMMISSION DISCUSSED THE POSSIBILITY OF INCLUDING AN ASTERISK NOTATION IN THE LAND USE MATRIX TO RESTRICT APPLICABILITY TO PARCELS EXCEEDING 10 ACRES IN THE RELEVANT ZONING DISTRICTS, WHICH WOULD HELP CONFINE THE PROVISIONS TO GENUINELY AGRICULTURAL CONTEXTS. IT WAS ACKNOWLEDGED THAT ANY PROPOSED ORDINANCE LANGUAGE WOULD NEED TO RETURN TO THE CITY ATTORNEY FOR REVIEW BEFORE FORMAL ADOPTION. STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO PREPARE DRAFT ORDINANCE LANGUAGE INCORPORATING THE SPECIFIC STRUCTURE DEFINITIONS AND TO PRESENT THE MATTER TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THEIR INPUT AS WELL.

REVIEW OF ACCESSORY USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

DELOUGHERTY PRESENTED A STAFF REPORT COMPILED WITH ASSISTANCE FROM SOURCEWELL REVIEWING HOW OTHER MINNESOTA COMMUNITIES DEFINE AND REGULATE ACCESSORY USES, PARTICULARLY TO PREVENT AN ACCESSORY USE FROM BECOMING THE PREDOMINANT USE OF A

PROPERTY. COMMUNITIES REVIEWED INCLUDED SAINT MICHAEL, BAXTER, ROGERS, AND MAPLE GROVE, WITH NUMERICAL LIMITS RANGING FROM 10 TO 30 PERCENT OF GROSS FLOOR AREA.

THE COMMISSION DISCUSSED THE CORE CONCERN: A PROPERTY OWNER COULD ESTABLISH A MINIMAL PRINCIPAL USE—SUCH AS A SMALL OFFICE—AND THEN CLAIM A SUBSTANTIALLY LARGER OPERATION AS AN ACCESSORY USE. THE MOST FREQUENTLY CITED EXAMPLE OF MISUSE WAS SELF-STORAGE OR MINI-STORAGE, WHERE A TOKEN PRINCIPAL USE FOOTPRINT IS USED TO JUSTIFY A DISPROPORTIONATE STORAGE OPERATION.

THE COMMISSION INDICATED GENERAL AGREEMENT WITH THE STAFF-RECOMMENDED APPROACH OF COMBINING A CLEAR QUALITATIVE DEFINITION WITH A NUMERICAL CAP. THE SUGGESTED LANGUAGE IN THE STAFF REPORT DEFINED AN ACCESSORY USE AS ONE THAT IS INCIDENTAL AND SUBORDINATE IN AREA, EXTENT, PURPOSE, INTENSITY, AND OPERATION TO AN ESTABLISHED PRINCIPAL USE ON THE SAME PARCEL, WITH ACCESSORY USES NOT TO EXCEED 25 PERCENT OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPAL USE. ADDITIONALLY, THE COMMISSION DISCUSSED LANGUAGE SPECIFYING THAT AN ACCESSORY USE SHALL NOT BE ESTABLISHED BEFORE THE PRINCIPAL USE, AND THAT A NOMINAL OR DE MINIMIS PRINCIPAL USE SHALL NOT BE ESTABLISHED FOR THE PURPOSE OF QUALIFYING ANOTHER USE AS AN ACCESSORY USE.

THE COMMISSION EXPRESSED PARTICULAR SUPPORT FOR THE ANTI-CIRCUMVENTION LANGUAGE, NOTING THAT IT WOULD DIRECTLY ADDRESS THE SCENARIO WHERE SOMEONE ESTABLISHES A TOKEN PRINCIPAL USE SOLELY TO ENABLE A LARGER ACCESSORY OPERATION. THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE 25 PERCENT CAP OR A 49/51 PERCENT MAJORITY STANDARD WAS MORE APPROPRIATE FOR CERTAIN CONTEXTS WAS BRIEFLY DISCUSSED, WITH THE COMMISSION LEANING TOWARD THE 25 PERCENT FIGURE AS RECOMMENDED WHILE ACKNOWLEDGING THAT SOME DISTRICT-SPECIFIC EXCEPTIONS MAY WARRANT FURTHER CONSIDERATION.

STAFF INDICATED A DRAFT ORDINANCE INCORPORATING THIS DIRECTION WOULD BE BROUGHT BACK TO THE COMMISSION, AND THE MATTER WOULD ALSO BE DISCUSSED WITH THE CITY COUNCIL.

NEW BUSINESS

REVIEW OF INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN RESIDENTIAL DWELLING §150.005

DEFINITIONS AND §150.038 LAND USE MATRIX

DELOUGHERTY PRESENTED A STAFF REPORT IDENTIFYING A CONFLICT BETWEEN THE DEFINITIONS IN CITY CODE §150.005 AND THE LAND USE MATRIX IN §150.038 REGARDING THE CLASSIFICATION OF DUPLEXES AND MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS. UNDER THE CURRENT DEFINITIONS, "DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY" EXPRESSLY INCLUDES DUPLEXES, TRIPLEXES, AND QUADPLEXES. HOWEVER, THE LAND USE MATRIX TREATS "DWELLING, DUPLEX" AND "DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY" AS SEPARATE LAND-USE CATEGORIES AND ASSIGNS THEM DIFFERENT LEVELS OF APPROVAL IN SEVERAL ZONING DISTRICTS—CREATING A DIRECT CONTRADICTION. THE CLEAREST CONFLICT OCCURS IN THE R-1 DISTRICT, WHERE A DUPLEX IS A CONDITIONAL USE BUT A MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING IS AN

EXCLUDED USE; BECAUSE A DUPLEX FALLS UNDER THE DEFINITION OF MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING, AN APPLICANT COULD SIMULTANEOUSLY READ THE CODE AS PERMITTING AND PROHIBITING THE SAME STRUCTURE.

THE COMMISSION AGREED THAT THE MOST STRAIGHTFORWARD RESOLUTION WOULD BE TO AMEND THE DEFINITION OF "DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY" IN §150.005 TO BEGIN AT THREE OR MORE DWELLING UNITS, EFFECTIVELY REMOVING DUPLEXES FROM THAT CATEGORY. THIS WOULD ALLOW "DWELLING, DUPLEX" TO STAND AS ITS OWN DISCRETE LAND-USE CATEGORY IN THE MATRIX WITHOUT CONFLICT, WHILE THE MULTI-FAMILY CLASSIFICATION WOULD THEN CLEARLY APPLY TO TRIPLEXES, QUADPLEXES, AND LARGER APARTMENT-TYPE STRUCTURES. STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO PREPARE PROPOSED ORDINANCE LANGUAGE REFLECTING THIS APPROACH FOR REVIEW AT A FUTURE MEETING, AND TO INFORM THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE WORK IN PROGRESS.

MISCELLANEOUS/COMMUNICATION

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

DELOUGHERTY PRESENTED THE ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT. KEY ITEMS INCLUDED:

PERMITS ISSUED: RECENT PERMITS INCLUDED A BARNDOMINIUM CONSTRUCTION ON TBD EARLE JENKINS DRIVE (PENDING SSTS DESIGN APPROVAL); A PATIO HOME AT 3826 BLAZE BLVD; AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT AT 3544 CEMETERY ROAD; A 2,080 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION AT 33040 ASPENWOOD DRIVE (PEQUOT MANUFACTURING); AND A 16,000 SQUARE FOOT ACCESSORY STRUCTURE IN THE C-2 ZONING DISTRICT AT 33740 STATE HWY 371. DELOUGHERTY NOTED THAT THIS PROPERTY OWNER PAID APPROXIMATELY \$11,000 IN PERMIT FEES TO THE COUNTY FOR AN ACCESSORY BUILDING OUTSIDE OF OUR MUNICIPALITY. HE EXPRESSED THE CITY'S PERMITTING FEES ARE COMPARATIVELY MODEST, ILLUSTRATING THAT JENKINS IS NOT OVERLY RESTRICTIVE IN ITS PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS COMPARED TO NEIGHBORING JURISDICTIONS.

PENDING APPLICATIONS: PRELIMINARY DISCUSSIONS CONTINUED WITH A RURAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY OWNER REGARDING A POTENTIAL CAMPGROUND OPERATION. CAMPGROUNDS ARE PERMITTED BY CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT IN THE AGRICULTURAL, C-2, AND PUBLIC DISTRICTS, SO THE APPLICANT WOULD NEED EITHER A REZONE OR AN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT BEFORE PROCEEDING. THE RESIDENTIAL STORAGE REZONE AND COMMON INTEREST COMMUNITY APPLICATION REMAINED ON HOLD. THE AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE APPLICATION ON THE 40-ACRE PARCEL WAS ON HOLD UNTIL AT LEAST THE FOLLOWING YEAR AT THE PROPERTY OWNER'S REQUEST.

ZONING COMPLIANCE: A CITIZEN CONCERN WAS FILED REGARDING A PROPERTY LOCATED BETWEEN THE GARDEN CENTER AND GOPHER TRAIL. DELOUGHERTY NOTED THAT THE CONCERN APPEARED TO RELATE TO NUISANCE STANDARDS, INCLUDING POTENTIALLY INOPERABLE OR UNREGISTERED VEHICLES. A FORMAL CITIZEN CONCERN FORM WAS SENT TO THE COMPLAINANT; NO ENFORCEMENT ACTION HAD BEEN INITIATED PENDING RECEIPT OF THE COMPLETED FORM.

PERMIT ACTIVITY SUMMARY: DELOUGHERTY NOTED THAT PERMIT ACTIVITY HAD INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY IN RECENT YEARS. THE CITY HAD PROCESSED APPROXIMATELY 19 LAND USE APPLICATIONS IN THE CURRENT YEAR AT THE TIME OF THE MEETING, COMPARED TO 9 IN 2021, 12 IN 2022, 17 IN 2023, AND HIGHER TOTALS IN THE TWO PRECEDING YEARS. THE INCREASE IN MORE COMPLEX BUILDING PERMITS WAS NOTED AS A POSITIVE INDICATOR FOR THE COMMUNITY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 6:52 PM MADE BY R. SILTMAN AND SECONDED BY D. SILTMAN. MOTION CARRIED.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 202_.

CASSANDRA M. DELOUGHERTY, CITY CLERK-TREASURER
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR



AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PREPARED BY: CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY

DATE: SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2026

SUBJECT: AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE CLASSIFICATION – CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION AND POTENTIAL ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

REPORT: THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT IS TO PROVIDE THE PLANNING COMMISSION WITH AN UPDATE REGARDING THE CITY COUNCIL'S DISCUSSION OF THE CITY'S CURRENT **"AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE"** CLASSIFICATION AND TO SEEK INPUT REGARDING A POTENTIAL ORDINANCE AMENDMENT.

THE ISSUE WAS PREVIOUSLY BROUGHT BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION BECAUSE **"AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE"** IS IDENTIFIED AS A PERMITTED USE WITHIN THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT UNDER **CITY CODE §150.038, LAND USE MATRIX**, BUT THE TERM IS NOT DEFINED IN **CITY CODE §150.005, DEFINITIONS**, OR ELSEWHERE IN THE CITY CODE.

AS DISCUSSED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL, THE LACK OF A DEFINITION CREATES UNCERTAINTY REGARDING WHAT TYPES OF STRUCTURES QUALIFY AS AN AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE AND MAKES CONSISTENT ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE ORDINANCE DIFFICULT.

CITY COUNCIL DISCUSSION

AT ITS SEPTEMBER 14, 2026 MEETING, THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE CITY'S EXISTING **AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE** CLASSIFICATION.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAD RECOMMENDED:

- REMOVING THE UNDEFINED TERM **"AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE"** FROM THE LAND USE MATRIX;
- ADDING SPECIFIC DEFINITIONS FOR **BARN, SILO, AND HAY SHED** TO THE DEFINITIONS SECTION OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE;
- ADDING THOSE SPECIFIC USES TO THE LAND USE MATRIX SO THAT EACH MAY BE SEPARATELY REGULATED; AND
- PERMITTING **BARN, SILO, AND HAY SHEDS** WITHIN THE **RURAL RESIDENTIAL (RR) ZONING DISTRICT ON PARCELS CONTAINING 10 ACRES OR MORE.**

THE CITY COUNCIL EXPRESSED CONSENSUS SUPPORT FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S PROPOSED APPROACH AND DIRECTED STAFF TO PROCEED WITH DRAFTING THE APPROPRIATE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT.

COUNCIL'S DIRECTION SUPPORTS REPLACING THE EXISTING BROAD AND UNDEFINED AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE CLASSIFICATION WITH MORE CLEARLY DEFINED AND INDIVIDUALLY REGULATED AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES.

THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT SHOULD THEREFORE ADDRESS:

1. REMOVAL OF **AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE** FROM THE LAND USE MATRIX;



AGENDA ITEM

2. DEFINITIONS FOR **BARN, SILO, AND HAY SHED**;
3. APPROPRIATE LAND USE MATRIX CLASSIFICATIONS FOR EACH STRUCTURE;
4. PERMITTED USE OF BARNS, SILOS, AND HAY SHEDS WITHIN THE **RURAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT ON PARCELS 10 ACRES OR GREATER**; AND
5. ANY ADDITIONAL STANDARDS NECESSARY TO ENSURE THAT THE STRUCTURES ARE USED CONSISTENTLY WITH THEIR INTENDED AGRICULTURAL PURPOSE.

PROPOSED SPECIFIC AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES

COUNCILMEMBER/COMMISSIONER SILTMAN HAS PROVIDED THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED DEFINITIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AS PART OF A POTENTIAL ORDINANCE AMENDMENT.

HAY SHED

“HAY SHED” – A STRUCTURE WITH THE SOLE PURPOSE OF STORING HAY, STRAW, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING.

GRAIN SILO

“GRAIN SILO” – A TALL, CYLINDRICAL STRUCTURE WITH THE SOLE PURPOSE OF STORING HARVESTED GRAINS.

BARN

“BARN” – A STRUCTURE TO SHELTER LIVESTOCK, LIVESTOCK FEED, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING.

THESE DEFINITIONS ARE PROVIDED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION CONSIDERATION AS A POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE TO MAINTAINING A BROAD **“AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE”** CLASSIFICATION.

UNDER THIS APPROACH, THE CITY COULD REMOVE “AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE” FROM §150.038 AND, INSTEAD, SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFY LIMITED AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES SUCH AS **HAY SHED, GRAIN SILO, AND BARN** WITHIN THE DEFINITIONS SECTION AND LAND USE MATRIX.

REQUESTED ACTION: THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW THE CITY COUNCIL’S DIRECTION AND PROVIDE ANY FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE PROPOSED DEFINITIONS, LAND USE MATRIX CLASSIFICATIONS, AND APPLICABLE STANDARDS FOR **BARNS, SILOS, AND HAY SHEDS** BEFORE STAFF PREPARES THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR FORMAL PUBLIC HEARING.

IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION REMAINS SUPPORTIVE OF ITS PRIOR RECOMMENDATION, STAFF REQUESTS DIRECTION TO PROCEED WITH PREPARATION OF THE PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY COUNCIL’S SEPTEMBER 14, 2026 DIRECTION.



AGENDA ITEM #

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PREPARED BY: CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY

DATE: SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2026

SUBJECT: ACCESSORY USES & ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

REPORT: THE PLANNING COMMISSION PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED PROPOSED AMENDMENTS CONCERNING THE DEFINITION AND REGULATION OF **ACCESSORY USE**, INCLUDING STANDARDS INTENDED TO CLARIFY WHEN AN ACCESSORY USE REMAINS SUBORDINATE TO THE PRINCIPAL USE OF A PROPERTY.

THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE INCLUDED:

- A LIMITATION OF **25% OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA**; AND
- AN ADDITIONAL STANDARD LIMITING ACCESSORY USES TO NO MORE THAN **49% OF THE TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA**.

THE PROPOSED STANDARDS WERE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW AND POLICY DIRECTION. AT ITS SEPTEMBER 14, 2026 MEETING, THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S PROPOSED LANGUAGE AND PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS. COUNCIL EXPRESSED GENERAL SUPPORT FOR BOTH THE PROPOSED DEFINITION AND THE RECOMMENDED PERCENTAGE STANDARDS.

COUNCIL DIRECTED STAFF TO FURTHER REFINE THE ORDINANCE LANGUAGE AND RETURN WITH A DRAFT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR FORMAL PUBLIC HEARING.

CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION

COUNCIL'S DISCUSSION INDICATES SUPPORT FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S GENERAL APPROACH OF ESTABLISHING MEASURABLE STANDARDS TO ENSURE THAT AN ACCESSORY USE REMAINS SECONDARY AND SUBORDINATE TO THE PRINCIPAL USE.

THE DRAFT ORDINANCE AMENDMENT SHOULD THEREFORE CONTINUE TO INCORPORATE:

1. THE PROPOSED 25% GROSS FLOOR AREA LIMITATION;
2. THE PROPOSED 49% MAXIMUM OF TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA; AND
3. CLARIFYING LANGUAGE NECESSARY TO MAKE THE STANDARDS UNDERSTANDABLE AND ADMINISTRATIVELY ENFORCEABLE.

REQUESTED ACTION: THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW THE CITY COUNCIL'S FEEDBACK AND PROVIDE ANY FINAL DIRECTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED ACCESSORY USE DEFINITION AND PERCENTAGE STANDARDS.

IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION REMAINS SUPPORTIVE OF THE PROPOSED APPROACH, STAFF REQUESTS DIRECTION TO FINALIZE THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT LANGUAGE AND PROCEED WITH SCHEDULING THE REQUIRED PUBLIC HEARING



AGENDA ITEM #

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PREPARED BY: CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY

DATE: SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2026

SUBJECT: INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN RESIDENTIAL DWELLING
§150.005 DEFINITIONS AND §150.038 LAND USE MATRIX

REPORT: THE PLANNING COMMISSION PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED AN INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE DEFINITION OF **DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY** IN §150.005 AND THE SEPARATE REGULATION OF **DWELLING, DUPLEX** WITHIN §150.038, LAND USE MATRIX.

UNDER THE EXISTING LANGUAGE, A MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING IS DEFINED AS BEGINNING WITH **TWO DWELLING UNITS**, EVEN THOUGH A DUPLEX IS ALREADY SEPARATELY DEFINED AND REGULATED AS ITS OWN LAND-USE CATEGORY.

THIS CREATES CONFLICTING ZONING TREATMENT IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS BECAUSE A PROPOSED DUPLEX MAY QUALIFY BOTH AS A **DWELLING, DUPLEX** AND AS A **DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY**.

TO ADDRESS THE INCONSISTENCY, STAFF RECOMMENDED AMENDING THE DEFINITION OF **DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY** BY REPLACING THE WORD “**TWO**” WITH “**THREE**” AND REMOVING THE REFERENCE TO DUPLEXES FROM THE DEFINITION.

THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED FORWARDING THAT APPROACH TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

CITY COUNCIL DIRECTION:

AT ITS SEPTEMBER 14, 2026 MEETING, THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND EXPRESSED SUPPORT FOR CHANGING THE DEFINITION OF **DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY** TO BEGIN WITH “**THREE OR MORE DWELLING UNITS**” AND REMOVING DUPLEXES FROM THAT DEFINITION.

COUNCIL DIRECTED STAFF TO PROCEED WITH DRAFTING THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT.

COUNCIL ALSO INDICATED THAT POSSIBLE CLARIFYING LANGUAGE MAY BE APPROPRIATE AND SHOULD BE REVIEWED AS THE AMENDMENT IS DEVELOPED.

THE AMENDMENT WOULD ALLOW:

- **DUPLEXES** TO CONTINUE TO BE SEPARATELY DEFINED AND REGULATED UNDER THE EXISTING DWELLING, DUPLEX CLASSIFICATION; AND
- **MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS** TO BEGIN WITH STRUCTURES CONTAINING THREE OR MORE DWELLING UNITS.

THIS WOULD RESOLVE THE PRIMARY OVERLAP BETWEEN THE TWO LAND-USE CLASSIFICATIONS.



AGENDA ITEM

REQUESTED ACTION: THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS REQUESTED TO REVIEW THE CITY COUNCIL'S DIRECTION AND PROVIDE ANY FINAL COMMENTS REGARDING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE **DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY** DEFINITION.

IF THE PLANNING COMMISSION REMAINS SUPPORTIVE OF THE AMENDMENT, STAFF REQUESTS DIRECTION TO PROCEED WITH ORDINANCE LANGUAGE THAT:

1. REPLACES "TWO" WITH "THREE" IN THE DEFINITION OF DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY;
2. REMOVES DUPLEXES FROM THE MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING DEFINITION;
3. RETAINS DUPLEX AS A SEPARATELY DEFINED AND REGULATED LAND USE; AND
4. INCORPORATES ANY NECESSARY CLARIFYING LANGUAGE BEFORE THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT PROCEEDS TO FORMAL PUBLIC HEARING.

ORDINANCE NO. O-26-54
CITY OF JENKINS
COUNTY OF CROW WING, STATE OF MINNESOTA

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE XV 'LAND USAGE', CHAPTER 150 'LAND USE AND SUBDIVISIONS' SUBSECTIONS 150.005 'DEFINITIONS' AND 150.038 "LAND USE MATRIX" OF THE JENKINS CODE OF ORDINANCES

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JENKINS DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

PURPOSE AND INTENT: THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THIS ORDINANCE IS TO AMEND THE JENKINS CODE OF ORDINANCES, TITLE XV: LAND USAGE, CHAPTER 150: LAND USE AND SUBDIVISIONS SUBSECTIONS 150.005: DEFINITIONS TO AMEND, STRIKE, AND INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS.

SECTION 1. TITLE XV, CHAPTER 150, SUBSECTION 150.005 TITLED "DEFINITIONS" IS AMENDED TO STRIKE, THE FOLLOWING:

~~**ACCESSORY USE OR STRUCTURE.** A USE ON THE SAME LOT THAT IS BOTH INCIDENTAL AND SUBORDINATE TO AND SERVING THE PRINCIPAL USE OR STRUCTURE OF FACILITY.~~

SECTION 2. TITLE XV, CHAPTER 150, SUBSECTION 150.005 TITLED "DEFINITIONS" IS AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

ACCESSORY USE. A USE OF LAND, A BUILDING, OR A PORTION OF A BUILDING THAT IS CUSTOMARILY INCIDENTAL AND SUBORDINATE TO THE PRINCIPAL USE OF THE PROPERTY AND IS LOCATED ON THE SAME LOT OR PARCEL AS THE PRINCIPAL USE. AN ACCESSORY USE SHALL NOT BECOME THE PRIMARY OR DOMINANT USE OF THE PROPERTY. WHEN CONDUCTED WITHIN A BUILDING CONTAINING THE PRINCIPAL USE, THE ACCESSORY USE SHALL OCCUPY NO MORE THAN **25% OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF THE BUILDING**. THE TOTAL AREA OCCUPIED BY ACCESSORY USES SHALL NOT EXCEED **49% OF THE TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA OF THE PARCEL**.

ACCESSORY STRUCTURE. A DETACHED OR SUBORDINATE BUILDING OR STRUCTURE LOCATED ON THE SAME LOT OR PARCEL AS THE PRINCIPAL USE OR PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE AND CUSTOMARILY INCIDENTAL TO AND SUPPORTIVE OF THAT PRINCIPAL USE OR STRUCTURE. AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SHALL NOT BE USED IN A MANNER THAT CAUSES IT TO FUNCTION AS THE PRINCIPAL USE OF THE PROPERTY. THE TOTAL AREA OCCUPIED BY ACCESSORY STRUCTURES SHALL NOT EXCEED **49% OF THE TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA OF THE PARCEL**.

BARN. A STRUCTURE TO SHELTER LIVESTOCK, LIVESTOCK FEED, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING.

DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY. ~~Two~~ **THREE** OR MORE DWELLING UNITS ATTACHED TOGETHER BY ANY POINT, INCLUDING DUPLEXES, TRIPLEXES, TOWNHOUSES, AND MULTI-LEVEL UNITS, REGARDLESS OF TYPE OF OWNERSHIP.

GRAIN SILO. A TALL, CYLINDRICAL STRUCTURE WITH THE SOLE PURPOSE OF STORING HARVESTED GRAINS.

HAY SHED. A STRUCTURE WITH THE SOLE PURPOSE OF STORING HAY, STRAW, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING.

SECTION 3. TITLE XV, CHAPTER 150, SUBSECTION 150.038 TITLED "LAND USE MATRIX" IS AMENDED TO STRIKE FROM THE EXISTING TABLE THE FOLLOWING USE:

USE	AG	RR	R-1	R-2	RS	P	C-1	C-2	I-1
AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE	P	E	E	E	E	E	P	P	E

NOTES TO TABLE:

A - ALLOWED WITHOUT A PERMIT P - PERMIT REQUIRED C - CONDITIONAL USE I - INTERIM E - EXCLUDED AC - ACCESSORY USE

SECTION 4. TITLE XV, CHAPTER 150, SUBSECTION 150.038 TITLED “LAND USE MATRIX” IS AMENDED TO INSERT ALPHABETICALLY INTO THE EXISTING TABLE THE FOLLOWING USES AND “NOTES TO TABLE.”:

USE	AG	RR	R-1	R-2	RS	P	C-1	C-2	I-1
BARN	P	E/P10+	E	E	E	E	P	P	E
GRAIN SILO	P	E/P10+	E	E	E	E	E	E	E
HAY SHED	P	E/P10+	E	E	E	E	E	E	E

NOTES TO TABLE:

A - ALLOWED WITHOUT A PERMIT P - PERMIT REQUIRED C - CONDITIONAL USE I - INTERIM E - EXCLUDED

AC - ACCESSORY USE P10+- PERMITTED ON PARCELS 10 ACRES IN SIZE OR GREATER

SECTION 5. REPEAL: THIS ORDINANCE SHALL REPEAL ALL ORDINANCES INCONSISTENT HERewith.

SECTION 6. EFFECTIVE DATE: THIS ORDINANCE AMENDMENT SHALL BE IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT FROM AND AFTER PASSAGE AND PUBLICATION ACCORDING TO STATE LAW. PASSED BY THE JENKINS CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF JENKINS, MINNESOTA, THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 2026.

ANDREW RUDLANG, MAYOR

ATTEST:

CASSANDRA M. DELOUGHERTY, CITY CLERK-TREASURER

**Summary Ordinance for Publication
ORDINANCE NO. O-26-54**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE XV LAND USAGE, CHAPTER 150 LAND USE AND
SUBDIVISIONS SUBSECTIONS 150.005: DEFINITIONS, AND 150.038 “*LAND USE MATRIX*”
OF THE JENKINS CODE OF ORDINANCES**

The City Council of the City of Jenkins, Minnesota has approved this summary publication of Ordinance #O-26-54, which amends the Jenkins Code of Ordinances, Title XV: “*LAND USAGE*”, Chapter 150: LAND USE AND SUBDIVISIONS Subsections 150.005: DEFINITIONS, and 150.038 “*LAND USE MATRIX*” to better define and regulate ‘DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY’, ‘ACCESSORY USES & STRUCTURES’, ‘AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES’, and ‘NOTES TO TABLE’ while protecting the property rights of the citizens of the City of Jenkins.

**THE FULL TEXT OF THIS ORDINANCE AMENDMENT IS AVAILABLE DURING
NORMAL OFFICE HOURS AT THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK AND IS POSTED AT
THE JENKINS CITY HALL.**

Dated this ____ day of _____, 2026.

Cassandra M. Delougherty
City Clerk-Treasurer
City of Jenkins



AGENDA ITEM

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PREPARED BY: CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY

DATE: SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2026

SUBJECT: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CODE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLAINT DETAILS POLICY

REPORT: THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT IS TO PRESENT A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S CODE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLAINT DETAILS POLICY, ADOPTED JUNE 9, 2025.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IS INTENDED TO CLARIFY THAT THE CITY'S COMPLAINT-FILING LIMITATIONS APPLY TO CODE ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINTS GENERALLY, EXCEPT WHEN THE ALLEGED VIOLATION PRESENTS A MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY.

THE CITY OF JENKINS UTILIZES A COMPLAINT-BASED CODE ENFORCEMENT PROCESS. THE CITY'S POLICY ESTABLISHES REQUIREMENTS FOR FILING COMPLAINTS, INCLUDING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMPLAINANT IDENTIFICATION, PROXIMITY TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION, AND LIMITATIONS ON REPEATED COMPLAINTS CONCERNING THE SAME VIOLATION.

THE CURRENT POLICY REFERS TO THESE REQUIREMENTS AS:

"LIMITATIONS ON FILING A COMPLAINT RELATED TO NON-SAFETY CODE VIOLATIONS."

STAFF RECOMMENDS REVISING THIS LANGUAGE BECAUSE THE PHRASE "NON-SAFETY CODE VIOLATIONS" MAY BE INTERPRETED TOO BROADLY. SOME CODE VIOLATIONS MAY INVOLVE A GENERAL HEALTH OR SAFETY CONSIDERATION WITHOUT RISING TO THE LEVEL OF AN URGENT CONDITION REQUIRING EXEMPTION FROM THE CITY'S NORMAL COMPLAINT REQUIREMENTS.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT WOULD CLARIFY THAT THE NORMAL COMPLAINT LIMITATIONS APPLY UNLESS THE ALLEGED CONDITION PRESENTS A MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

STAFF RECOMMENDS REPLACING THE EXISTING INTRODUCTORY LANGUAGE WITH:

"THE FOLLOWING LIMITATIONS APPLY TO COMPLAINTS INVOLVING ALLEGED CODE VIOLATIONS UNLESS THE ALLEGED VIOLATION PRESENTS A MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY:"

THE REMAINDER OF THE EXISTING COMPLAINT REQUIREMENTS WOULD CONTINUE TO APPLY, INCLUDING:

1. THE COMPLAINT MUST RELATE TO AN IDENTIFIED CODE VIOLATION.
2. THE COMPLAINANT MUST BE:
 - AN ADJOINING LANDOWNER OR A LANDOWNER WITH A DIRECT LINE OF SIGHT TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION; OR
 - A LEGAL TENANT OF AN ADJOINING PROPERTY OR PROPERTY WITH A DIRECT LINE OF SIGHT TO THE ALLEGED VIOLATION.



AGENDA ITEM

3. ONCE A COMPLAINT CONCERNING THE SAME PROPERTY AND CODE VIOLATION HAS BEEN ACCEPTED, SUBSEQUENT COMPLAINTS REGARDING SUBSTANTIALLY THE SAME VIOLATION WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED FOR TWELVE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THE MOST RECENTLY ACCEPTED COMPLAINT.

STAFF FURTHER RECOMMENDS ADDING THE FOLLOWING CLARIFICATION:

“THESE LIMITATIONS DO NOT APPLY WHEN THE CITY RECEIVES INFORMATION CONCERNING AN ALLEGED CODE VIOLATION THAT MAY CONSTITUTE A MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY.”

REASON FOR THE AMENDMENT

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT WOULD PROVIDE CLEARER DIRECTION TO RESIDENTS, STAFF, AND DECISION-MAKERS REGARDING WHEN THE NORMAL COMPLAINT REQUIREMENTS APPLY.

THE CHANGE WOULD PRESERVE THE CITY’S EXISTING COMPLAINT-BASED ENFORCEMENT PROCESS WHILE ENSURING THAT SERIOUS OR URGENT HEALTH AND SAFETY CONCERNS ARE NOT RESTRICTED BY REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PROPERTY PROXIMITY OR PRIOR COMPLAINTS.

IT WOULD ALSO HELP DISTINGUISH BETWEEN:

- ROUTINE PROPERTY MAINTENANCE, NUISANCE, ZONING, AND AESTHETIC COMPLAINTS; AND
- CONDITIONS INVOLVING A SERIOUS AND URGENT RISK TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY.

REQUESTED ACTION:

STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND CONSIDER RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

THE AMENDMENT DOES NOT SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGE THE CITY’S COMPLAINT-BASED ENFORCEMENT PROCESS. RATHER, IT CLARIFIES THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH THE EXISTING COMPLAINT LIMITATIONS DO NOT APPLY.

THE COMMISSION CAN RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CODE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLAINT DETAILS POLICY CLARIFYING THAT COMPLAINT-FILING LIMITATIONS APPLY UNLESS AN ALLEGED CODE VIOLATION PRESENTS A **MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY.** THE COMMISSION MAY ALSO CHOOSE TO DENY OR TABLE THE AMENDMENT. IF TABLING, STAFF REQUEST FURTHER DIRECTION.



Code Enforcement and Complaint Details Policy

Amended _____, 2026.

Property maintenance and code enforcement activities promote vibrant, attractive, and desirable neighborhoods; help maintain property values and the significant investments made by City residents; eliminate blight, deter crime, and support effective housing maintenance standards. Like most communities, the City of Jenkins uses a complaint-based code enforcement process. The overriding goal of enforcement is compliance, not punishment.

Residents are encouraged to take steps to comply with the ordinances on their own property before complaining against others and to discuss issues with their neighbors, when possible. The City's enforcement process steps in when this is not possible. No two enforcement issues are the same. In many instances, residents are simply unaware of the Code and correct the situation immediately. However, in other situations, a resolution of compliance can take more time.

When a violation is confirmed, appropriate action is taken. Due to staff and time constraints, and extraneous circumstances outside the City's control, it is sometimes necessary to prioritize complaints and violations. When this happens, complaints are prioritized as follows:

1. Immediate risk to public health and safety.
2. High risk to health and safety through potential environmental impacts.
3. Work begun or actions taken without necessary permits.
4. Aesthetic and nuisance violations.

All complaints made to the city must include the complaints' name and contact information. Complaints submitted anonymously will not be considered valid.

Limitations on Filing Certain Code Enforcement Complaints

The following limitations apply to complaints involving alleged code violations **unless the alleged violation presents a major, immediate, or imminent threat to public health or safety:**

1. The complaint must identify a specific condition or activity that is reasonably believed to constitute a violation of City Code.
2. In order to file a complaint, the complainant must be one of the following:
 - a. An adjoining landowner listed in the Crow Wing County real property records, or a landowner whose property has a direct line of sight to the alleged code violation.
 - b. A tenant legally occupying an adjoining property, or a tenant legally occupying property that has a direct line of sight to the alleged code violation.
3. Once a complaint regarding a particular property and code violation has been accepted pursuant to this section, subsequent complaints concerning substantially the same condition or violation will not be accepted for twelve (12) months from the date of the most recently accepted complaint.

These limitations do not apply when the City receives information concerning an alleged code violation that may constitute a **major, immediate, or imminent threat to public health or safety**. Such concerns may be reported regardless of the complainant's proximity to the property or whether a previous complaint concerning the property has been submitted.

As required by Statute, the City shall keep the complaints' name and contact information confidential, and it shall not be shared. The City does actively enforce the City's tall grass ordinance and sign provisions as it relates to right-of-way signs. City staff may also observe and respond to code violations during regular business hours.



AGENDA ITEM #

REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PREPARED BY: CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY

DATE: SEPTEMBER 30TH, 2026

SUBJECT: CITY STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH REVIEW

REQUESTED BY: PLANNING COMMISSIONER DEBBIE SILTMAN

REPORT: PLANNING COMMISSIONER DEBBIE SILTMAN HAS REQUESTED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL REVIEW THE CITY'S STREET INVENTORY AND DISCUSS INCONSISTENCIES IN EXISTING ROADWAY/RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTHS.

THE CITY'S ADOPTED ROADWAY STANDARDS IDENTIFY A **66-FOOT WIDTH FOR MAJOR ROADWAYS**. HOWEVER, SOME EXISTING CITY STREETS ARE IDENTIFIED AT WIDTHS OF APPROXIMATELY **72 FEET, 77 FEET, AND 80 FEET**.

COMMISSIONER SILTMAN HAS ASKED WHY SOME CITY ROAD RIGHTS-OF-WAY ARE WIDER THAN THE CURRENT STANDARD AND WHETHER PORTIONS THAT ARE NO LONGER NEEDED COULD BE REDUCED OR VACATED.

BEFORE CONSIDERING ANY REDUCTION, IT IS IMPORTANT TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THE **TRAVELED ROADWAY** AND THE **PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY**. RIGHT-OF-WAY MAY INCLUDE ADDITIONAL SPACE NEEDED FOR:

- DRAINAGE AND DITCHES;
- UTILITIES;
- SNOW STORAGE;
- SHOULDERS AND SLOPES;
- SIGNS AND CULVERTS; AND
- FUTURE ROAD OR TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS.

FOR THAT REASON, A RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDER THAN 66 FEET IS NOT NECESSARILY UNNECESSARY.

COMMISSIONER SILTMAN HAS ALSO RAISED THE QUESTION OF WHETHER EXCESS RIGHT-OF-WAY COULD EVENTUALLY BECOME PART OF ADJOINING PRIVATE PROPERTY, ALLOWING THAT PROPERTY TO BE PRIVATELY OWNED AND POTENTIALLY TAXABLE.

ANY VACATION OF PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY WOULD REQUIRE REVIEW OF THE INDIVIDUAL ROADWAY, PROPERTY RECORDS, INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS, AND THE APPLICABLE LEGAL VACATION PROCESS.



AGENDA ITEM

THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY WISH TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZE A REVIEW OF CITY STREETS THAT EXCEED THE CURRENT 66-FOOT STANDARD. STAFF RECOMMENDS REVIEWING THE CITY'S WIDER ROAD RIGHTS-OF-WAY ON A **STREET-BY-STREET BASIS** BEFORE CONSIDERING ANY REDUCTIONS OR VACATIONS.

THE REVIEW COULD IDENTIFY:

- EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH;
- ACTUAL ROADWAY WIDTH;
- UTILITIES, DRAINAGE, AND OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE;
- FUTURE PUBLIC NEEDS; AND
- WHETHER ANY PORTION MAY BE CONSIDERED UNNECESSARY RIGHT-OF-WAY.

REQUESTED ACTION: STAFF REQUESTS THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSS WHETHER TO RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AUTHORIZE FURTHER REVIEW OF CITY STREETS THAT EXCEED THE CURRENT 66-FOOT STANDARD BY STAFF AND CITY ENGINEER..

THE REVIEW COULD INCLUDE THE EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH, ACTUAL ROADWAY WIDTH, UTILITIES, DRAINAGE NEEDS, FUTURE IMPROVEMENTS, AND WHETHER ANY PORTION MAY REASONABLY BE CONSIDERED UNNECESSARY.

Cassandra Delougherty

From: Brian Goerges
Sent: Thursday, September 24, 2026 12:26 PM
To: Cassandra Delougherty
Cc: Ryan Trumble; Laura O'Brien
Subject: Big Thank You to the City of Jenkins!

Hi Cassandra,

We very much appreciate the Veterans Street improvement project. Please let the city council, planning & The City of Jenkins know that we are very grateful, as it helps our business & other business's along with the residents who drive this street daily, to travel on a smoother, safer and more defined road surface!

Brian Goerges

Business Development



P.O. Box 580
Pequot Lakes, MN 56472
(C) 218-
(P) 218-
(F) 218-
Email
Web: www.pequottool.com

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately.