Regular Planning Commission Meeting & Public Hearing Agenda
Monday, November 2nd, 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 OCTOBER 5TH, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
    UNFINISHED BUSINESS
4. PUBLIC HEARING:
    a. PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54 AMENDING DEFINITIONS AND LAND USE MATRIX
        i. OPEN HEARING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
        ii. CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING
        iii. PLANNING COMMISSION DELIBERATION
        iv. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION
5. NEW BUSINESS
    a. DATA CENTERS
        i. SAMPLE ORD. AMNDMT: CITY OF BRAINERD
    b. SHORELAND REGULATIONS
        i. 2026 JENKINS ZONING MAP
6. MISCELLANEOUS/COMMUNICATION
    a. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT
7. ADJOURNMENT

OCTOBER 5TH, 2026 6:00 PM
JENKINS PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES

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 JOBY GOERGES, ROMAN SILTMAN AND DEBBIE SILTMAN; CITY CLERK/ZONING ADMINISTRATOR CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY. NOT PRESENT: PLANNING COMMISSIONER COREY DERKSEN.

APPROVAL

CORRECTIONS TO THE DRAFT MINUTES WERE IDENTIFIED, INCLUDING A DUPLICATE NOTATION OF COMMISSIONER DEBBIE SILTMAN AS BOTH PRESENT AND ABSENT UNDER ROLL CALL, AND MISSPELLED NAMES IN THE APPROVAL SECTION. STAFF ACKNOWLEDGED THE ERRORS. THE MINUTES WERE APPROVED AS CORRECTED.

> ***MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 8TH, 2026 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AS CORRECTED WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER D. SILTMAN AND SECONDED COMMISSIONER GOERGES. MOTION CARRIED.***

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

AGRICULTURAL USES AND AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES

CITY CLERK/ZONING ADMINISTRATOR DELOUGHERTY PRESENTED A DRAFT OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54, WHICH CONSOLIDATES SEVERAL PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED CHANGES INTO A SINGLE AMENDMENT. THE DRAFT PROPOSED REMOVING THE UNDEFINED TERM "AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE" FROM THE LAND USE MATRIX AND REPLACING IT WITH SPECIFIC, NARROWLY DEFINED STRUCTURE TYPES—BARN, GRAIN SILO, AND HAY SHED—EACH WITH LIMITED, PURPOSE-SPECIFIC DEFINITIONS.

THE CENTRAL ISSUE BEFORE THE COMMISSION WAS HOW TO CLASSIFY THESE STRUCTURES IN THE LAND USE MATRIX, PARTICULARLY FOR RURAL RESIDENTIAL (RR) PARCELS OF 10 ACRES OR MORE. DISCUSSION FOCUSED ON WHETHER SUCH STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DESIGNATED AS PRIMARY STRUCTURES, WHICH WOULD TRIGGER ACCESSORY STRUCTURE RIGHTS, OR CLASSIFIED IN A WAY THAT PREVENTS THE BARN, SILO, OR HAY SHED FROM SERVING AS A SPRINGBOARD FOR UNRELATED STORAGE DEVELOPMENT. THE COMMISSION EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT LABELING THEM AS PRIMARY STRUCTURES COULD ALLOW PROPERTY OWNERS TO SUBSEQUENTLY CONSTRUCT

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES—INCLUDING LARGE STORAGE BUILDINGS—WITHOUT A PRIMARY DWELLING.

AFTER DELIBERATION, THE COMMISSION AGREED TO INTRODUCE A NEW CLASSIFICATION, "STAND ALONE STRUCTURE," TO BE DEFINED IN THE ORDINANCE AND INCORPORATED INTO THE LAND USE MATRIX ALONGSIDE BARN, GRAIN SILO, AND HAY SHED. THIS DESIGNATION WOULD CLARIFY THAT THESE THREE STRUCTURE TYPES ARE NEITHER PRIMARY NOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, THEREBY PREVENTING THE TRIGGERING OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURE RIGHTS. THE DEFINITION OF "STAND ALONE STRUCTURE" WOULD SPECIFY THAT ONLY A BARN, GRAIN SILO, OR HAY SHED QUALIFIES UNDER THAT CLASSIFICATION. STAFF WAS DIRECTED TO DRAFT THE UPDATED DEFINITION AND INCORPORATE IT INTO THE REVISED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT. ADDITIONALLY, THE COMMISSION IDENTIFIED THAT THE DRAFT DEFINITION OF "DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY" IN SECTION 2 OF THE ORDINANCE STILL REFERENCED DUPLEXES AND DIRECTED THAT THE THRESHOLD BE CORRECTED TO THREE OR MORE DWELLING UNITS.

> ***MOTION TO APPROVE THE CHANGES TO ORDINANCE NO. O-26-54 AS DISCUSSED, INCLUDING THE INCORPORATION OF A "STAND ALONE STRUCTURE" DEFINITION AND THE CORRECTION TO THE "DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY" DEFINITION, WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER R. SILTMAN AND SECONDED BY D. SILTMAN. MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.***

ACCESSORY USES AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

NO ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION BEYOND MATTERS ADDRESSED UNDER ITEM 4A ABOVE. THE PROPOSED 25% GROSS FLOOR AREA AND 49% TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA LIMITATIONS FOR ACCESSORY USES, AS PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED BY THE CITY COUNCIL, WERE CONFIRMED TO REMAIN IN THE DRAFT AMENDMENT.

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

ADDRESSED THROUGH THE CORRECTION TO THE "DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY" DEFINITION INCORPORATED INTO ORDINANCE NO. O-26-54, AS DISCUSSED UNDER ITEM 4A.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54 AMENDING DEFINITIONS AND LAND USE MATRIX

ADDRESSED IN FULL UNDER ITEM 4A ABOVE.

NEW BUSINESS

CITIZEN CONCERN/COMPLAINT POLICY AMENDMENT

DELOUGHERTY PRESENTED A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S CODE ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLAINT DETAILS POLICY, ORIGINALLY ADOPTED JUNE 9, 2025. THE AMENDMENT WAS

PROMPTED BY A SITUATION IN WHICH A NON-RESIDENT, NON-ABUTTING INDIVIDUAL FILED A FORMAL COMPLAINT REGARDING LONG-STANDING INOPERABLE EQUIPMENT ON A PROPERTY THEY DROVE PAST ON THEIR WAY TO PROPERTY LOCATED OUTSIDE THE MUNICIPALITY.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT CLARIFIES THAT THE EXISTING COMPLAINT-FILING LIMITATIONS—INCLUDING COMPLAINANT PROXIMITY REQUIREMENTS—APPLY TO ALL CODE ENFORCEMENT COMPLAINTS UNLESS THE ALLEGED VIOLATION PRESENTS A MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH OR SAFETY. THE COMMISSION SUPPORTED THE AMENDMENT AND FURTHER DIRECTED STAFF TO ADD LANGUAGE IN BOTH RELEVANT POLICY LOCATIONS SPECIFYING THAT IN CASES OF A MAJOR, IMMEDIATE, OR IMMINENT THREAT, COMPLAINANTS SHOULD CONTACT LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OR EMERGENCY SERVICES DIRECTLY, RATHER THAN FILING THROUGH THE CITY'S STANDARD COMPLAINT PROCESS.
NO FORMAL MOTION WAS REQUIRED AS THE ITEM IS A POLICY MATTER TO BE ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

CITY STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY ROAD WIDTH REVIEW

REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONER DEBBIE SILTMAN, THIS ITEM ADDRESSED INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE CITY'S ADOPTED 66-FOOT RIGHT-OF-WAY STANDARD AND SEVERAL EXISTING STREETS RECORDED AT WIDTHS OF 72, 77, AND 80 FEET. DELOUGHERTY DISPLAYED THE CITY'S GIS MAPPING TO ILLUSTRATE THE DISCREPANCIES. THE COMMISSION NOTED THE HISTORICAL RATIONALE FOR WIDER RIGHT-OF-WAYS AND ACKNOWLEDGED THAT ANY FORMAL REDUCTION WOULD INVOLVE SIGNIFICANT ENGINEERING AND LEGAL COSTS.
THE COMMISSION REACHED A CONSENSUS THAT RIGHT-OF-WAY WIDTH REVIEWS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED ON A STREET-BY-STREET BASIS AS INDIVIDUAL ROAD PROJECTS ARISE, RATHER THAN UNDERTAKING A CITYWIDE REVIEW AT THIS TIME.

MISCELLANEOUS/COMMUNICATION

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

DELOUGHERTY REPORTED ON A PENDING BARNDOMINIUM PERMIT APPLICATION ON A RURAL RESIDENTIAL PARCEL. THE APPLICANT WAS REQUIRED TO ADJUST PLANS TO MEET THE MINIMUM DWELLING AREA REQUIREMENT—THE GREATER OF 400 SQUARE FEET OR 25% OF THE TOTAL STRUCTURE SQUARE FOOTAGE—PRIOR TO PERMIT ISSUANCE. THE PERMIT IS PENDING FINAL SSTS DESIGN APPROVAL.

DELOUGHERTY ALSO SHARED A LETTER OF APPRECIATION FROM BRIAN GOERGES OF PEQUOT MANUFACTURING REGARDING THE RECENTLY COMPLETED VETERANS STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, AND NOTED THAT THE PROJECT HAD GENERATED POSITIVE COMMUNITY FEEDBACK. SOME MINOR DRAINAGE CONCERNS AT THE EAST END OF THE PARKING LOT WERE DISCUSSED WITH THE PROJECT ENGINEER, WHO INDICATED DRAINAGE WAS PERFORMING AS DESIGNED GIVEN SITE

CONDITIONS. STAFF WAS TO CONTINUE MONITORING AND ADDRESS ANY OUTSTANDING PUNCH LIST ITEMS.

ADDITIONALLY, DELOUGHERTY NOTED AWARENESS OF A PENDING PRELIMINARY PLAT APPLICATION IN THE VICINITY OF LOWER WHITEFISH LAKE, RECEIVED FOR CITY COMMENT. STAFF INDICATED THEY WOULD MONITOR THE MATTER AND COULD SUBMIT WRITTEN COMMENTS OR PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM ON BEHALF OF THE CITY IF THE COMMISSION OR COUNCIL HAD INPUT TO PROVIDE.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:31PM MADE BY COMMISSIONER GOERGES AND SECONDED BY R. SILTMAN. MOTION CARRIED.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED THIS 2ND DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2026.

_____

CASSANDRA M. DELOUGHERTY, CITY CLERK-TREASURER
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

DRAFT

AGENDA ITEM # 4a

REPORT TO CITY COUNCIL

PREPARED BY: CASSANDRA DELOUGHERTY
DATE: OCTOBER 27TH, 2026
SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING – PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54: MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS, AGRICULTURAL USES/STRUCTURES & ACCESSORY USES/STRUCTURES

REPORT: THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLIC HEARING IS TO RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENTS REGARDING PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54, WHICH WOULD AMEND CITY CODE §150.005, DEFINITIONS, AND §150.038, LAND USE MATRIX, INCLUDING THE NOTES TO TABLE.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ADDRESSES SEVERAL ZONING ORDINANCE ISSUES PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY COUNCIL, INCLUDING MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS, AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES, ACCESSORY USES, AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURES.

AT ITS OCTOBER 5, 2026 MEETING, THE PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEWED AND RECOMMENDED APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES. THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THOSE RECOMMENDATIONS ON OCTOBER 13, 2026, AND AUTHORIZED THE NOVEMBER 2, 2026 PUBLIC HEARING, WITH MINOR CORRECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS:

1. MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS

REVISES THE DEFINITION OF DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY TO INCLUDE THREE OR MORE DWELLING UNITS, ELIMINATING THE EXISTING OVERLAP WITH DUPLEXES, WHICH WOULD CONTINUE TO BE SEPARATELY DEFINED AND REGULATED.

2. AGRICULTURAL USES AND STRUCTURES

REMOVES THE UNDEFINED AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURE CLASSIFICATION AND ESTABLISHES INDIVIDUAL DEFINITIONS AND LAND USE MATRIX CLASSIFICATIONS FOR:

- BARN: A STRUCTURE USED FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF SHELTERING LIVESTOCK, LIVESTOCK FEED, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING.
- GRAIN SILO: A STRUCTURE USED SOLELY FOR STORING HARVESTED GRAINS.
- HAY SHED: A STRUCTURE USED SOLELY FOR STORING HAY, STRAW, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING.

THESE STRUCTURES WOULD CONTINUE TO BE PERMITTED IN THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT AND ALLOWED BY PERMIT ON RURAL RESIDENTIAL PARCELS OF 10 ACRES OR GREATER.

3. LAND USE MATRIX – NOTES TO TABLE (P10+)

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ADDS A NEW DESIGNATION, "P10+", TO THE NOTES TO TABLE UNDER §150.038, LAND USE MATRIX.

THE DESIGNATION P10+ IS IDENTIFIED AS "PERMIT REQUIRED ON PARCELS 10-ACRES IN SIZE AND GREATER,", SUBJECT TO THE APPLICABLE PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS.

THIS DESIGNATION WOULD APPLY TO BARNS, GRAIN SILOS, AND HAY SHEDS WITHIN THE RURAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, ALLOWING THESE SPECIFIC AGRICULTURAL STRUCTURES ON QUALIFYING PARCELS WHILE MAINTAINING RESTRICTIONS ON SMALLER PROPERTIES.

4. STANDALONE STRUCTURES

ESTABLISHES A NEW STANDALONE STRUCTURE CLASSIFICATION APPLICABLE EXCLUSIVELY TO BARNS, GRAIN SILOS, AND HAY SHEDS THAT EXIST INDEPENDENTLY ON A PARCEL.

THESE STRUCTURES WOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED PRINCIPAL OR ACCESSORY STRUCTURES AND WOULD NOT ESTABLISH RIGHTS TO ADDITIONAL ACCESSORY BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES WITHOUT A PRINCIPAL USE OR STRUCTURE.

5. ACCESSORY USES AND STRUCTURES

SEPARATES THE EXISTING COMBINED DEFINITION OF ACCESSORY USE OR STRUCTURE INTO TWO INDIVIDUAL DEFINITIONS TO CLARIFY APPLICABLE STANDARDS.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT ESTABLISHES:

- A MAXIMUM OF 25% OF THE GROSS FLOOR AREA OF A BUILDING CONTAINING THE PRINCIPAL USE FOR ACCESSORY USES.
- A MAXIMUM OF 49% OF THE TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA FOR ACCESSORY USES.
- A MAXIMUM OF 49% OF THE TOTAL BUILDABLE LOT AREA OCCUPIED BY ACCESSORY STRUCTURES.

CITY COUNCIL REVIEW:

AT ITS OCTOBER 13, 2026 MEETING, THE CITY COUNCIL REVIEWED THE PLANNING COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISCUSSED THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

COUNCILMEMBER/COMMISSIONER SILTMAN REQUESTED A MINOR CORRECTION TO THE LANGUAGE, AS DISCUSSED AT THE PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, CLARIFYING THAT A BARN IS USED FOR THE **SOLE PURPOSE** OF SHELTERING LIVESTOCK, LIVESTOCK FEED, OR LIVESTOCK BEDDING, AND CONSISTENT USE OF THE TERM GRAIN SILO WITHIN THE ORDINANCE.

A MOTION TO SCHEDULE THE NOVEMBER 2, 2026 PUBLIC HEARING, INCORPORATING THE NOTED CORRECTIONS, WAS APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

PUBLIC HEARING:

THE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL CONDUCT THE PUBLIC HEARING TO ALLOW RESIDENTS AND INTERESTED PARTIES AN OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, OR CONCERNS REGARDING PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54.

AGENDA ITEM # 4a

FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC HEARING, THE COMMISSION SHOULD CONSIDER ANY TESTIMONY RECEIVED AND DETERMINE WHETHER ADDITIONAL MODIFICATIONS ARE NECESSARY BEFORE FORWARDING ITS FINAL RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL.

REQUESTED ACTION:

PLEASE DISCUSS THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND CONSIDER A MOTION RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE AMENDMENT O-26-54, AS PRESENTED OR WITH ANY ADDITIONAL REVISIONS DEEMED NECESSARY TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ADOPTION. THE PLANNING COMMISSION CAN CHOOSE TO DENY OR TABLE THE AMENDMENT. IF TABLING, STAFF REQUEST FURTHER DIRECTION.

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 WITH THE SOLE PURPOSE OF SHELTERING 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.

STANDALONE STRUCTURE: A CONSTRUCTED OR ERECTED OBJECT OR BUILDING HAVING A FIXED LOCATION ON THE GROUND THAT IS NEITHER A PRINCIPAL (PRIMARY) STRUCTURE NOR AN ACCESSORY

STRUCTURE. A ***STANDALONE STRUCTURE*** EXISTS INDEPENDENTLY ON A LOT, IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED FROM HAVING ANY ACCESSORY BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES, OR FACILITIES SUBORDINATE TO IT, AND IS **EXCLUSIVELY LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING AGRICULTURAL USES**:1. ***BARN*** 2. ***HAY SHED*** 3. ***GRAIN SILO***. NO OTHER BUILDING OR STRUCTURE TYPES SHALL BE PERMITTED TO EXIST AS A STANDALONE STRUCTURE UNDER THIS ORDINANCE.

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	E	E	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+- PERMIT REQUIRED 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: 5a

STAFF REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PURPOSE

The purpose of this agenda item is to introduce data centers as an emerging land use and discuss whether the City of Jenkins should consider establishing specific zoning regulations.

Communities throughout Minnesota are reviewing their ordinances to determine how data centers should be regulated, particularly regarding location, electrical demand, water usage, noise, and compatibility with surrounding properties.

This discussion is intended to be informational and to provide the Planning Commission an opportunity to consider whether additional regulations may be appropriate for Jenkins.

BACKGROUND – WHAT IS A DATA CENTER?

Data centers house computer servers and related equipment used for digital storage, processing, and technology services. Facilities vary in size, with larger developments potentially requiring significant electrical infrastructure, cooling systems, and backup generators.

Potential land-use considerations include:

- **Water and Sewer:** Jenkins does not provide municipal water or sewer services. Data centers requiring substantial water for cooling or wastewater disposal could present infrastructure and environmental concerns.
- **Electrical Infrastructure:** Large facilities may require significant electrical capacity, substations, and utility improvements.
- **Noise:** Cooling equipment, ventilation systems, and backup generators may operate continuously.
- **Land Use Compatibility:** Large industrial-style buildings and supporting infrastructure may be inconsistent with surrounding development and the City's community character.
- **Economic Impacts:** Data centers may generate property tax revenue but typically provide relatively few permanent jobs compared to their size.

CITY OF JENKINS – EXISTING ZONING REGULATIONS

Staff reviewed the City's published Code of Ordinances, specifically Chapter 150, Land Use and Subdivisions.

Section 150.038 establishes the City's land-use matrix and identifies uses allowed within each zoning district.

The matrix does not specifically identify *data centers* as a separate land use.

However, it includes several categories that could potentially be relevant:

Existing Land Use	Current Zoning Treatment
Industrial Use	Permitted in I-1
Warehousing, commercial	CUP in AG, C-2 and I-1
Service Business	Permitted in C-1 and C-2
Commercial Use (Other, not classified)	CUP in C-1 and C-2

Importantly, § 150.038(B) states that uses are prohibited unless specifically allowed under the code. Accordingly, the City should not automatically assume that a data center is permitted as an industrial use, warehouse, or service business.

A determination would need to be made on whether the proposed activity meets an existing definition or requires an ordinance amendment.

OTHER COMMUNITIES

Several Minnesota communities have reviewed or established regulations addressing data centers.

Community	Approach
City of Brainerd	Established specific regulations addressing data centers, including conditional use requirements and operational standards.
City of Sartell	Established conditional use requirements for data centers.
City of Waite Park	Used a temporary moratorium to evaluate data center regulations.
City of St. Joseph	Used a temporary moratorium to study data center development.
Crow Wing County	No specific countywide data center regulations were confirmed in the preliminary review.

Cass County	Considered amendments addressing data centers within industrial zoning districts.
Morrison County	No specific data center regulations were confirmed in the preliminary review.

These examples illustrate different approaches to regulating data centers. The county findings remain preliminary and should be verified against current adopted ordinances.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS FOR JENKINS

As the City evaluates this emerging land use, the Planning Commission may wish to consider:

1. Whether data centers are compatible with the City's existing land-use patterns and long-term development goals.
2. Whether the absence of municipal water and sewer services presents challenges for certain types of data center development.
3. Whether the existing zoning ordinance provides adequate guidance for reviewing potential applications.
4. Whether additional research, definitions, or development standards should be considered.

Potential approaches could include maintaining the existing ordinance, establishing specific zoning standards, requiring conditional use approval in designated districts, or considering restrictions on certain types or sizes of facilities.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review and discuss the information presented regarding data center development.

This initial discussion is intended to identify questions and concerns, evaluate the City's existing regulatory framework, and determine whether additional research or ordinance amendments should be considered.

No formal action is required at this time. Staff is seeking general direction from the Planning Commission regarding any additional information it would like to review.

This report was prepared by Sourcewell for the City's review and consideration. The information in this report is derived from the City's official controls, which may include comprehensive plans, long-range plans, applicable ordinances, and information submitted to the City as part of application materials. Nothing in this report constitutes legal advice or engineering advice. Local government officials retain final decision-making authority.

AGENDA ITEM: 5a i

ORDINANCE
NO. 1581

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 515-6-2 RULES AND DEFINITIONS, 515-3 APPENDIX A TABLE OF USES, AND 515-3 ALLOWED USES OF THE ZONING CODE, RELATING TO DATA CENTERS

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by the Planning Commission as required by the Zoning Code, on April 16, 2025

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Brainerd, Minnesota, as follows:

SECTION ONE: Purpose

The purpose of this ordinance is to create land use regulations and provide a definition for data centers to protect the public health, safety, and welfare and avoid unintended impacts on resources and adjacent uses.

SECTION TWO: Section 515-6-2.C Definitions of Use, Standards and Terms are hereby amended as indicated, with the following added language underlined:

Data Center: A facility or portion of a facility housing networked computer systems and telecommunications equipment used for remote storage, processing, and distribution of data. Data centers include commercial cryptocurrency mining facilities, AI centers, cloud storage, and other similar uses.

SECTION THREE: Section 515-3 Appendix A Table of Uses (Industrial and Utility Uses) is hereby amended with the following new underlined language added to the table:

ZONING DISTRICT	Section Reference	RL-1	RL-2	GL	CN-1	CN-2	TN-1	TN-2	TN-3	GC	CC	TC	MS	ME	GI	PSP	P
Data centers, AI centers, cloud storage, and other similar uses.	515-3-XX														C		

SECTION FOUR: Section 515-3 Allowed Uses is hereby amended with the following new language underlined and shall be added to Section 515-3 in alphabetical order with all other required numerical sections to change in descending order:

A. Data Centers are not permitted to operate in the City of Brainerd unless explicitly approved by a Conditional Use Permit. Data Centers that are ancillary to another primary use are permitted if they:
   1. Occupy no more than ten percent of the building footprint,

2. Are used to serve the enterprise functions of the on-site property owner and are not used to lease data storage and processing services to third parties.
3. Are not housed in a separate stand-alone structure on the parcel.

B. **Noise.** Commercial grade mechanical equipment and similar noise sources, including but not limited to generators and air heating or cooling equipment, shall comply with the requirements of MPCA noise rules (Minn. Rules Ch. 7030).

1. The Data Center shall be designed and built to incorporate sound mitigation methods to reduce sound levels emanating from the Data Center to adjacent residential structures within 1000 feet of the facility.
2. Prior to approval, a noise study shall be submitted by a third-party engineer demonstrating to the City that the operation of the data center will comply with MPCA noise rules.
    a. The operator shall conduct a sound study performed by a third-party acoustic engineer to document baseline sound levels in the area of the proposed Data Center, including noise levels measured at the property line of the nearest property to the Data Center property that is planned or zoned for residential land uses, or other noise sensitive use as reasonably determined by the Zoning Administrator.
3. Upon operation of the Data Center, the operator must conduct an additional noise study, as measured at the property line of the nearest property to the Data Center or other noise sensitive use as reasonably determined by the Zoning Administrator.
4. The City may order an additional sound study once per year during peak operation of the Data Center mechanical equipment. The Data Center operator must provide the results of the noise study, conducted by a third-party engineer, to the City within 30 days of the request by the City or show proof that they have contracted with a third-party engineer and the results will be available in a reasonable amount of time.
5. Unless backup generators are supplying backup electrical supply during a power outage, backup generators may operate between the hours of 9:00 am and 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays.
    a. Curtailment of power supply or voluntary shutdown of power is not considered to be a power outage.
6. Upon request by City staff after issuance of a certificate of occupancy and commencement of the operation of the Data Center, the operator of a Data Center must provide a liaison between the hours of 8:00 am and 10:00 pm CST each day to respond to complaints about noise emanating from the Data Center.
    a. Contact information shall be posted on the City of Brainerd website.
    b. Upon operation of the Data Center, the City shall notify and provide contact information for the facility liaison to property owners within 500 feet of the facility.

C. **Hazardous Waste Plan.** Prior to operating, the operator shall submit a hazardous waste plan for review by the Community Development Department, Public Works Department, Public Utilities Department, and Fire Department.
    a. Verification must be provided that all electronic waste generated by the operation will be handled by a licensed electronic waste recycling firm.
    b. Changes to the operation of the facility that affects hazardous waste material must be approved by the City.

D. **Water and Wastewater Plan.** Prior to approval, the developer shall apply for a sewer extension permit with the MPCA and submit a water and wastewater plan for review by the Public Works Department and Public Utilities Department.

E. **Screening.** Outdoor equipment that serves the data center, including but not limited to mechanical equipment and generators, must not be located closer to a property line along a public street than the principal building and must be fully screened from view of adjacent public rights-of-way and properties.

F. **Energy Plan.** Prior to approval, loads over one megawatt in capacity will be responsible for having a system impact study completed by the appropriate power transmission owner operator in the area.

SECTION FIVE: This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force one week from and after its publication.

Adopted this _____day of _____, 2025

_____
MIKE O'DAY
President of the Council

Approved this _____day of _____, 2025

_____
DAVE BADEAUX
Mayor

ATTEST: _____
NICHOLAS W. BROYLES
City Administrator

Published: One Time – _____

AGENDA ITEM: 5b

STAFF REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

PURPOSE

The purpose of this agenda item is to introduce the possibility of adopting a City of Jenkins Shoreland Ordinance and discuss whether the City should consider establishing its own shoreland regulations rather than continuing to rely on Crow Wing County's ordinance.

This discussion is intended to provide the Planning Commission an opportunity to consider whether establishing City-specific shoreland regulations would better serve the community.

BACKGROUND

The City of Jenkins currently addresses shoreland regulations under Section 150.035 of its Zoning Ordinance, which adopts Crow Wing County's shoreland regulations by reference.

Historically, the City understood that only one parcel fell within the Shoreland Overlay District based on its zoning map. However, a more recent review of the zoning map identified substantially more properties within the shoreland district than previously recognized.

These include properties along **Hay Creek River** and properties associated with the **Unnamed Natural Environment lake to the North of the city, Rat and Upper Hay** lakes.

Under Minnesota shoreland regulations, shoreland generally includes land within 1,000 feet of a qualifying lake and 300 feet of a qualifying river or stream, or the landward extent of the designated floodplain, whichever is greater.

As a result, properties do not need to have direct waterfront access to fall within the Shoreland Overlay District.

Given the additional properties identified, the City may wish to evaluate whether adopting its own shoreland ordinance would be beneficial.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS OF A CITY SHORELAND ORDINANCE

Local Control and Flexibility: A City-specific ordinance would allow Jenkins to establish shoreland standards that reflect local development patterns, community priorities, and environmental conditions while remaining consistent with Minnesota DNR requirements.

Consistency with City Zoning: A municipal shoreland ordinance could be developed to better coordinate with the City's existing zoning districts, lot standards, setbacks, and development procedures.

Clearer Regulations: Establishing a standalone City ordinance could make it easier for property owners, contractors, and staff to understand which regulations apply without having to reference both City and County ordinances.

Future Ordinance Updates: The City could evaluate and amend its shoreland standards based on local needs rather than relying on changes made to Crow Wing County's ordinance.

Administration and Enforcement: Having City-specific regulations could provide clearer procedures for reviewing applications, issuing permits, and addressing shoreland-related zoning matters.

CONSIDERATIONS

While adopting a City-specific ordinance may offer benefits, the City would also need to consider:

- Staff time and resources needed to develop and maintain the ordinance.
- Coordination with the Minnesota DNR to ensure compliance with state shoreland requirements.
- Potential differences between existing County standards and proposed City standards.
- Impacts on property owners and existing development.
- The need to maintain accurate shoreland mapping and classifications.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider the following questions:

1. Would adopting a City-specific shoreland ordinance provide benefits over continuing to reference Crow Wing County's regulations?
2. Are there local development patterns or concerns that would be better addressed through City-specific standards?
3. Would incorporating shoreland regulations directly into the City's zoning ordinance improve clarity for property owners and staff?

4. Should staff further research the process and requirements for developing a municipal shoreland ordinance?

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss the potential benefits and considerations associated with adopting a City of Jenkins Shoreland Ordinance.

Given the additional properties recently identified within the Shoreland Overlay District, staff believes it may be beneficial to evaluate whether City-specific regulations would better align with the City's existing zoning ordinance and development goals.

No formal action is required at this time. Staff is seeking general direction from the Planning Commission regarding whether further research and coordination with the Minnesota DNR should be pursued.

This report was prepared by Sourcewell for the City's review and consideration. The information in this report is derived from the City's official controls, which may include comprehensive plans, long-range plans, applicable ordinances, and information submitted to the City as part of application materials. Nothing in this report constitutes legal advice or engineering advice. Local government officials retain final decision-making authority.

AGENDA ITEM: 5b1

