

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 20 February 2001

Planning Commission [PC] Members: Skyler Schlueter [SS], John Hunt [JDH], Suvia Judd [SJ], Kathleen Warnick [KW], James Hagedorn [JH], Janet Hohle [JanH], Louise Barber [LB];
Planning Director, Gerard Billington [GB]

Present/Absent: SJ, KW, JDH, JH, LB present; SS, JanH, absent. Staff: GB

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 2/6/01

Meeting:

Minutes from 2/6/01 meeting passed.

GB presented the memorandum of understanding drafted by the South Latah Highway District for the CC for transportation planning, eventually resulting in a fairly detailed plan. The county would assist with noticing, the subdivision approval process and advice on local planning; the SLHD would participate in the subdivision approval process, and actively plan (as opposed to its current maintenance function). Maintenance has been the aim of both the north and south districts, and planning has taken a back seat.

JDH wanted to know if, since the PC is mentioned as a participant in the memorandum, but not a signing member, would it involve substantially more preparation/participation on the PC's part (i.e., expansion of our role). GB: PC participation is already implied in Comprehensive Plan. Is there an agreement of understanding with the North Latah Highway District? GB: PD adjusting permits already to include both districts. Hopefully, north district will follow this example. SJ suggested that PC forward this draft/agreement to north district and invite their participation, and append areas of interest for a formal agreement with the north district. Discussion followed concerning who is and how highway districts are elected; normally little change for a very long time because there are no nominations, therefore, no elections. Noticing for nominations are made, but if no one steps forward, that is the end of the process.

Performance bonds for cell towers discussed next. CC had some concerns about the new ordinance's liens: There seemed to be no real relationship between property's value and the cost of tower removal (small piece of property, but huge expense of removal and reclamation). GB said that the prosecutor's office has been somewhat negative on performance bonds in the past, but this may now be the avenue to tweak bonds' use and perhaps even lead to performance bonds for subdivisions, etc. All present willing to look carefully at the issues involved.

The PC must now return to its business of the last three years of overhauling the ordinances. For the next meeting it is assigned that PC go through the 9/22/00 draft of the ordinance and bring topics for town meetings to the 3/6/01 meeting (e.g., short plats, feedlots, quarries, etc.). Anyone on the PC who has been investigating any subsidiary areas related to these topics (for instance, feedlots) should come prepared to share that information with the PC. (The proposed combined dairy farm of UI/WSU was discussed; presumed it would go in Latah County, not area of city impact or over the Washington border.) GB: ZC wants PC to revisit: airstrips (should not be permitted use in Ag/For); child care facilities (should go back in under conditional uses for Ag/For); advertisements for someone else's business cannot go on someone's property in Ag/For; sound and smell issues need revisiting for stables and kennels.

Next meeting 6 March 2001 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B. March 20, 2001 meeting will not be held.

Submitted by: _____ 27 February 2001
Louise D. Barber

