

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 4 December, 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, Michelle Fuson [MF]; Assistant Planning Director, Bill Belknap [BB]

Present/Absent: SS, JH, KW, JDH, JanH, LB present; SJ absent. Staff: MF. Paul Kimmel, Loreca Stauber, John Nelson.

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 11/6/01; Article 4 (Zoning Districts); Erosion Control Standards (Section 2/07); Letter to Gerard Billington of 6/25/01 and the city's draft amendments to the Moscow Area of City Impact, city commission and county commissioners' responses to the draft, and the map of areas A and B.

Meeting:

Minutes from 11/6/01 accepted.

The County Commissioners joined the PC for the purpose of discussing the draft amendment of the Moscow Area of City Impact agreement, specifically the newly designated overlay areas A and B.

Loreca Stauber began with the sentiment that she is generally opposed to the scope of Area B, an area she believes should be under the county's jurisdiction. The line, wherever it is drawn, should be adjusted to eliminate potential development in prime agricultural land. JH: how much prime land is enclosed in the newly proposed Area A, which was created to allow development within easy reach of city services. A and B were created to avoid leapfrogging development. JH: there is a need in the county to provide for business development near existing infrastructure.

Is contouring of the line(s) possible? Most of PC thinks this is desirable. Keeping the farmland viable important, perhaps not for farming with big machinery, but for different kinds of farming.

Could the city keep a more carefully delineated A, and the county reclaim B? SS: the area in the eastern portion of B is probably realistic for the city to retain, if for no other reason than the highway by-pass will probably go there; perhaps development should be squeezed north of Moscow along Highway 95. [Historically, the original area of impact was much bigger than A/B for the purpose of providing the city a buffer, protection of entrance into the city, etc. It took nine years to reach the agreement the last time.]

Janet: All these decisions should be based on population projections; Moscow is now at 1.5% growth. Does this growth projection sustain the claim for the amount of area enclosed in A/B? Highway/corridor planning should be made before development planning.

SS: there is a need to designate industrial areas. MF said that Swan Ridley(?) and the Economic Development Council are examining this.

John Nelson asked where, if not Area B, would five-acre lots be possible. Response was that five-acre lots are not desirable since they create a services' nightmare.

Loreca Stauber asked if the PC would collect its thoughts in writing and forward them to the CC. Paul Kimmel asked that a workable map of Area A be created so we can make a specifically responsive statement.

Wireless tower ordinance changes will be discussed at the 15 January meeting. Noted that the county prosecutor has requested Orofino's junk ordinance and will shortly report back to PC with his response.

Next meetings: 15 and 29 January 2002 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B.

Submitted by: _____ 26 December 2001
Louise D. Barber