

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 15 January 2002

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, JanH, LB present; SJ, JDH absent. Staff: MF. Present from the City of Moscow: Susan Ripley, Chair, City Council; Joel Hamilton, Planning Commission; Joel Plaskon, Community Development

Packet materials: revised agenda; minutes from 12/4/01; website address for A/B zones of City of Moscow; 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; revisions for the cell tower ordinance.

Handout: City's revised Moscow Area of City Impact Agreement draft.

Meeting:

Minutes from 12/4/01 accepted.

MF introduced the proposed changes in the wireless communication ordinance (11.05); the change, adding the word "public" before road or right of way (sections 11.05.06, 11.05.08), passed unanimously. The second concern related to the zoning commission's discovery that the objecting public are primarily concerned about blinking lights atop the taller co-locating towers; ZC would like the authority to permit shorter towers to accommodate this problem. Since this defeats the entire thrust of the PC ordinance, SS will discuss this with the commissioners, inform the ZC of our intent; further discussion tabled until later date. Mention was made that there is a great discrepancy between the brightness of lights on different towers, and the language might be reworked to require the minimum brightness possible.

The members of the various City commissions/agencies present introduced themselves and explained that they were present to answer questions and make clarifications regarding the proposed draft of the area impact agreement. Joel Plaskon explained that the handout draft included the changes that had accommodated all the proposed changes suggested by the county that were possible. Joel Hamilton explained that the reason for the designated areas A/B was to insure that development occurred first in Area A, with annexation and city services extended; any areas beyond that immediately adjacent to the city cannot be developed. JH suggested that development be encouraged along 95 north, Troy Highway, and Mountain View Road. Hamilton responded that corridor development is harder for the city to accommodate with services than compact development. Stated emphatically that neither the city nor the county wants leapfrogged development. Susan Ripley explained that the southwestern area of A/B is large in order to accommodate the future highway by-pass, proposed to go to the west of Moscow through the area of impact. (An ITD member does attend all Moscow transportation meetings.) Joel Plaskon said that the city was considering a change in its ordinances to allow for a division and clustering of, say, four homes on half- to two-acre sites for Ag/For 40-acre (or greater) parcels (thus preserving the surrounding open space), but that discussion is not near completion; these would be without city services. SS wanted to know if they had devised a plan to superimpose grids for future development on areas that would be in this category of development; city had, indeed, required that of the failed Cameron South development proposal. Any change in Ag/For land would only occur through the public process with zone changes, etc. (including industrial zones). Joel Hamilton stated that productive farmland is what surrounds the city for the most part, and that the city desires to enforce compact development that does not damage continued farming.

It was noted that due to the recent Blaha case before the U.S. Supreme Court, the city may now only make recommendations to the county regarding the area of city impact.

The rationale for the southeastern portion of Area A was that the city would eventually flow into the SE Moscow Sewer District and that area would be annexed. KW wanted to know why the language (p. 2, no. 3) in the proposed agreement “discouraged” multi-user sewer systems. If a zone change, and then a PUD, then multi-user system the only way to go. Noted that multi-user systems are a real problem when annexation occurs and services must match. That was the reason; language change will be pondered.

After further discussion, PC decided to let the results of the Blaha case take care of any of the PC’s concerns regarding the size of Area B, but that the Moscow Area of City Impact Agreement needs to include the language of the county’s ordinance regarding land division in the Ag/For Zone.

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

Submitted by: _____ 17 January 2002
Louise D. Barber