Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 29 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.

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 1/15/01; Memorandum from PC to Board of Commissioners regarding Area of Impact changes; Legal Memorandum to Michelle Fuson from William Thompson, Latah County Prosecuting Attorney, regarding wireless telecommunications towers (11.05); draft of 11.05; Article 4 (Zoning Districts)

Meeting:

Minutes from 1/15/01 accepted with substitution of "annex" for "flow into" (second paragraph, second page).

Wireless telecommunications towers: SS spoke with Carl Mickelsen (Zoning) about the PC intent for fewer, higher towers to enable co-location, and ZC had understood that intent, but was experiencing complaints about the lights on the higher structures; the majority of complaints were about lights. MF asked to look into FAA regulations, and SS will attempt to draft language that might allow lower towers (but, therefore, less co-location). KW suggested lowering the intensity of the lights.

Area of Impact: MF suggested that requiring the City to follow the County's AG/FOR land division might not work (the County uses GIS and the City does not have that capability); it might be better to request a change of boundary. Would it be possible for the County to contract out its GIS service to the City? JH noted that Area B is huge and should conform to the County regulations. Decided to submit the memorandum by MF to the City and see what the response is.

Discussion regarding the draft ordinance revisions (Article 4). (Article 3, Flood Plain, needs to be updated to fit with current FEMA information.) The terms in 4.01.01D ("commercial or industrial uses" and "agricultural or forestry service industries") are too vague; if, for instance, "agricultural or forestry service industries" veer into commercial, shouldn't the land be rezoned industrial. KW: why should the feed for small animal concerns be produced only on adjacent land? Why does where feed is produced matter? SS: What we need to get at is the number of animals in containment and for how long that containment occurs; perhaps a pounds/acre formula is the answer, or perhaps requiring containment of animals for no longer than six months out of the year. Pair (cow/calf)/acre? MF will rework this section.

Bill Thompson is reviewing the language of the junk ordinance and will probably have a response to the PC in a month.

Next meeting: 19 February 2002 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B.

Submitted by:_____ 11 February 2002
Louise D. Barber