

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 19 February 2002

Planning Commission [PC] Members: Skyler Schlueter [SS], John Hunt [JDH], Suvia Judd [SJ], Kathleen Warnick [KW], James Smith [JS], Janet Hohle [JanH], Louise Barber [LB];
Planning Director, Michelle Fuson [MF]; Assistant Planning Director, Bill Belknap [BB]

Present/Absent: SS, SJ, KW, JanH, JS, LB present; JDH absent. Staff: MF. Guy Curtis, First Step Internet ([FSI] an internet service provider) was present in the audience, and made many helpful comments regarding the discussion of wireless telecommunications.

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 1/29/01; p. 31f, wireless telecommunications towers (11.05) ordinance; Article 4 (Zoning Districts)

Meeting:

Minutes from 1/29/01 accepted.

Jim Smith has replaced Jim Hagedorn and represents the eastern county.

SJ questioned whether property values had been considered with the proposed change (11.05.06i) to setbacks of telecommunications towers; SS commented that if the waiver were signed by a neighbor(s), recorded with the deed, it was the equivalent of an easement. Lighting is the main issue; requirements for lighting and camouflaging of towers within the realm of the ZC. JS questioned whether there was a possibility of requiring coverage of the entire county to address lack of equal access (as opposed to the now-required main corridors; the “digital divide”); Guy Curtis responded that the revenue doesn’t exist to do this, but that FSI is oriented toward rural access. He further commented that the big business tower holders are not rushing to give co-location access to companies like his because, although not competitive now, they will be in two years or so. The fees are too high for a small company (e.g., \$1200/mo), and response to inquiries slow. Co-location within the City of Moscow costs only \$150/mo. Because small concerns like FSI use unlicensed frequency/equipment, they only answer to FAA regulations, not FCC (which controls licensed frequencies/equipment). MF noted that in reviewing ITD documents regarding towers, there are not very many lighting requirements (i.e., lighting is required only on towers over 500 feet). Near airports, there is a requirement to provide the FAA notice of application so that FAA will respond to the required lighting. PC could require minimum lighting. SS said concern in Latah County is crop dusters; they must be protected, regardless of how low the actual requirements are. Discussion tabled until MF reports back, noting that the ITD has more restrictions on lighting than the FCC.

Zoning, Article 4. MF will get feedlot language from a county extension agent and Janet will bring the state law regarding animals to next meeting. MF: feedlots or dairies could go in industrial zone with CU permit. This question concerns all of the following: food and animal processing, feedlots, dairies, and food production facilities (chicken/eggs), or the “next step after primary production” (SJ); could include saw mills, slaughter houses; “commercial” means “being paid by another for services.” More information will be gathered; MF will create language for PC input for next meeting.

Discussion about what parcel means; for zoning purposes, a parcel is a “buildable parcel.” This should be clarified in definitions section.

Landing strips need further clarification; suggested that PC add “private landing strip for personal use” to the ordinance.

The next meeting will concern conditional uses, but the discussion about whether to create a new Rural zone out of the existing A/F zone must come first; if new zone, the CUs for A/F might be more restrictive.

Next meeting: 5 March 2002 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B. Discussion must include Article 3 (flood plain); County may have to readopt regulations/agreement? before the upcoming FEMA deadline.

Submitted by: _____ 22 February 2002
Louise D. Barber