

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 3 March 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, KW, JanH, JS, LB present; SJ, JDH absent. Staff: MF.

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 2/19/02; Article 4 (Zoning Districts); Proposed Change in Zoning Ordinance for Floodplain; Section 11.05 (wireless communication towers); letter from Taggart Engineering & Surveying re. 1-, 3-, 5-acre tract sizes in Latah County subdivision ordinance.

Meeting:

Minutes from 2/19/02 accepted.

Rules of Conduct (Section 10, Hearings and Procedures Ordinance) and 67-6506 (Conflict of Interest) read aloud for benefit of newer members on the PC. SS noted that these should be paid careful attention to when a vote is pending and that notification ahead of time is adequate to prevent a problem.

MF reported on contact with the ITD re. wireless communication towers. ITD requires no lighting on towers of less than 150 feet, but encourage lighting above 100 feet (medium-intensity strobe and red at night recommended); very little enforcement capability; over 200 feet (but not below!), Federal rules apply. There are requirements that if a tower is within 20,000 feet of an airport or if the runway is 3200 feet long, FAA requirements must be met.

JS: PC should recommend no lighting and that if that forces towers to be lower, so it goes. SS had talked with an aerial applicator who responded that lighting does not matter to crop dusters; they don't fly at night, and can see what they are doing by day (lights might even be a distraction); no private aircraft may fly below 500 feet anyway, only commercial (crop dusters) can fly lower. JS: PC should demand co-location. SS: apply a formula so towers rent at a certain amount (i.e., a tower has a thirty-year lease on the land with a specific value; divide the cost of the tower by the time of the lease and any charge cannot be beyond that figure; the land would not increase in value and inflation would not apply). The ordinance now requires three and that a tower cannot be built unless co-location is impossible. Additional discussion: camouflaging towers, the difference between wireless and radio towers that require no co-location (as on Paradise Ridge and Moscow Mountain), health factors (noted that we may not now take health factors into consideration, but that if things change, the ordinance can be revisited); a time-limiting element for any CU; and moving in the direction of complete county coverage and the promotion of economic development with this industry in more rural locations throughout the county. A motion passed to get rid of white strobe lights on towers (this would take the form of a request to any companies controlling any that already exist).

11.05.08 language approved; 11.05.13 will be worded that "the maximum intensity for tower lighting is a low intensity, non-pulsing (steady) red at night as defined by the FAA." A public hearing will be noticed.

Next meeting: 19 March 2002 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B; this will be a public hearing to discuss FEMA updates to panels #330 and #440 in order to maintain our insurance.

Submitted by: _____ 13 March 2002
Louise D. Barber

