

**Special Meeting of Latah County Planning and Zoning commissions
with the City of Moscow Planning and Zoning Commission
9 April 2003**

Present/Absent: [get attendance from city secretary]

Handed out: map of CAI.

Meeting: Joel Plaskon introduced the purpose of the meeting; following receipt of the county's proposal for the CAI, the city P&Z wanted to meet before they made recommendation to the city council. Specifically of interest to the city is: the size and/or delineation of the boundary, the processing of applications, and the policies that govern the ACI. He explained that the map's proposed orange line would override the county's blue line and that ordinances on either side of the line would be different. A serious concern of the city is planning around the proposed designated arterial and collector roadways. There followed a reminder by county personnel that the Blaha case dictates that the county must be the deciding body regarding the ACI.

Joel Hamilton: the city is aware of the Blaha case; there seem to be two roles the city can play, planning and administrative; he feels that the city needs a legitimate role in planning in some fringe areas (e.g., for transportation), but that the county can/should administer area outside of A, perhaps even annex A and develop to city standards. B would conform to county standards. Joel Plaskon: annexation should occur in response to residential (not commercial) development proposals and not by force.

There are two strong reasons for a smaller area: 1) review by the county ZC would be a burden, and 2) the representation issue would be resolved. Renegotiations could occur at any time to address problems. Plaskon: If the area remained the same as it is now, and the process were implemented with the city controlling in close, the county our further (with jointly written ordinances), wouldn't this achieve the representation issue? Does the county oppose same size? Carl Mickelsen: this would achieve representation, but not address the workload; shrinkage of size would address that impact on ZC; he noted that Area A would cover projected growth and that outward expansion could be accommodated. Sue Ripley noted that zoning by both the city and the county should be worked on before any growth occurs, but that administration of any outer reaches would be county's job. Nels Reese: the city was in "dream mode" with Canterwood and Cameron developments; the city and county should be meeting more often (like tonight) and stay on the same page. He proposed that administration in Area A, say, should be city's with county people present, and vice versa in Area B (county responsibility with city people present). The current ACI is more like a 60-year projected area; A is more like a 20-year projection.

Sue Scott: people don't even know where the ACI is; the process should not involve two sets of hoops. She would like to see a clear process once. Regarding transportation, the particulars of highways are important, but the planning around highways is important too.

Joel Hamilton, in response to a question about what the city wants, said he would like to see a formal planning role for the city in the area that's not immediately adjacent to the city, such as a joint city/county chapter of the comprehensive plan/standards in the ACI. In Area B, county would use their standards and administer, but planning should involve the city; in Area A (a growth boundary for 20 years), the land should be annexed, but what the administrative structure should be

still a question to him. Clearly the city's interests reach beyond 20 years. There needs to be a development of procedure to make people feel represented. Perhaps the creation of chapters in each of the comprehensive plans with common material on maps.

_____? There needs to be a closer working arrangement of all agencies (county and city) and more frequent renegotiation; meetings like tonight's most productive.

Kirk ____ (resident of the ACI on city P&Z) is a proponent of getting rid of the ACI altogether; the city is behind in enforcing things in ACI, and roadways are what determine what happens (roads first, then zoning and boundaries; roads followed by development). Sue Ripley: the designated beltway (dashed pink line on city's map) would be in the city's jurisdiction, but the by-pass would be outside; Joel Hamilton: the beltway might not be the city's. Noted that Moscow's Transportation Committee has been trying to determine where this future beltway would go, and educate the public to expect it (it's way off in future).

Suvia Judd asked if the city had seen the "options" sheet prepared by legal counsel for the county regarding the ACI? The question of administration and workloads was serious, as is the question of drafting the revisions or a new set of ordinances for proposed area B. Huge undertaking. Carl Mickelsen said that dealing with three sets of ordinances would be impossible. Joel Plaskon suggested that the zoning standards of the county be applied in the outer area; Area A would be a planning (only) "chapter" in the ACI (not a full blown document). Suvia Judd: ordinances flow from plan, so a collage not so easy to implement. Noted that three areas would confuse the public, so it should be kept as simple as possible. Sue Scott: do these lines divide property? Michele Fuson: there are ca. eight property lines/large parcels bisected; the original lines were dictated by prime agricultural land demarcations.

Joel Plaskon: why reduce Moscow's ACI when Bovil has such a large area? Michele Fuson: the county controls the Bovil ACI; only Genesee controls its ACI, with Troy and Deary having a role in subdivisions.

Sue Scott: if area were reduced to proposed Area B, how would the county get the city's input? Carl Mickelsen: better notification; city can always come to county and initiate hearings. Noted that this meeting and others like it would be very effective. Joel Plaskon: what is best for both entities is the main thing to keep in mind, that "dream" areas require planning and foresight, and that is part of the [city's] responsibility.

Submitted by: _____ 29 April 2003
Louise D. Barber

