

Latah County Planning Commission
Special Meeting with Zoning Commission
Minutes, 9 April 2003

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

Present/Absent: JDH, SJ, SS, KW, JH, JS, LB, Latah County Zoning commissioners Carl Mickelsen, Bob Hassholdt, Larry Betts, Jim Hagedorn, Wayne Spraus, as well as County commissioners Jack Nelson and Tom Stroschein, present. Staff: MF.

Handouts: 11/25/02 letters from Latah County Zoning Commission and Planning Commission to County Commissioners; 2/19/03 letter to Mayor Comstock with county proposal for City Area of Impact [CAI] renegotiation; 3/27/03 letter from Joel Plaskon to set up CAI meeting 4/9/03; options sheet by county prosecutor's office for CAI; Blaha case review; 9/30/97 CAI ordinance; questionnaires from 12/3/02 public meeting; packet with agenda for 4/9/03 meeting from City; maps of existing and revised (proposed) areas of impact boundaries.

Meeting. MF: purpose, to prepare for meeting with the city at 7:30; review of the ZC recommendations (to use the city's ordinances and have them conduct hearings, with three ZC members present at those hearings); county commissioners [CC] revised that with the suggestion that the hearings be videotaped (legal counsel recommendation); SS wondered if county residents would have a voice, to which Carl Mickelsen [CM] responded that they would not be able to present testimony at the point when the county ZC reviewed the video tape, but would be able to present if the ZC requested another hearing. MF went over the survey/questionnaires: ca. 150 people at the 12/3/03 meeting; 30 responses (predominantly favoring county control of process); JS questioned whether the CC had ignored the proposals by the PC and ZC except to reduce the size of the CAI; MF: no, they didn't ignore the recommendations; Jack Nelson commented that, of the people who testified at that meeting, most were small landholders who were worried about being annexed; the hearing was not representative of the large landholders; SS: from the city's point of view, the larger area effectively "annexes" the area without providing services, with the little guy having no benefits. SJ questioned the revision or rewriting of the ordinances.

MF: the city is coming at this discussion from a philosophical rather than a practical point of view (the question of planning for transportation, for example); Jack Nelson noted that the city can plan for transportation outside their sphere; SS: the county is approachable, and a widened area wouldn't make any difference; ITD would be in control, with both city and county on board. JS: growth has not occurred to the point expected when the original agreement was negotiated. MF pointed out that the large Bovil CAI area is controlled by the county, Genesee handles all of their area; and Troy and Deary handle subdivisions.

On the question of joint ordinances (asked for by the county), KW commented that these might be easier to make changes to, but would be no easier to enforce. If the city's ordinances were applied in the ACI, would the county be flexible? Both Nelson and Stroschein said yes. Stroschein further commented that the city should be responsible, with the county being involved; however, if the PC and ZC can live with the city ordinances, it's okay by him. JDH: is there a burden on the ZC to use the city's ordinances? CM (chairman of the ZC) responded yes, but ZC would come down with

Blaaha case behind them; a joint ordinance would not add anything and being familiar with two sets of ordinances, rather than three, would be quite sufficient.

Size of area: Bob Hassholdt suggested 10-20 year projection sufficient since the agreement would be renegotiated anyway within that time; Jim Hagedorn: all have been in agreement that the current size should be reduced; he prefers the blue line on the "revised" map. SS: if the city is set on the current size, they should be willing to give the area's residents more rights. KW: it is understandable that the city is interested in development outside of the CAI; they do have input now, but they don't have to have control to have input. The opportunity for participation in all matters concerning the ACI is always available.

Renegotiation: how often? Could be six months to ten years.

Adjournment to 7:30 meeting with the City of Moscow Planning and Zoning Commissionin, 1912 Building, 4/9/03.

Submitted by: _____ 29 April 2003
Louise D. Barber