

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 7 October 2003

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

Present/Absent: JDH, SJ, KW, JH, JS, LB present; SS, absent. Staff: Michelle Fuson

Packet: Agenda; two versions of the draft articles (one with revisions in bold; the other “clean”); Natural Resource Conservation Service [NRCS] Access Road standards.

Handouts: Sewer District summary information sheet; minutes of September 16, 2003

Meeting. Minutes for 9/16/03 approved with correction re. “commercial kennels” (4.01.02.3).

MF related that the ACI meeting between the county and the city on 10-1-03 had gone smoothly, that a small additional area was added to the map in the southwestern section, and that Prosecutor Robin Eckmann and MF would be developing the procedures for ACI implementation for both entities.

Discussion concerning 2.09 (Erosion Control Standards): JH suggested that the table on page 3 in the NRCS standards (May 2002, 560-1; from packet) be included in 2.09. This was agreed upon, as well as moving 2.09 and 2.10 (Building Setbacks from Riparian Areas) to Article 7, Design Standards. Language in 2.09 to be: “No sediment may flow outside the disturbed area of a construction site, private driveway, or road. The land owner is responsible for taking whatever steps are necessary to retain sediment, storm water run-off, or construction water within the disturbed area.” Language in 2.10 to be: “To protect aquatic and terrestrial habitat and other biological resources, all buildings shall be set back at least 100 feet from streams shown on 7.5 minute USGS maps. . . . “

Creation of water/sewer districts ensued with an information summary provided by Karl Otterstrom. JDH questioned if formation of such a district was as difficult as MF believed; his reservation was that people could slide this in. However, with district court, hearings, findings, and an election involved, and given the serious authority given to such a district (e.g., to levy taxes, build improvements, sell bonds, and make appropriate regulations, etc.), it appears to be quite an undertaking. This discussion related in particular to Article 9 (Manufactured Housing and Buildings).

Motion passed for . . . and my granddaughter just woke up! You can all wait with baited breath for the rest of these minutes.

A motion passed for changes to 7.01.03.3, 7.01.02.4E, and 6.03.01.2.

MF reported that Planning Department staff had gone through the draft ordinances and had some suggestions: one was to state that if the ordinances were conflicting, whichever part was more restrictive should prevail (a “severability clause”); another was to have the maximum fine for non-compliance (1.02.5 [not 4 because of inclusion of 1.02.3, adoption of the zoning map]) be \$300/day, the offense recurring each day anew until corrected; the amount, of course, does not have to be \$300/day; prosecutor’s office would assign amount. Another suggestion by staff was to change the language in 2.02.01 to: Nonconforming use refers to a lot use, building, or

structure, which was legal when built or commenced, but is out of compliance with (later) ordinance changes.

PC decided on a variety of language tinkering up to but not including Article 3. Next meeting will be devoted to discussion following a careful reading of all the ordinances, and a decision on dates for public input.

Next Meeting: 21 October 2003 at 5:30pm in the Latah County Courthouse, Room 2-B.

Resubmission by: _____ 15 October 2003
Louise D. Barber