

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 31 August 2004

Planning Commission [PC] Members: 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: SJ, KW, JH, LB present; JDH, JS absent. Staff: MF.

Packet: Agenda

Handouts: minutes for 8/17, Pat Vaughan memo

Meeting. Minutes for 8/17/04 accepted after several changes: re. storage containers, the language should read "PC decides to let this alone."; Airports: "conditional uses to include . . . Permitted uses include those . . ."; setback for mining in last paragraph has the numbers reversed and should read ". . . suggests that a 1000-foot setback . . . than the 2500-foot designated in the draft

The Vaughan memo: While promoting the diversification of agriculture, agro-tourism, etc., is good, there are problems for the planning department if laborers or "guests" are allowed to rent or live in existing buildings on small acreage; is the property actually a farm; who owns it, whether the people living there are actually farm laborers; all these might be problems for PD. Do we want to allow for additional houses? Currently it's one residence/40 acres, 2/80 acres, 3/120 acres and all the houses can be in one spot; a problem permitting renters. SJ: housing laborers is better than transporting them. Limits to existing buildings a problem, since there are building code issues for habitation. PC tables this discussion.

MF's questions for PC:

What is a "service yard?" PC decided that it is normally associated with vehicles (e.g., Avista facilities, MacGregor equipment yard, state highway garages).

6.01.05.3: when an easement is required due to land division, even if both parcels are owned by the same person, the easement shall be recorded [at the time of creation] on a form provided by the PD.

The question of "lots" and/or "parcels": could we not use the definition currently in 6.01.01: All parcels of land recorded or approved by the Planning Department on or before January 1, 1997 shall be considered existing parcels."

MF noted (same section) that all county roads are category 19 (right of ways), and therefore are not parcels, and do not create parcels.

7.01.01.1 (Design Standards): need for knowing what the list of the Latah County Historic Preservation Commission is; SJ will contact Pam Petersen about this.

7.01.01.2 (Design standards) should be deleted as it is redundant (see 7.01.01.5).

Are setbacks necessary for airports? PC felt unnecessary since FAA and state standards would be so stringent.

2.04.03.1 (Mineral Resource Development): consider having the ZC determine setbacks, rather than having 1000 feet set; JH suggested that the ZC address safety issues as well; these are often the problem.

Re. manufactured housing and buildings (Article 9), it was noted that the CC adopted 9.01-09 into the building code, with the exception of 9.04 and 9.10, which will remain in the ordinance. These relate to not permitting a RV, camper, etc. to be used as permanent living quarters (9.04), and that manufactured housing developments be located only in suburban residential zones and subject to the short plat (6.02) and full plat ordinances (6.03). A "Building Placement Certificate" has been created, which relates to buildings in flood plains that are exempt from building permits.

PC to reflect upon: definitions, “commercial,” expansion of CUPs, 500 feet from historical site, boundaries to parcels in land divisions (boundary lines), and the Vaughan issue.

Next Meeting: 21 September 2004 at 5:30pm in the Latah County Courthouse, Room 2B.

Submitted by Louise D. Barber, 15 September 2004