

**Latah County Planning Commission**  
Minutes, 7 December 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; JS, JDH absent. Staff: MF. Guests: Mary Jane Butters, Nick Ogle

**Packet:** Agenda; minutes from 11/16/04; draft of ordinance table of contents; discussion points from CC; letter re. CAFOs from Moscow League of Women Voters

**Handouts:** “Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations and Proximate Property Values” (article by John A. Kilpatrick from *The Appraisal Journal*, July 2001)

**Meeting.** Minutes of 11/16/04 approved as amended. 3.01.02.1 (limit of number of employees): SJ had talked with Mary Jane Butters and asked her to discuss agro-tourism with the PC; the CUP process covers most of her particular situation at the present time, but it may be that she will want to employ 45 people in the future; what then? It was noted that agricultural workers in the Ag/For zone are not counted, so Butters is okay for now; others may, however, need assistance to develop ag-tourism businesses (more leniency in numbers of employees). It was further noted that the ZC would always be able to set a number of employees, even if the ordinance had no limit; PC is now proposing a limit of 6-15, meaning that more than 15 would require a rezone. (Butters reminded PC that more laborers are required for organic farming; SJ asked that she keep in mind the impacts – noise, machinery, disposal, water usage, etc. – when researching practices; “what would you hate if you were a neighbor?”). MF: it won’t hurt to remove the upper limit, but “a suggested limit, with ZC discretion” might be the direction to go. Example of an ag-related commercial use: a winery, where growing grapes is an allowed use; processing, bottling would be conditional uses; and, Camas Winery operating out in county, for instance, could be conditionally permitted even if they don’t grow the grapes. SJ suggested that Butters develop a proposal (as the PC has asked the Palouse Prairie advocates to create) that would help guide the PC. Furthermore, Butters will compile a list of many of the examples of innovative ag-tourism businesses across the country so the PC can see what’s actually going on; PC will need this by the 12/21/04 meeting.

CC would like to remain as the zoning board of appeals, and wants the number of persons testifying to be limited(?); JH: the hearing official should be able to control redundancy; there should not be a limit. MF: leave first appeal with the ZC because appeals “matters” go to CC and the final appeal would be to the CC. Rooms for rent in ag/for zone shall be proposed at 2 rooms/4 person maximum. PC to delete dump station requirement in RV parks. Setbacks (3.02.03) to be 35 feet from any property line. Minimum lot size in suburban residential zone ((3.03.03) may be 9600 sq. feet if there is a public water/sewer system; otherwise, 12, 000 sq. feet. PC will delete parking language in industrial zone and section will require same parking as all other zones (as in 9.03). PC would like to stick with its suggested 100-foot distance for a temporary dwelling for dependent person from primary residence (4.04). Number of animals in CAFO: MF: we need to figure out what a feedlot actually is; 3.01.01.2 to be deleted; 3.01.02.2 (Conditional Use) to read: “Feedlots, dairies, or other types of similar facilities or year-round/continuous confined animal management operations with more than 25 AU, but not exceeding 250 AUs, excluding winter containment, and transient confinement in small enclosures as part of a managed pasture rotation of these animals.”

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

Submitted by Louise D. Barber, 16 December 2004

