Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 5 June 2001

Planning Commission [PC] Members: Skyler Schlueter [SS], John Hunt [JDH], Suvia Judd [SJ], Kathleen Warnick [KW], James Hagedorn [JH], Janet Hohle [JanH], Louise Barber [LB];
Planning Director, Gerard Billington [GB]

Present/Absent: SS, KW, JH, JDH, JanH, LB present; SJ absent. Staff: GB

Packet materials: agenda; minutes from 5/15/01; **Handouts**: responses to town meetings from Wm. Bartlett, SJ comments on town meetings for input in tonight's meeting; email from Donn Morse about cellular telecommunications; newspaper article on hog operation in Cassia County.

Meeting:

Minutes from 5-15-01 accepted.

Discussion followed concerning PC response to the town meetings. Precise input lacking by comparison to the land division meetings several years back. General sense that one meeting and audience's first look at this information probably couldn't be expected to elicit much considered response. It was suggested that attendance, at least in Potlatch, was not representative of the community. Some discussion about going after more feedback through surveys, sampling, phone survey, etc., but PC decided not to follow up in this manner. There was a general feeling that intimidation from a few audience members slanted the meetings' range of responses; however, the silence of many spoke volumes of contrasting opinion. GB sensed that overall reaction was "limit restrictions." Countering the intimidation sensed at two of the three meetings, the PC felt that the direction we have been going is perhaps more "representationally correct" and that the PC should not back off – that the document that is so-far drafted represents what the public wants and dovetails with the comprehensive plan.

Next step is to *consider* all the responses from the meetings while we walk through the draft in the coming meetings; possibly PC needs to make changes (like junk/home businesses visible or audible from public roads needing more regulation than something located in an enormous piece of property). Regarding junk, the question of screening unsightly property poses huge problems, since the reaction of those forced to screen their problem property is often to put up an even more offensive screen than the offending problem. Question of whether there is any way around the fact that most of what we are dealing with will be grandfathered in? Could we get at some of these offenses by calling forth the environmental question? GB suggested that we must be careful to add on things that can be enforced, and the PD is already stressed in this regard.

At the 17 July 2001 meeting, GB will have the draft of the ordinance prepared for final discussion and potential tweaking. GB will also have the draft reviewed by the Prosecutor's office so legal input is a part of final discussion.

Next meeting 17 July 2001 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B. No meetings 19 June/3 July 2001.

Submitted by:_____ 6 June 2001
Louise D. Barber