

**Latah County Planning Commission**  
Minutes, 21 May 2002

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]; Assistant Planning Director, Bill Belknap [BB]

**Present/Absent:** SJ, KW, JS, Janet, JDH, LB present; SS, absent. Staff: MF, John Simler present.

**Packet materials:** agenda; minutes for 5/7/02; Article 4 draft; Section 11.05 Wireless Telecommunication Towers and Transmission Facilities

Handouts: Tentative schedule for PC summer meetings; letter from Ron Monson, Latah County Surveyor

**Meeting:**

Minutes from 5/21/02 accepted with correction (“limited” deleted from item K, p.2).

Public hearing (cell towers). SJ opened discussion re. 11.05; the letter from Ron Monson read into the record. JH questioned the need for a survey (or imposing the cost of perhaps an unnecessary survey, since adjacent landowners would be required to sign a waiver). JDH made a motion that if a tower were less than 150% of its height from an adjacent property line, a survey would be required; motion passed to include in the language of 11.05.06i: “These letters shall be accompanied by a current survey of the property line relative to the setback, approved or reviewed by the county surveyor.” KW suggested some minor editorial changes for 11.05/07-8; motion passed for these changes.

After clearing up confusion regarding co-location on towers, MF pointed out that the ordinance as written would prohibit towers above the height requiring anything but a low-intensity, non-pulsing red light. PC decided that the language is adequate.

The public hearing was closed.

Other business: schedule for next four months presented; MF indicated that PC needs to adhere to a fairly tight schedule since the Area of City Impact agreement negotiations were upcoming in the fall.

In reviewing 4.01.01B, JH suggested that the requirement be 35 feet from any stream shown on a 7.5 minute USGS map (rather than 30 feet); this would allow landowners to be in compliance for some state or federal programs). Under discussion of 4.01.03, the one-acre minimum parcel size was explained (a departure from the previous 40-acre parcel requirement for a building permit); the one acre is the smallest amount of property to adequately fit a home, well, and septic plan.

Wind-generating devices: should these be conditional or allowed? Since buildings, towers, etc., are CUs, why should these not be conditional uses? Would not codes pertain? MF will check building code. The question of residential or commercial use arose; PC felt that encouraging this alternative source of energy should allow a “windmill” as a permitted use in the Ag/For zone; discussion tabled.

4.02 (Rural Residential zone): the main purpose of this zone is residential. MF will bring a map to demonstrate how much land in Latah County falls in this zone to next meeting; generally now small lots in a subdivision would describe this zone (like Potlatch to Harvard), but not in any areas of city impact. A minimum lot size is one acre (although often the parcels are five-acres), but a short plat is required to build. KW questioned why “sales facilities” (4/02/01B) would not be permitted (e.g., road-side stands). A.U.M. language should be reflected in 4/02.01C.

Viola and Joel are examples of Suburban Residential Zones in the county ( with ¼-acre lot sizes).

Schedule June/July: June 18 (articles 6, 7, and mobile home parks -- not currently allowed in the county; July 2 (flood hazard areas, CU permit and variance, Article 8); July 16 (Article 2, junk). August set aside for town meetings.

Next meeting: 4 June 2002 at 5:30pm, County Courthouse, 2-B; allowed uses in zones (Article 4).

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_ 28 May 2002  
Louise D. Barber