

Latah County Planning Commission

Minutes, 15 October 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]

Present/Absent: SJ, KW, JDH, JH, LB present; SS, JS absent. Staff: MF, Karl Otterstrom.

Packet materials: Agenda, 9/17/02 minutes, draft of all Latah County ordinances

Meeting:

Karl Otterstrom, new associate planner, was introduced. Minutes of 9/17/02 accepted; 8/20/02 minutes acceptance delayed until 11/5/02 meeting.

SJ chaired and changed the agenda from discussion of remaining sections of the ordinances, since the Area of City Impact [ACI] agreement renegotiation seems to have higher priority for CC. A draft of the county's proposal is about to be sent to the city; the city has an application for a rezone before it, but desires a moratorium on applications (for subdivisions, PUDs, rezones, and mobile home parks) while the agreement is renegotiated to reflect the Blahah case. (This case concerns a lawsuit against an Idaho county brought by an individual who was not properly represented/protected by the county; suit was upheld by the district court,. Presently, the county has no role in ACI rulings; there exists only a review to determine whether proper procedure was followed; no substantive review.) Additionally (to be renegotiated), Latah County wants to reduce the size of the ACI.

SJ questioned why all of the PCs efforts to substantially revise the current ordinances should be derailed by this. MF described where the city and the county were, and surmised that the renegotiation would undoubtedly take precedence over the PC's current work. The renegotiation will probably take 4-5 months, and be followed by the creation of new zones, rewriting of sections of the ordinances, work on comprehensive plan, etc. Current work on revising the ordinances could be fit into the renegotiation process. JH questioned what the role of the PC would be in the ACI process; MF: immediately, to review the ACI document that goes to the city. JDH: what role does PC play in redefining the area; MF: determination of size, which direction growth of city of Moscow likely to be, city's interests, county's interests, and that the CC will want a whole set of ordinances that the PC would be recommending; PC would be researching all of this throughout the process. SJ will comment to CC that disrupting the ordinance revision task is unfair at this late stage.

Discussion turned to the business at hand -- the upcoming public meetings to discuss the thorny issues of the ordinance revisions. Meetings were scheduled for late October and early November. PC voted to tentatively postpone until December. Next meeting (11/5) will be dedicated to working on the chosen topics; 11/19 meeting will be to develop presentations.

Last set of public meetings discussed: mineral resources (i.e., gravel pits), animal containment/feeding, junk, and home occupation). Potential topics for this round: administrative short plats, land divisions, second dwelling 200 feet from primary residence, junk, animals on small lots/feedlots, windmills, flood plain restrictions, the omission of the rural zone, no manufactured

home parks, the change away from exemptions from ordinances in cases of court decisions or inheritance (MF reported that prosecuting attorney had ruled that the latter is legal).

MF suggested that design standards (Article 7) should be for all construction; that removal of Article 9 (Manufactured Housing & Buildings) would probably prohibit the expansion of existing parks. The sections to be thoroughly reviewed by the PC are: junk (section 2.06), land division (6.01), feedlots/animal containment/small lots (various sections in 4), and flood plain (Article 3). Article 3 will be reworked by MF before 11/5 to reflect the view by the PC that there shall be no new construction or activity (fill/dredging) in the flood plain unless an applicant can prove that no other option exists for construction/activity, and that the individual cannot create a new buildable parcel if it does not exist. LB will look back through minutes to discover our former choice of language.

Next meeting (11/5) will finish discussion concerning: articles 3 (flood plain), 4 (zoning districts), 6 (full plats; note that 6.04 in the draft is incorrectly stuck out and should not be; reinstate), 7 (design standards), and 9 (manufactured homes and buildings). SJ had spoken with Troy Ott regarding feedlots/diary and year-round dry-lot feeding; he feels this is consistent with agricultural practices; SJ will invite him to make a brief presentation before the PC on 11/5. JH will revise windmill language by that meeting.

Next meeting: 5 November, **Room 207**, Latah County Courthouse.

Submitted by: _____ 19 October 2002
Louise D. Barber