Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 19 November 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: All present. Staff: MF.

Meeting:
11/5/02 minutes accepted with correction in third paragraph: ”the DEQ is supposed to enforce, but it just doesn’t happen” should read “the DEQ is supposed to enforce water quality non-point pollution, much of which is complaint driven, and therefore the regulations are frequently not enforced.”

MF opened the discussion re. the Moscow Area of City Impact [ACI], stating that the CC want the area reduced, and that the City suggests their “Area A.” What can a resident of the ACI (but not of the city) expect: the ACI can be developed to higher density; opportunities for development are more economically feasible; the 40-acre rule applies; subdivision is easier, although a subdivision might be limited by sewer and water considerations and must adhere to city codes (which are more stringent than the county’s); it is within the rural fire district (of Moscow’s Fire Department); is within Moscow School District; served by County Sheriff; roads are handled by the county. The downside of being a resident in the ACI is that one cannot vote in city elections. One advantage to the county of the ACI is that it doesn’t have to plan for urban issues; the tax base is okay (a resident in the county pays 25% less than in city).

SJ: if the area shrinks, will the land between the new and old boundaries morph into a new sort of zone? PC is leaning toward no development out at boundaries (e.g., Canterwood Estates, ca. one mile from current city limits). JS: why not shrink and review every five years; allow city to annex when necessary. MF: the effects of review are not immediate. KW: leave the boundaries alone and ask the city for input re. services; county should have more say. SJ: stay with the current boundary, but provide county with more teeth; noted that the city is not happy with the idea of ranchettes because they wreak havoc on “future” lot alignments, streets, etc.

MF: city wants their ordinances used, but does not want to process or enforce. JH: why not shrink the current area and divide up control? MF: the idea behind areas A (and B) was that A was proposed for higher density and no development without city services (i.e., any development would have to agree to be annexed). The ZC wants the area shrunk, and a combined hearing with three members of the ZC sitting in at the hearing to determine the reasoning and logic behind the decision; they want a streamlining of the application process.

The PC will recommend to the CC re. Process of Review, “The City receives and processes the applications, conducts fact-finding, and makes a decision. The matter is then forwarded to the County who has a series of choices: affirm the decision, modify the decision, or reverse the decision. If the County believes more information is needed for whatever reason, it can hold a public hearing.” Re. Governing Law, the PC recommends “The County adopts the City’s zoning ordinance for the Area of City Impact.” Re. Enforcement, PC recommends “The City enforces in

the Area of City Impact." Finally, re. Boundaries of the Area of Impact, PC recommends "Reduce the Area of Impact."

Next meeting: December 3, 2002, 5:50 pm, Room 2B, County Courthouse. Discussion will continue on articles 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9. This meeting will be followed by the public meeting for input regarding the ACI, Moscow High School Multipurpose Room, 7:00 pm.

Submitted by:_____ 14 November 2002
Louise D. Barber