Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 18 February 2003

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: JDH, SJ, KW, JH, JS, LB present; SS absent. Staff: MF.

Folder Material: minutes of 2/4/03; draft articles 1-9; letter to Joel Plaskon re. Area of City Impact [ACI] renegotiation.

Meeting: JDH gave an overview of his way of handling the chairmanship – a collaborative style -- and his desire to speed through the articles' changes and finish with the project of rewriting the ordinances, now in its fourth year.

Minutes of 2/4/03 accepted with a change in the third paragraph "lighting": " . . . some lighting efficiency measures in specific projects," and removal of question mark after SS in second to last line (same paragraph).

Letter to Joel Plaskon (Planning Department, for City of Moscow) is a draft from the CC. PC suggested minor editorial changes; MF explained that the areas A and B referred to are similar to the areas on the map the PC looked at earlier. She further noted that the thinking behind this draft (bullet three) was that the CC didn't think the city's ordinance quite addressed some of the problems and residents in the ACI were not quite properly represented; if the city's ordinance were modified, this "in-between ordinance" (new language for the ACI, distinct from both the city ordinances and the county ordinances) would clear up the problem and be easier to change. JDH questioned how to create this version of the ACI ordinance; MF: the county PC would modify the city's ordinance. KW noted that the city has zones that don't apply to more rural areas. By reducing the size we will have to revise the Comprehensive Plan and rework the ordinances; an example of the result would be that Canterwood Estates would be in the county (similar to Eastman Acres, out in the county). What to do with the areas that have been in the ACI and would then become county? Most areas are agricultural, so they would become AG/For, low-density would become rural residential. Canterwood is not a PUD and was rezoned, so it may require another rezone (it may have covenants). JDH: sub-committee of PC and City? PC does not want to be derailed from its current work; PC needs help figuring out how to implement renegotiation. MF: the PC will be derailed, however, there is a window for ordinance revision work. KW: let the draft of the letter go forth; all agreed.

Lighting (section 2.08): SJ will speak with Bill Kochman and redraft the language about "cut-offs," bulbs, houselights, etc.

Article 3 (flood hazard): Any change in a stream channel would be controlled by the Army Corps of Engineers and an applicant would need a floodplain development permit; whatever change that was permitted would still have to result in *no* increase in base flood elevation. Question about anadromous fish in county; yes, in Potlatch basin (steelhead); Army Corps handle this, as well. SJ: moved to accept Article 3; seconded and passed.

Article 4 (zoning districts): PC needs equivalencies of different animals to 1000 pounds of cow/calf pair, because we will need public input on this. JDH: move forward on this; MF will forward the current language for perusal to Troy Ott and those attending the regular PC meeting where there was so much discussion of this issue. 4.01.02.2D: change to "At a minimum, the Zoning Commission shall set conditions on lighting, noise, aesthetics, water, nutrient management, and odor management." Explained that the PD sends issues with questions to agencies responsible for enforcement, and if they respond, the ZC has guidelines; if no response, the ZC assumes it is their responsibility to set the conditions. PC approved language of 4.01.02.12D (Fish and Game input regarding windmills and migratory birds). Changes to 4.02.02.9 (rural residential) and 4.03.01.4 (suburban residential): " . . . or one dwelling unit with two or fewer rooms for rent." 4.04 (commercial): remove 4.04.02.8 (feedlots; now conditional in Ag/For and Industrial), but leave windmill section in. The move to accept Article 4 as drafted was seconded and passed.

Next meeting: 4 March 18, 2003, 5:50 pm, Room 2B, County Courthouse.

Submitted by:_____ 23 February 2003
Louise D. Barber