

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 4 March 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: SJ, SS, KW, JH, JS, LB present; JDH absent. Staff: MF.

Folder Material: minutes of 2/18/03; draft articles 1-9; emails from Bill Kochman and Richard Bowman handed out.

Meeting: Minutes of 2/18/03 accepted. Lighting (2.08) discussed; one problem with mercury lights is their disposal, which is not a problem for sodium lights or the -ines (as in fluorine); metal halide is good for motion, as it imitates a broad spectrum, uses less energy (both heat and light) than incandescent bulbs. PC: "All outdoor lights, including lights attached to a home or other type of building or structure shall be equipped with photo sensors so they are automatically turned off during daylight hours." 2.08.5 to read: "At a minimum these conditions [2.08.1: 100 watts or less; 2.08.2: of a sharp cutoff fixture design . . . ; 2.08.3: lamped with high pressure sodium or metal halide bulbs] must be set by the Zoning Commission for all Conditional Use Permits, and include all existing lighting, when a site has a change of use." MF will work on final wording.

Brief discussion on the fact that there are no expiration dates on conditional uses; PC should revisit this; MF: nothing in the code says that CUs cannot be permanent; periodic review should occur, but staff has little time; applicant has rights and random changes to a CU cannot be made (reviewing and changing conditions would be random); a Potlatch resident asked for modification of conditions, ZC complied and amended, and county prosecutor ruled illegal; legal only when CU had expired.

Email from Richard Bowman re. Contained Feeding Operations [CFOs]; point one: more specific definition of an animal unit is needed; LB will try to get this from Troy Ott; point two: the language of the ordinance at present indicates that certain practices (that are perfectly understandable and acceptable agriculturally) would be small feedlot operations, and therefore out of compliance. PC needs to revisit this section.

Article 6: changes were suggested by the county surveyor for 6.01.03.3; suggested that county prosecutor review these suggestions before PC decides upon this.

Article 7: MF has redrafted the article to reflect design standards; 7.01 (all construction) with two sections, 7.01.01 (all construction prior to issuance of building permit), and 7.01.02 (all construction prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy); 7.02 (design standards for short plats), which should comply with 7.01; and 7.03 (design standards for full plat subdivisions), which needs discussion (see items for discussion at next meeting below). MF thinks 7.01.02.6 should be eliminated because it is unenforceable; questions arose about fire hazard and erosion control; possible overlay zones for wooded areas where shrubbery, etc., should not be planted; erosion and water quality issues come into play with steep grades (15% steep, but lesser grade means more road building); JH will investigate grade issues; SS will call rural fire districts to discover what they consider preferable.

MF: there may be a need for more road building standards (including ditches, water bars, culverts, etc.).

Next meeting: 18 March 2003, 5:50 pm, Room 2B, County Courthouse. For discussion: **items to consider for full plat subdivision design standards, which include street, alley, utilities, parkland, buffer zones, plat stages, security of improvements, sidewalks, bike paths, storm-water control, public lighting, snow and ice removal, impact fees, performance bonds, roads, water systems, etc.**

Submitted by: _____ 12 March 2003
Louise D. Barber