

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 16 November 2004

Planning Commission [PC] Members: 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, JH, JS, LB present; JDH absent. Staff: MF. Paul Kimmel, Tom Stroshein, and Jack Nelson, Latah County Commissioners, and Susan Peterson, County Clerk

Packet: Agenda; minutes from 10/26; 10/29 rough draft of county ordinances; summary of commissioners' changes/questions for the land use ordinances; memorandum from Michelle Fuson re. Area of City Impact;

Handouts: Discussion points re. CC and ordinance draft

Meeting. Ordinance draft/reorganization began with 1/02.17 (Appeals): CC wants to retain role as final body of appeals (not the ZC) since they are the elected officials; CC considers this a duty, not a burden, and especially so if the next step would be district court.

PK wanted to know more about mediation (1.02.18); MF: can occur anytime between two parties; is not used in decision making; disputes normally between two individuals; mediation must meet all criteria of the comprehensive plan; administrative decisions not often subject to appeal.

3.01.01.6 (rooms for rent in A/For zone): currently not permitted, as it is in all other zones; PC made the change based on the perceived need for the elderly to have another person there for assistance, etc.; issue of how many rooms, parking, separate entrances/kitchen/bathroom; would the building code illuminate these issues? MF will check.

3/01.02.1 (CUPs in A/F zone): Number of employees; PK: we should figure out a way to encourage businesses and their expansion, not limit them; if the business were not A/F related, then definitely restrict expansion; however, the problem could be a slaughterhouse or packing facility and its impact on neighbors; JN: add to the number but control it through the CUP process? PK: say, 25? TS: CUP if more than 5 employees? CUP definitely a better process than a rezone.

3.01.02.3 (dumping stations at RV parks): suggested that there be a dumping system installed if more than 5 RVs; expensive to install, and market should take care of this; normally, these are set up where they can tie into a city system; no owner would allow dumping into his own septic system.

3.01.03 (size and setbacks): CC wants the minimum setback for residential structures to be 35 feet from any property line.

3.03 (suburban residential): setbacks (proposed -- 70 continuous foot frontage, 10 feet from property line, and 20 feet from right of way); a 12,000 sq. ft. lot size would be the minimum size for both the structure and an individual septic system; 9600 sq. ft. lot would require a combined septic or to be tied into a public sewer system.

9.05.01.2 (parking lot standards): CC: don't encourage large parking lots, but definitely parking must not occur on streets.

4.04 (temporary dwellings for dependent persons): CC: the location of this structure will, of necessity, be dependent upon the water/septic system, and the 100 feet should be unnecessary; TS: temporary dwellings do not seem to be being abused (although Gerard Billington found that they were).

3.01.02.2 (CAFOs): What is the purpose of this section? A reaction to southern Idaho? SJ: the number of animals has always been a problem; TS: concentration is the problem; currently, Latah is more stringent than any state regulations; PC will look at the numbers again, especially the lower numbers; upper limits should remain in place; the way the ordinance reads currently could impact 4-H projects, which is not the intent.

8.03 (full plats): CC questioned underground utilities requirement, as well as sidewalks, bike paths, parks, gated communities; JN: size of lots should dictate these "requirements" (if lots are small, these things are justified, but if the lots are larger, why should there be a park, for instance?); SJ: underground utilities was based on the lessened fire risk. The issue of gated communities' prohibiting public access to parks, roads a problem? PK: fire protection requirements a must; could not village-type affordable housing be considered? MF: water/sewage then an issue; currently, manufactured homes provide for this; PC will revisit this.

4.03 (mineral resource development): registration questioned; huge difference between Latah registration and registration with the Idaho Department of Lands; PD will notice these property owners, and notice would go to Bennett, Potlatch, etc. A balance is needed between registration and a CUP; JH: a reclamation permit is required for surface disturbance of a one-acre pit at one time (?); Potlatch and the Forest Service charge royalties?, so process is different for them.

LB had to leave; rest of minutes taken by JH.

Next Meeting: 7 December 2004(?) at 5:30pm in the Latah County Courthouse, Room 2B.

Submitted by Louise D. Barber, 22 November 2004