

Latah County Planning Commission
Minutes, 15 November 2005

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.

Packet: Agenda, minutes from 10/18/05; 10/18/05 M. Stanton memo; 10/19/05 Barry Chestnut email; various materials from Don Lazarini

Handouts: 10/18/05 minutes; 4.03 revision; 11/11 Stanton memo; Articles 3 and Section 4.03

Meeting: Minutes of 10/18/05 and 11/1/05 accepted. 7/25/05 letter from Carol Alexander discussed re. spiritual/recreational retreat facilities in Latah County. MF: currently allowed in draft: “campgrounds, recreational vehicle parks, golf courses, parks, recreational fields, gun clubs, meeting halls, fairgrounds” and B&Bs (with 4 double occupancy rooms); all are CUPs; otherwise a rezone is required; a recreational resort permit written to exclude any undesirable features might work; Hatley’s horse facility (no CUP) has been in existence long enough that it is a non-conforming use, and it would require a CUP if there were a change in scope of operations. PC discussed features that might be desired; Murray Stanton suggested that the frequency of use, road, fire department involvement, etc. are important; SJ: impacts on neighbors at issue; JH and LB will investigate other facilities and report at 12/6 meeting.

7.01.06 (Expansion of Conditional Uses): language changed to read: “The expansion, enlargement, or alteration of an approved conditional use shall be reviewed by the Planning Department upon written request by the permit holder. . . .”

4.03 (Mineral Resource Development; [see **handout of 11/15/05 for changes other than those listed below**]): Boldface indicates changes; definition of purpose vastly expanded; Betty Nagle: really restrictive; MF: if you are an existing small pit (“less than one acre of property has been disturbed”) and you want to expand or change, you need to get a CUP; otherwise you do not need one. If you already have a CUP and want to expand, you need an amendment to your permit, but the conditions that apply on the original permit are the only ones that would apply to you – not the “new” conditions in 4.03.03. Murray Stanton: does “one year” apply? MF: no, these normally extend for 6 and sometimes 20 years; rockpits are not subject to section 7.01.07 (Expiration of a Conditional Use Permit; “A conditional use permit shall expire if the use allowed by the permit is not initiated within one year of the effective date or if the use is initiated and then ceases for a period of one year.”); additional changes to 4.03: delete “mud” and add (underlined) “. . . to minimize their impact on surrounding property and existing uses, and to provide definitions . . .”(4.03.01); delete July 4 (4.03.5); add (underlined) “. . . or not exempt as per Section 4.03.04 of this ordinance or does not have a conditional use permit” and delete “Permitted mineral resource developments shall be registered annually as provided by Section 4.03.02” (4.03.03); substitute “may” for “shall” and delete the sentence “The Board or the Commission may require or recommend no bond if a determination is made that the posting of a bond would not be in the public interest or contrary to law.” (4.03.03.5); delete “and greater than set back from dwelling?” and add (underlined) “. . . the mineral resource and associated use are located on the same parcel or adjacent parcel under the same ownership” (4.03.04.1). Note that 4.03.03 has been added to allow personal use on own property. JH suggested that this be voted on at later date. MF will provide corrected copy.

Article 7 (Conditional Use Permits and Variances): MF: the variances changes reflect state code; JH moved acceptance of 7.02 to be forwarded to the public without change, seconded, and passed

unanimously. 5.01.02.5 (see JH handout from 10/18/05) to read “There shall be no new construction of dwellings, placement of manufactured homes, or accessory buildings in the floodplain . . .”; JH moved acceptance of 5.01.02.5, seconded, and passed unanimously. 5.01.02.6 must remain in the document since the definitions do not exist elsewhere; suggested that the last sentence be deleted (“However, roads, bridges, culverts, . . .”). 8.01 (Divisions of Property); discussion about Palouse Prairie input; David Saarf said that information is ready to assist property owners’ understanding; SJ suggested that the group make the information available in a brochure through the PD. JH moved acceptance of 8.01-8.03 to be forwarded to the public without change, seconded, and passed unanimously.

MF made changes to 3.01.02.15 (Accessory Cottage Housing), and various other additions, deletions, and cross-referencing changes (that will be clear in the corrected copy); however, MF highlighted the changes in 3.01.03. (Size and Setback Requirements; addition of new sentence: “A detached accessory building can be built to the side or rear lot lines provided a written mutual agreement of the abutting property owners on the property lines affected be recorded with the Latah County Auditor”) and 3.05.02. (Industrial Zone, Conditional Uses; 3.05.02.2 shall read “Agricultural or forestry processing or production facilities and slaughterhouses with more than 25 full-time equivalent employees.”); JH moved acceptance Article 3, with above changes and amendments, but without further change, and that it be forwarded to the public; seconded, and passed unanimously.

Next Meeting: 6 December 2005 at 5:30pm in the Latah County Courthouse, Room 2B

Submitted by Louise D. Barber, 22 November 2005