

LATAH COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

LATAH COUNTY COURTHOUSE *522 S. ADAMS * PO BOX 8068 * MOSCOW, ID 83843 * (208) 883-7220

Janet Hohle, Chairman
Robert Henriksen

J. Steven Heick, Vice Chairman
Suvia Judd
Sid Eder

Cindy Agidius, Secretary
Rod Parker

Meeting Notes for August 21, 2012

PC Present: Eder, Heick, Henriksen, Hohle, Judd, Parker

PB Present: Fuson

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 PM.

There were no previous meeting minutes to review for adoption.

Michelle Fuson reported that she had directed her staff to develop different scenarios to test the concepts the PC has been developing over the past several months. Staff was very successful in uncovering a variety of issues that require further input from PC members before ordinance drafting can proceed. These issues and the PC discussion follow:

#1: Should parcels within existing subdivisions be eligible for division under the new ordinance?

Discussion ensued and identified several thoughts on the issue: 1) Are there existing conditions or circumstances that should preclude these parcel landowners of the same opportunity that is intended for other Ag/Forest Zone county residents? 2) Would there be any possibility of creating new subdivision-like clusters outside of the full/short plat ordinance as an unintended consequence? 3) Is there any combination of minimum acreage and dwelling density that might mitigate potential concerns? 4) Would a distance formula between subdivisions mitigate any unintended consequences?

PC requested staff to bring some maps to the next meeting so a spatial/geographic picture of existing subdivisions could be reviewed.

#2: PB staff explained that other staff had suggested adding ordinance language that would recommend (not require) future parcels be placed in a manner to preserve existing natural resources, waters, etc. The PC was amenable to this.

Number 3 and 4 are in regard to access to transportation infrastructure: the new land division concept would require new parcels and the existing parcel to use a common driveway to access a county road.

#3: Would it be acceptable to allow two access points from a land division to accommodate a creek or road that bisects the existing parcel. The PC was amenable to this.

#4: Can an existing parcel with approved access to a state highway keep that access and the resulting divisions be directed to a county road for access? The PC is interested in minimizing driveway access points to state highways and would want to discourage the scenario as presented. The PC members discussed the option of the PB retaining administrative review and approval authority for this variation.

#5: The PB staff recommended the cluster driveway easement not be 50 feet width as is required in the short plat section of the ordinance but be 25 or 30 feet so there could be 20 feet of graveled road surface to allow passage of two vehicles. It was explained that the land division ordinance currently required 25 feet. The PC agreed to 30 feet.

#6: Currently surveys are not required for new parcels; however, staff explained that the County Surveyor suggested that they be required in circumstances whereby a new parcel cannot easily be defined using aliquot land descriptors. The PC was amenable to this.

#7: Should non-dwelling structures (sheds, outbuildings) need to meet the 200 foot distance from original parcel dwelling requirement? The PC was amenable to the requirement for dwellings only.

#8: Should landowners of the remnant created under the new division ordinance be allowed at that time to exercise additional divisions under the old ordinance if that remnant would have been eligible for such? The PC will continue this discussion.

The PC discussed the potential response to a new land division ordinance and how many new parcels might result from the new process. If the rate of increase in the number of new parcels is a concern are there some mechanisms to address this? One idea was to have a limited availability for new land division opportunities to be exercised over a prescribed schedule. The PC requested staff to inquire if this might have some legal constraints.

The PC also requested staff to inquire as to whether there was any legal path that would allow special dispensations regarding land divisions for hardship cases.

The next PC meeting will be September 18, 2012.

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 PM.

Submitted by substitute recorder:

Janet Hohle

August 23, 2012