



City of Leavenworth
Planning Commission Meeting
March 7, 2018 (Wednesday)
7:00 PM
City Hall – Council Chambers

MINUTES

Larry Hayes called the meeting to order for the city of Leavenworth planning commission meeting for March 7th, 2018. The time was 07:01.

Planning Commission Members in attendance: Pete Olson; Scott Bradshaw; Joel Martinez; and Larry Hayes

No minutes

The Planning Commissioners discussed the revised 2018 to 2020 docket. This docket is a reflection of a joint meeting with the council and planning commission, where the docket was rearranged.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the zero-lot-line docket item; and whether the first step was to address in the plan unit develop (PUD)s or not?

Developer Service Manager Pate discussed examples that are part of the subdivision process, and the one that's the most commonly recognized is a PUD, and the Planning Commissioners agreed that to be cautious to rush into something of that nature. Much discuss ensued regarding standards, districts, and alley access regarding zero-lot-line.

The Planning Commissioners continued its discussion regarding defining affordable housing. At the last meeting, Planning Commissioners couldn't come to conclusion on the actual definition or changing definition for affordable housing. Planning commission asked for examples or samples of other jurisdictions that had affordable housing as part of incentive programs, and then maybe derive a definition from those other agencies,

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed examples from Bellingham, Marysville, Shoreline, Snohomish, Kirkland, and Everett.

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed Bellingham, and its incentive program for affordable housing in a way that has standards that are reduced, so they allow reduced parking, reduced setbacks, and other types of incentives. Bellingham is willing to deviate from standards to implement affordable housing. Such is voluntary (not mandatory). The Planning Commissioners discussed the process. Basically, Bellingham encourages affordable housing by offering incentives

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed Marysville. This example uses a menu for a developer to choose incentives (an à la carte scenario), whereby if, the developer receives a benefit, Marysville spells out how much density incentive and what incentive you get as bonuses for housing. This system has a lot more flexibility for developers because then they can pick and choose on what type of benefit to the public that they're going to provide for how much density they receive. This is a voluntary system.

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed Shoreline. Shoreline is a mandatory system. This system mandates the densities and bonuses ("the developer must provide affordable housing, at these levels, at these districts.")

The Planning Commissioners discussed tax incentives.

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed Snohomish which is another density example. This system has two parts. One is the eligibility criteria for just affordable housing in a multi-use districts and commercial districts, and the second is an additional program for senior housing. This example of Code has two system approach of affordable housing in specific districts and densities; and opportunities for senior housing. This example speaks directly to senior housing as other examples do not. This system is focused on multi-family, with different multi-family densities and designations. They have high, medium and low. Snohomish uses a 60% of the annual median income threshold. If the developer provides affordable housing at 60% of median income, or if you're senior, the developer gets this density bonus program.

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed Kirkland. This is a mix and match which also provides a density program and in the lieu of payment program. This is an example where a developer is willing to write a check and be cleared of affordable housing obligation. And that means that city would then have to, in time, build those units, or give the monies to a housing authority who would then build those units. This is a mandatory program where one minimum requirement is that the developer provide at least 10% of any unit over four or more to the affordable housing.

The Planning Commissioners discussed the Whistler example; and size of City and size of projects that may work with differing regulations. The examples are from all large population areas.

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed Everett. This is examples of duplexes, accessory buildings, and small lots to address affordability in adding housing opportunity through those three criteria being duplexes and smaller lots,

Developer Service Manager Pate presented and reviewed smaller lots

The Planning Commissioners agreed that they desired to explore the menu scenario (Marysville - Menu with incentives) and Bellingham (setback and parking, and other reduction in standards for bonuses). The Planning Commissioners discussed limitations in a snow town.

Developer Service Manager Pate will return with feedback and direction on incentives, and then the Planning Commissioners can consider using their definitions, evaluate their definitions, and seeing if those are right for Leavenworth.

The planning commission discussed the “essential workers” matrix. At the last meeting, the Planning Commissioners asked “who are we trying to serve;” and agreed that the matrix was valuable in understanding wages and positions. This matrix included workers in our community. The Planning Commissioners reviewed the school district’s statistics on per capita of income, median family income, and male, female, and then by renter and home owner data. The top dollar, which is a medium income of a homeowner, was reviewed by the Planning Commissioners. There’s 495 people that are in that bracket of people that are earning from \$10,000-\$25,000 (Household). The Planning Commissioners continued its discussion on earnings compared to income bracket to positions.

The Planning Commissioners discussed rent of around \$900 to a \$1,000 a month for a \$50,000 income. A Teacher can afford about a \$900 apartment or mortgage. The Planning Commissioners discussed the BERK study in that, in the assessment, it says that there’s a need for higher, and, of course, lower brackets of rentals, and once those open up more, that would create a shift and things might fall into a place more appropriately. The Planning Commissioners discussed a target range should be something around the \$40,000 to \$60,000, but may not be able to afford the \$900 - \$2000 in rent

Commissioner Olson moved to adjourn; and seconded by Commissioner Hayes. adjourned.