



City of Leavenworth
Planning Commission Meeting
April 4, 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 April 4th, 2018. The time was 07:00.

Planning Commission Members in attendance: Pete Olson, Anne Hessburg, Andy Lane, Joel Martinez, Chuck Reppas and Larry Hayes

Also attending was Steve Demarest.

Commissioner Lane motioned to approve the minutes for February 7th and March 7th, 2018 with the amendments and Commissioner Hessburg seconded. All in favor.

Manager Pate continued the presentation on the modified Bellingham and Marysville codes. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission agreed to focus on two examples, and what needs to be added, subtracted, and put into place. These are both voluntary-type incentive programs, and one is à la carte. From this, the Planning Commission can galvanize the definition of workforce housing, specific to Leavenworth.

The Planning Commission reviewed the eight-percent annual income definition, and HUD information for Chelan County specifically. This includes adjustments for family sites, and the 38 percent housing cost burden for water, sewer, and garbage. The Planning Commission discussed rising costs of utilities, and 38% may be better than a standard 30%. The Planning Commission does not want the city to monitor it, but the city should be advised, or shown that the development fits within the 80 percent guideline.

The Planning Commission reviewed the increased density criteria and the parameter of what size the project would be. The Planning Commission does not want to restrict the size of property or project and wants to encourage empty lot in-fill. The Planning Commission reviewed a scenario of developing 12 lots with 100 percent of them as affordable, it'd be a 50 percent increase. So, the developer could have six more for a total of 18 lots instead of 12. The Planning Commission desired to incentivize single-lot owners as well.

The Planning Commission reviewed condominiums and the multi-family district. Town home or side-by-side attached town home could accommodate affordable housing much easier than single family with single lot development but allowing condominiumization in single family for affordable housing under separate ownership may be desired. Common wall construction options are on the Docket and will be a part of future Planning Commission meetings. Reduction of process was discussed, including Binding Site Plans.

The Planning Commission reviewed smaller lots sizes and dimensional deviations to the standards.

The Planning Commission desired incentive programs for all districts that allowed residential uses and discussed allowing an administrative process rather than a quasi-judicial process. The Planning Commission discussed the standards where deviations could be allowed without parameters in the code. There's not a range of potential variation. The Planning Commission agreed that it could be a shock to a neighbor if, all of a sudden, there's an approval for no setbacks without the opportunity to comment. A hearing examiner review makes sense when there are no specific parameters for potential variations from the code. If there were specific allowable code variations (clear parameters for approval) staff could approve. Otherwise, it would be very subjective.

The Planning Commission agreed that the Bellingham example is not ideal.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Marysville example (the à la carte program) for residential density incentives. This includes a ratio program for public benefits and density incentives. The Planning Commission desired to differentiate between rental and ownership regarding the percent of income to qualify and did not want to distinguish between elderly or non-elderly. The Planning Commission discussed a modification of the 80% threshold for owner and renter. The Planning Commission removed many inapplicable sections. In addition, the Planning Commission discussed the distinction of dedication of public facilities and then improvements for these dedicated public facilities. Basically, the first step is that the developer gives the land, and then the second step is that the developer can get more bonus if they improve it. The Planning Commission continued to review and discuss each of the incentives including "Contribution towards an identified capital improvement project."

The Planning Commission discussed combining aspects of the Bellingham example with Marysville.

The Planning Commission discussed alleys, parking, traffic, RV access, and other topics.

Commissioner Olson moved to adjourn and Commissioner Reppas seconded. All approved.