



Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

Wednesday, July 1, 2026 at 7:00 PM
City Hall Council Chambers
700 Highway 2, Leavenworth, WA

The Meeting will be hosted at City Hall, with an option to join via Zoom Webinar using one of the following options:

- (1) connecting via the Zoom app: Meeting ID: 918 5458 0303 Passcode: 093075
- (2) using the web link: <https://zoom.us/j/91854580303?pwd=GasMP6FqBaaYWQ4XiWzWlf3u6SEbdT.1>
- (3) calling: 1-253-215-8782. Alternative call-in phone numbers: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/91854580303?pwd=GasMP6FqBaaYWQ4XiWzWlf3u6SEbdT.1>

The Planning Commission is responsible for long range planning and legislative policy recommendations to the City Council. Recommendations are based on thorough understanding of options and public comment/discussion. Every year, the City Council directs the Planning Commission work through the establishment of the Docket.

Meeting Etiquette:

1. Have one discussion at a time and limit distractions.
2. Seek to understand before being understood.
3. Be respectful of each other; by assuming good intentions and acknowledging it is ok to disagree.
4. Focus on constructive problem solving.

1. Call Meeting to Order, 7:00 pm

2. Roll Call: Planning Commission Chair: Alison Miller (#7 - expiration 2030)

Planning Commission Commissioners: Elizabeth Sall (#1 - 2030), Amanda Taub (#2 - 2027), Simon Farivar (#3 - 2028), Drew Foulk (position #4 - 2029), James Whitesides (#5 - 2029), Colin Forsyth (#6 - 2030)

3. Review and approval of June 3, 2026 Meeting Minutes

- a. Sample Motion: *I move to approve the Planning Commission minutes dated June 3, 2026.*

4. Comprehensive Plan Update

An updated draft Comprehensive Plan is expected to be issued for public review in mid-July. This new draft considers the public and agency feedback that has been received to date. All comments have been reviewed and considered; however, not all comments necessitate a change to the plan.

In order to align the updated Comprehensive Plan with state mandated updates to development regulations, all mandated updates to both the Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations must be completed and adopted by December 31, 2026. In an effort to stay on track due to mandated timelines for SEPA, 60-day review, etc., staff has set the following timeline in an effort to stay on track:

Timeline:

July 14: PROS Plan goes to City Council for a Public Hearing
August 5: PC Hearing on the Comp Plan
September 8: Comp Plan goes to City Council for Public Hearing
September 22: Comp Plan Ordinance to Council
November 4: Development Regs PC Hearing
November 10: Development Regs City Council Study Session, set Public Hearing
November 24: City Council Hearing on Development Regs
December 31: Both Comp Plan and Development Regs go into effect together on the same day.

5. Development Regulations Review & Discussion

- a. B&B Code Update (1st review): Review change to language regarding calculation of 4% housing stock. Discuss how to calculate in UGA.
- b. Co-Living Housing: Review RCW 36.70A.535 and consider adopting code as outlined in state law. Must adopt code this year.

All Planning Commission meetings are open to the public

- c. Parking Code Update: Review Parking Memo, Staff Summary of Updates, and RCW to discuss proposed changes to parking code. Provide direction for staff to update Chapter 14.12.
- d. R-3 Zoning: Discuss moving this forward as part of the development regulation update to align with Comprehensive Plan to promote infill and smaller house sizes. Discuss dimensional standards, uses, etc. for this district.

6. Open discussion items, at the Chair's discretion

7. Future Meeting Dates:

- a. August 5, 2026 – Comprehensive Plan Hearing

8. Adjournment



Planning Commission City Council

Joint Meeting Minutes

Wednesday, June 3, 2026, at 7:00 PM

City Hall Council Chambers

700 Hwy 2, Leavenworth WA

Open of the Meeting: Chairman Drew Foulk called the planning commission meeting to Order at 7:02 pm. Mayor Florea called the city council meeting to order at 7:04pm.

Planning Commission Roll Call: *James Whitesides; Alison Miller, Elizabeth Sall, Amanda Taub, Drew Foulk, Colin Forsyth. Absent: James Whitesides, Simon Farivar.*

City Council Roll Call: *Anne Hessburg, Mike Bedard, Shane Thayer, Travis McMaster, Zeke Reister.*

City Staff: *Mayor Carl Florea, City Clerk Andrea Fischer, Maggie Boles, Community Development Director and Celeste Barry, Senior Planner*

Community Present: Andy Day, Ellen Farley, Victoria Sandborn, Shane Thayer.

Docket discussion: Director Boles discussed the Docket. Comp Plan and development regulations are taking most of the Planning Commissions' time. Discussed the parking code and the CUP code which are next up in the list of docket items. The PC will likely not have time to work on other items until the Comp Plan is adopted. The one exception is The Bed & Breakfast code review that was added to the Docket to look at how we calculate the 4% cap and how to use pre-approved ADU plan sets. Councilmember Hessburg asked about getting the plan sets from Syndicate Smith for pre-approved ADU's. B&B code moratorium ends in October.

Other items discussed: Co-living State code requirements were explained to the City Council. Commissioner Miller brought up the issue of the last City Council meeting discussion about "low hanging fruit", R3 zoning, multifamily zones, and feeling disrespected by some councilmembers. Councilmember Hessburg disagreed with this assessment and stated that the Council listens to the Planning Commission and does attempt to solve affordable housing issues. Discussion ensues regarding housing within city limits, and housing struggles outside the city limits. Housing density should be within city limits. Commissioner Miller wants the Council to think about making more large-scale changes that will be more impactful on affordable housing.

City Council adjournment: 7:38pm

Planning Commission meeting:

Review and approval of Minutes: The minutes for May 6, 2026, were reviewed and approved. Chair Foulk motioned to approve the minutes, and Commissioner Miller seconded. Motion carried by all.

Public Hearing on the PROS Plan: Chairman Foulk opens the Public Hearing on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan at 7:42pm. Director Boles presented the PROS Plan and explains that it is being brought forward separately from the Comprehensive Plan in order to qualify for State grants available this summer. The PROS Plan will go to the City Council for Hearing on July 14, 2026.

Public Comments:

Andy Day, 225 Pinegrass. Approves of the PROS Plan in general, endorses the Osborn Community Center. Wants us to add something regarding interlocal agreements for the pickleball and tennis courts between the City and the Cascade School District.

Ellen Farley 58 Eckman Ln. Supports Andy Day's ideas and the PROS Plan.

Victoria Sandborn 9546 E. Leavenworth Rd. Supports the PROS Plan.

Shane Thayer 305 ? Drive. Any noise dampening looked at for the pickleball courts? He receives complaints about this.

Public comment portion of hearing closed at 7:59pm.

Discussion:

Alison Miller recommends adding a Policy under Goal 6 addressing the public comments. Elizabeth Sall suggests adding courts to “such as” in Policy 6.3. Add “*Partner with Cascade School District to support public access to school grounds and maintenance and improvements to facilities such as ball fields, courts, playgrounds, trails*”

Commissioner Miller moves to approve the PROS Plan with recommended edits in Policy 6.3. Commissioner Forsyth seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

Public Hearing is closed at 8:11pm.

Nomination of new Chairperson.

Drew Foulk steps down as Chairperson. Drew Foulk nominates Elizabeth Sall. Elizabeth Sall passes and nominates Alison Miller. Commissioner Forsyth seconds. Passes unanimously. Alison Miller will be the chairperson through the end of 2026.

Updates:

Staff is looking for additional funding sources for the Comp Plan update, as budget is running low.

Planning Commission discusses B&B code changes. Will bring forward the 4% cap calculations but do not want to remove pre-approved ADU's from the B&B code. Staff will draft a B&B code change to bring to the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission also discusses wooden fences and the WUI code.

Comments from Planning Commission on the 2026 Comp Plan Elements are due to Staff by June 17, 2026

Future Meeting: The Commission moves not to hold a special meeting in June. Next meeting is the regular July 1 meeting.

Adjournment: Commission Chair Drew Foulk adjourned the meeting at 8:59pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Maggie Boles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Maggie" being larger and more prominent than the last name "Boles".

Maggie Boles
Community Development Director

§ 18.52.120 Conditional use permit – Bed and breakfast.

- A. The purpose of permitting bed and breakfasts within the residential zoning districts is to provide an option for property owners to supplement household income or to recoup maintenance/development costs for housing stock.
- B. No bed and breakfast shall be permitted:
 - 1. On lot sizes less than 6,000 square feet; and
 - 2. When the existing percentage of bed and breakfasts is at or above four percent of the total housing stock permitted within the residential zoning districts. The four percent shall be ~~defined by the assessor's data for residential dwellings (State Code 11) in residential zoning districts within the city limits~~ calculated using the most current Office of Financial Management (OFM) population estimates; specifically for one unit housing units within the city limits.

Within the county UGA, the total percent of B&Bs shall be four percent of the UGA housing stock within the UGA's residential zoning districts, as determined by the Chelan County Community Development Director, ~~following the same calculation process as within the city.~~

- 3. [Insert any proposed language regarding limiting the use structures built using city pre-approved plans for a set period of time] – City Council Request
Example: Residences built using the City's pre-approved dwelling unit program shall not be permitted for use in conjunction with a bed and breakfast facility for a period of 5 years from the date of certificate of occupancy.

RCW 36.70A.535 Co-living housing. (1) Cities and counties planning under this chapter must allow co-living housing as a permitted use on any lot located within an urban growth area that allows at least six multifamily residential units, including on a lot zoned for mixed-use development.

(2) A city or county subject to the provisions of this section may not require co-living housing to:

(a) Contain room dimensional standards larger than that required by the state building code, including dwelling unit size, sleeping unit size, room area, and habitable space;

(b) Provide a mix of unit sizes or number of bedrooms; or

(c) Include other uses.

(3) (a) A city or county subject to the provisions of this section also may not require co-living housing to:

(i) Provide off-street parking within one-half mile walking distance of a major transit stop; or

(ii) Provide more than 0.25 off-street parking spaces per sleeping unit.

(b) The provisions of (a) of this subsection do not apply:

(i) If a city or county submits to the department an empirical study prepared by a credentialed transportation or land use planning expert that clearly demonstrates, and the department finds and certifies, that the application of the parking limitations of (a) of this subsection will be significantly less safe for vehicle drivers or passengers, pedestrians, or bicyclists than if the jurisdiction's parking requirements were applied to the same location. The department must develop guidance to assist cities and counties on items to include in the study; or

(ii) To portions of cities within a one-mile radius of a commercial airport in Washington with at least 9,000,000 annual enplanements.

(4) A city or county may not require through development regulations any standards for co-living housing that are more restrictive than those that are required for other types of multifamily residential uses in the same zone.

(5) A city or county may only require a review, notice, or public meeting for co-living housing that is required for other types of residential uses in the same location, unless otherwise required by state law including, but not limited to, shoreline regulations under chapter 90.58 RCW.

(6) A city or county may not exclude co-living housing from participating in affordable housing incentive programs under RCW 36.70A.540.

(7) A city or county may not treat a sleeping unit in co-living housing as more than one-quarter of a dwelling unit for purposes of calculating dwelling unit density.

(8) A city or county may not treat a sleeping unit in co-living housing as more than one-half of a dwelling unit for purposes of calculating fees for sewer connections, unless the city or county makes a finding, based on facts, that the connection fees should exceed the one-half threshold.

(9) (a) A city or county subject to the requirements of this section must adopt or amend by ordinance and incorporate into their development regulations, zoning regulations, and other official controls the requirements of this section to take effect no later than December 31, 2025.

(b) In any city or county that has not adopted or amended ordinances, regulations, or other official controls as required under this section, the requirements of this section supersede, preempt, and invalidate any conflicting local development regulations.

(10) Any action taken by a city or county to comply with the requirements of this section is not subject to legal challenge under this chapter or chapter 43.21C RCW.

(11) For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(a) "Co-living housing" means a residential development with sleeping units that are independently rented and lockable and provide living and sleeping space, and residents share kitchen facilities with other sleeping units in the building. Local governments may use other names to refer to co-living housing including, but not limited to, congregate living facilities, single room occupancy, rooming house, boarding house, lodging house, and residential suites.

(b) "Major transit stop" means:

(i) A stop on a high capacity transportation system funded or expanded under the provisions of chapter 81.104 RCW;

(ii) Commuter rail stops;

(iii) Stops on rail or fixed guideway systems, including transitways;

(iv) Stops on bus rapid transit routes or routes that run on high occupancy vehicle lanes; or

(v) Stops for a bus or other transit mode providing actual fixed route service at intervals of at least 15 minutes for at least five hours during the peak hours of operation on weekdays. [2024 c 180 s 2.]

Intent—Findings—2024 c 180: "(1) The legislature makes the following findings:

(a) Washington state is experiencing a housing affordability crisis;

(b) Co-living housing is a type of housing that can provide rental homes affordable to people with moderate to low incomes without requiring any public funding, and rents in newly constructed, market-rate co-living housing in the Puget Sound region can be affordable to people with incomes as low as 50 percent of area median income;

(c) Co-living housing is a residential development with sleeping units that are independently rented and provide living and sleeping space, in which residents share kitchen facilities with residents of other units in the building;

(d) Co-living housing historically provided a healthy inventory of rental homes on the lowest rung of the private housing market, comprising up to 10 percent of housing in some cities;

(e) Starting in the mid-20th century, local governments began adopting restrictive zoning and other rules that increasingly prohibited co-living housing, or made it impractical to build or operate, and its numbers plummeted;

(f) Today, many cities and counties outright prohibit co-living housing on most of their residential land, or they enforce any number of restrictions that make it effectively impossible to build new co-living housing or to convert existing buildings into co-living housing;

(g) Co-living housing provides options for people who:

(i) Wish to lower their housing expenses by paying less for a smaller home;

(ii) Prefer a living arrangement with shared community spaces that facilitate social connections;

(iii) Wish to trade off location for space and, by living in a small home, also get to live in a high opportunity neighborhood they could not otherwise afford; or

(iv) Want a low-cost, more private alternative to having a roommate in a traditional rental;

(h) Many communities throughout Washington face a severe shortage of workforce housing, and co-living housing provides housing affordable to that income range and below, without public funding;

(i) Co-living housing reduces pressure on the limited amount of publicly funded affordable housing by providing housing that is affordable to lower income residents who might otherwise wait years for subsidized housing;

(j) Co-living housing works best for single-person households, but the housing for singles that it provides reduces demand for family-sized rentals from singles who would otherwise group together to rent large homes;

(k) Co-living housing provides a good option for seniors, especially those who want to downsize, or those who desire a living arrangement that is more social than a standard apartment. When located in walkable neighborhoods, co-living housing gives mobility options to seniors who can no longer drive;

(l) Co-living housing is well-suited for the conversion of office buildings to housing, because it typically requires less plumbing and fixtures for kitchens and bathrooms;

(m) Co-living housing is well-suited for very low-income people, supportive and recovery housing, and "housing first" homes for the formerly homeless;

(n) State building codes have established minimum sizes and other standards to ensure that co-living housing meets modern health and safety standards;

(o) Creating co-living housing near transit hubs, employment centers, and public amenities can help the state achieve its greenhouse gas reduction goals by increasing walkability, shortening household commutes, curtailing sprawl, and reducing the pressure to develop natural and working lands; and

(p) Co-living housing, because the units are small, is inherently more energy efficient than standard apartments, both saving residents money and reducing the state's energy demand.

(2) Therefore, the legislature intends to allow the creation of co-living housing as a means to address the need for additional affordable housing options for a diversity of Washington residents."
[2024 c 180 s 1.]

DRAFT MEMORANDUM

Date:	March 30, 2026	TG:	1.24426.00
To:	Maggie Boles – City of Leavenworth		
From:	Dan McKinney and Drew Heckathorn – Transpo Group		
Subject:	Leavenworth Parking Code Update		

This technical memorandum evaluates opportunities to update the City of Leavenworth’s off-street parking requirements (found in the Leavenworth Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 14.12.150) to better align with current best practices, incorporate the City’s defined land uses, and support overall City policies, goals, and objectives. The analysis and findings described in this memorandum are based on a review of Leavenworth’s existing off-street parking requirements, a comparison to other jurisdictions, and industry standards derived from national studies.

The goal of this update is to support the City’s goals and objectives, including efficient land use development, economic vitality, multimodal accessibility, and supporting residents’ quality of life while accommodating tourism activity in the downtown area. This memorandum focuses on providing recommendations for updating the City’s off-street parking requirements but also provides an overview of Leavenworth’s and other jurisdictions’ related on-street and other parking policies for additional context and future considerations.

Background

Leavenworth Policies, Goals, and Objectives

Key planning documents, including the 2021 Comprehensive Plan (currently undergoing an update in 2026), the 2018 Downtown Strategic Parking Management Plan, and the 2024 Downtown Parking Strategic Management Action Plan, were reviewed to provide overall guidance to make sure any updated parking requirements align with overall City policies and long-term goals and objectives.

The Comprehensive Plan envisions a Leavenworth community that balances growth with preservation of its natural, historic, and neighborhood character, emphasizing sustainable development and multimodal transportation options. Policies within the Comprehensive Plan include consideration of public-private partnerships for shared parking facilities and encouraging underground or structured parking to promote efficient land use development and maintain street frontage aesthetics and walkability. The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan emphasizes multimodal accessibility and reduced automobile dependency through an improved trail system, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and enhanced Link Transit service.

The 2018 Downtown Strategic Parking Management Plan and subsequent 2024 Downtown Parking Strategic Management Action Plan formalized policies to manage parking efficiently as a tool for economic vitality and accessibility for all downtown users – visitors, residents, and employees. Specific outcomes from the 2018 plan included the introduction of time limit restrictions for on-street parking in the downtown area and an expansion of the off-street parking employee permit program. The 2024 plan evaluated adding public parking supply through building a new parking garage and funding mechanisms to support this added capacity through a fee-in-lieu program, enhanced enforcement, and adjustments to the City’s existing paid parking and permit programs.

Updating the City's off-street parking requirements to better right-size parking supply with demand would help support these planning policies and help achieve the City's long-term goals and objectives of improving accessibility, reducing reliance on single-occupancy vehicles, preserving neighborhood character and historic street frontages, and supporting sustainable growth.

Existing Parking Challenges

The City of Leavenworth, though a small residential community, is a nationally recognized year-round tourist destination with many visitors attending its festivals, shops, restaurants, and outdoor recreation. This tourism economy drives significant seasonal and weekend visitation, with a high concentration of tourists in the compact downtown core along Front Street, U.S. Highway 2, and adjacent streets. The historic, walkable nature of downtown constrains opportunities and desire to increase parking capacity in this high demand area. Parking spillover concerns are prominent, especially in adjacent residential neighborhoods where visitor overflow leads to short-term parking in residential areas, impacting residents. During peak festivals (e.g., Village of Lights, Oktoberfest), traffic and parking congestion intensify on narrow roadways, risking emergency access and pedestrian safety.

Parking challenges extend beyond the downtown core, particularly in residential and emerging development areas. Many neighborhoods and undeveloped areas in the City lack full curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and improved street frontage, limiting the feasibility of reliable on-street parking. Newer land uses – such as more compact residential developments, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), middle housing, and mixed-use projects encouraged by the Comprehensive Plan and recent state housing laws – are increasingly common as development opportunities but not well-reflected in the City's existing parking code, potentially leading to misalignments between the City's current regulations and actual parking behavior. Too much off-street parking required for new developments can potentially increase impervious surfaces, raise development costs, and detract from walkability; however, too little off-street parking required can potentially create additional parking spillover issues onto nearby residential streets.

Overall, these challenges highlight a need for right-sizing parking to support tourism/development-driven economic vitality and the City's goals for sustainable growth, housing affordability, and preservation of the downtown's compact, walkable character.

Existing Off-Street Parking Requirements

The number of off-street parking stalls required for new developments and changes of use (i.e., for changes of use increasing floor area by 50% or more) are described in LMC 14.12.150. The code includes minimum parking requirements for a variety of specialized land uses such as dance halls, bowling alleys, churches, mortuaries, and other specific recreational or institutional uses. While the parking code includes many types of land uses, LMC 14.12.150 does not cover all land uses defined in the LMC zoning code (as listed in LMC 18.25.030), creating potential gaps or inconsistencies when applying requirements. One of the goals of this update is to incorporate all the land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030 into the City's off-street parking requirements. Additionally, there are opportunities to consolidate the off-street parking requirements for some specialized land uses, which could help make administering the requirements more efficient for the City and clarify expectations with the development community.

Some of the independent variables utilized for calculating off-street parking requirements – such as square footage of dwelling area for residential developments (1 stall per unit under 1,500 square feet, 2 stalls per unit equal to or greater than 1,500 square feet), yards in length of the course for golf courses, and square feet of area used for industrial uses – do not align with the independent variables most commonly found in industry standards such as the ITE *Parking Generation Manual*. In the ITE manual, independent variables like per unit or per bedroom for

residential developments and gross floor area or gross leasable area for commercial or industrial developments are more common and have more empirical studies associated with them. Utilizing less common independent variables can create interpretation challenges and are potentially more difficult for developers to anticipate in the planning stages of their developments. Additionally, parking requirements derived from less common independent variables may also have fewer empirical studies associated with them to validate these requirements. Leavenworth's use of these less common independent variables may be leading to less reliable alignment of off-street parking supply with actual parking demand for some uses.

The requirements include some reductions and exemptions, including a 5% reduction for multifamily developments (>20 units) within 0.5 miles of a public transit park-and-ride. Within the downtown exemption area, off-street parking is required only for new developments exceeding 10,000 square feet and requirements for residential and hotel developments are less than other areas of the City due to the pedestrian-oriented nature of downtown and availability of on-street parking. These reductions and exemptions are a good example of the City's current practices to right-size parking, which this update intends to further support.

While the City does employ some right-sizing of parking requirements currently, additional opportunities exist to further align parking requirements to anticipated parking demand and support the City's policies, goals, and objectives. The following sections of this memorandum describe some of these opportunities, supported by current practices in other jurisdictions and industry standards.

Comparison to Other Jurisdictions

A number of other jurisdictions' off-street parking requirements were reviewed to provide a comparison with Leavenworth's requirements. Many consistencies were found between Leavenworth's requirements and other nearby jurisdictions such as the County of Chelan and City of Chelan as these jurisdictions likely all adopted requirements in similar periods and referenced similar supporting data. Looking farther out across the region, more variability exists between jurisdictions' adopted requirements. While many jurisdictions' requirements were reviewed, this memorandum focuses on the requirements found in two other jurisdictions (the City of Chelan and City of Snoqualmie) to offer insights into how small Washington cities with significant tourism activity require parking for new developments. This memorandum also provides an overview of innovative parking policies in a handful of other jurisdictions (the City of Hood River, City of Port Townsend, City of Seattle, and City of Bellevue) for additional context and highlight approaches Leavenworth could consider in the future as growth and development continues to evolve.

Parking Requirements Comparison

City of Chelan

Chelan's parking code is outlined in the *City of Chelan Development Standards* document (Section Nine), which provides a detailed framework for off-street parking requirements that, as shown in Table 1, is similar to Leavenworth's in the land uses included and specific requirements referenced. Like Leavenworth, Chelan's off-street parking requirements include specialized uses (not shown in Table 1) such as bakeries, bowling alleys, churches, and veterinary hospitals, with similar minimum requirements.

Table 1. Leavenworth and Chelan Minimum Parking Requirements Comparison

Land Use	Leavenworth ¹	Chelan ²
Studio/1-Bedroom/2-Bedroom Apartments	1 per du (<1,500 sf)	1.5 per du
3+ Bedroom Apartments/Single-Family Homes	2 per du (≥1,500 sf)	2 per du
Hotel	1 per room ³	1.2 per room
Retail	2 per 1,000 sf	5 per 1,000 sf
Office	3.3 per 1,000 sf	3.3 per 1,000 sf
Medical/Dental Office	5 per 1,000 sf	5 per 1,000 sf
Restaurant	10 per 1,000 sf ⁴	10 per 1,000 sf
Industrial	1 per 1,000 sf	1 per employee

Notes: du = dwelling units, sf = square feet

1. *Leavenworth Municipal Code*, Chapter 14.12.150

2. *City of Chelan Development Standards*, Chapter Nine

3. Leavenworth's hotel parking minimum includes additional requirements of 0.3 stalls per employee

4. Leavenworth's restaurant minimum requirement only applies to assembly and service area

Chelan's downtown, like Leavenworth's, is historic with many individual buildings not providing on-site parking as these developments pre-dated off-street parking requirements. Chelan's parking policies include notable provisions for flexibility in the downtown area, with off-street parking requirements exempt from the "High Density Commercial District" zone except for auto-dependent uses such as hotels and gas stations. This exemption is based on the pedestrian-oriented nature and on-street parking availability in Chelan's downtown, like Leavenworth's reduced downtown requirements but applied more broadly without a maximum square footage threshold. Chelan's exceptions for auto-dependent uses like hotels and gas stations are also an example of their effort to right-size parking depending on the unique travel behavior characteristics of each use type (i.e., most visitors travel to Chelan's hotels via private automobile due to limited taxi/Uber/Lyft services and airport access available).

Additionally, on-street parking credits allow reductions in Chelan's required off-street parking in return for improvement of on-street parking (curb, gutter, sidewalk, and catch basins if needed), with credit of one stall per each 10 feet of improved street frontage for angled parking and one stall per each 20 feet of improved street frontage for parallel parking, limited to 50% of the total off-street parking required. This policy provides a mechanism to offset off-street parking requirements through on-street public infrastructure contributions, helping to address peak public parking demand and spillover issues.

Leavenworth, with similar land use contexts and travel behavior as Chelan, could benefit from some of Chelan's unique parking requirements, such as exempting uniquely automobile-oriented uses from reduced parking requirements or allowing on-street parking credit incentives in exchange for improvements to the public right-of-way. Both of these adjustments to Leavenworth's requirements would support the City's policies, goals, and objectives, such as supporting sustainable growth and improving residents' quality of life.

City of Snoqualmie

Snoqualmie's parking code (found in the Snoqualmie Municipal Code, Chapter 17.65) features a consolidated off-street parking requirements table with relatively fewer land use categories than Leavenworth's, grouping uses more broadly (e.g., "retail sales and service" and "religious institutions") and omitting some specialized uses like dance halls and bowling alleys. This consolidated approach can help reduce the administrative burden of interpreting requirements, making it easier to apply requirements consistently across many developments and adapt to evolving land use patterns without frequent code amendments. Snoqualmie's parking code also employs independent variables that are more aligned with industry standards found in the ITE *Parking Generation* manual, such as per unit for residential uses, per room for hotels, and per

square foot of gross floor area for many retail, office, and industrial uses. As mentioned, the independent variables most referenced in the ITE manual have more empirical studies associated with them, providing a stronger justification for the validity of the parking demand rates determined by these variables.

Snoqualmie's off-street parking requirements also include a variety of reduction opportunities, with up to 50% parking requirement reductions for senior or affordable housing developments, 50% reductions through approved parking demand studies, 10% reductions for transportation demand management (TDM) programs, and 25% reductions for shared parking. Snoqualmie has also established parking maximums for some land uses, where total provided parking may not exceed 125% to 200% of the minimum requirements depending on the land use. Parking maximums cap the supply of parking allowed, for instances where a developer elects to supply more parking than is required, to avoid the aesthetic and environmental impacts of large surface parking lots.

Table 2 presents a comparison of the minimum parking requirements for many primary land uses for the City of Leavenworth and City of Snoqualmie.

Land Use	Leavenworth¹	Snoqualmie²
Studio/1-Bedroom/2-Bedroom Apartments	1 per du (<1,500 sf)	1 per du
3+ Bedroom Apartments/Single-Family Homes	2 per du (≥1,500 sf)	2 per du
Hotel	1 per room ³	1 per room
Retail	2 per 1,000 sf	4 per 1,000 sf
Office	3.3 per 1,000 sf	3.3 per 1,000 sf
Medical/Dental Office	5 per 1,000 sf	4 per 1,000 sf
Restaurant	10 per 1,000 sf ⁴	12.5 per 1,000 sf ⁵
Industrial	1 per 1,000 sf	1 per 1,000 sf

Notes: du = dwelling units, sf = square feet

1. *Leavenworth Municipal Code*, Chapter 14.12.150
2. *Snoqualmie Municipal Code*, Chapter 17.65
3. Leavenworth's hotel parking minimum includes additional requirements of 0.3 stalls per employee
4. Leavenworth's restaurant minimum requirement only applies to assembly and service area
5. Snoqualmie provides option to lower restaurant minimum requirement through demonstration of lower occupancy

Leavenworth could benefit from a similar consolidation of uses included in its off-street parking requirements (while ensuring that all land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030 are addressed) and utilizing independent variables commonly found in the ITE manual, as practiced in Snoqualmie. These updates would help the City efficiently administer its parking requirements and help right-size parking by utilizing requirements supported by more empirical studies and aligned with industry standards. Other unique parking requirements utilized by Snoqualmie may be considered in the future, such as greater reduction opportunities or parking maximums, especially if growth and development intensify as the City evolves.

Other Innovative Parking Policies

City of Hood River

While Hood River's downtown area does require minimum off-street parking for new developments, developers are provided with the option to pay an in-lieu fee to opt out of these requirements, depositing funds into a dedicated account for public parking, transit improvements, or pedestrian enhancements. Fees are set by Hood River City Council resolution and reviewed annually, based on inflation and costs of providing new off-street spaces – including land acquisition, financing, and construction costs. This program applies to much of the Hood River downtown area, enabling historic site preservation and intensification without needing to provide

off-street parking for each individual use. The program does not guarantee a specific number of spaces built elsewhere but generally supports shared public facilities like parking structures/garages, consistent with their adopted parking management plan. For Leavenworth, this type of in-lieu fee program, as recommended in the 2018 Downtown Strategic Parking Management Plan and the 2024 Downtown Parking Strategic Management Action Plan, could help generate funds for centralized parking solutions to manage seasonal tourism peaks and lessen spillover parking concerns. While implementing an in-lieu fee program is not part of this update to Leavenworth's parking requirements, the updates recommended in this memorandum support and work in tandem with the eventual implementation of an in-lieu fee program for Leavenworth's downtown area.

City of Port Townsend

In March 2024, the City of Port Townsend became Washington's first jurisdiction to fully eliminate minimum off-street parking requirements citywide, shifting to market-driven supply choices. Maximum parking limitations remain to prevent overparking (e.g., no more than 150% of former minimums in residential zones). This policy aims to reduce impervious surfaces for environmental benefits, support housing affordability, encourage active transportation, and facilitate infill and adaptive reuse developments within the City's historic downtown core. Eliminating parking minimums entirely is a less common but rapidly evolving approach to reduce development costs, preserve the historic character of a community, and support multimodal transportation options; however, this approach typically requires proactive community buy-in and active monitoring of on-street parking to ensure adverse parking spillover effects are not occurring. Since this approach requires further evaluation and ongoing monitoring, it is not included in this update to the Leavenworth's parking requirements, but should be considered in the future, especially if more jurisdictions start to adopt this approach.

City of Seattle

Seattle's parking policies emphasize flexibility and sustainability, with no parking minimums required in downtown, urban centers, or areas within 0.25 miles of frequent transit (i.e., 15-minute headways or less), shifting to a more market-driven policy like Port Townsend. Parking maximums apply in some areas to limit excessive parking. Seattle also allows for shared parking reductions of up to 50%, in-lieu fee options in some zones, and off-site parking credits for parcels within 1,000 feet of a development. Seattle's parking policies offer a variety of options for Leavenworth to consider; however, some of these policies may only work effectively in a larger city context, especially policies associated with unique travel behavior in Seattle, such as higher transit use.

City of Bellevue

Bellevue's parking code includes both parking maximums and a variety of reduction options, with reductions of up to 75% in mixed-use districts, up to 20% for shared parking, and 25-100% reductions for residential developments within 0.5 miles of frequent transit (i.e., 15-minute headways or less). Like Seattle, off-site parking credits for parcels within 1,000 feet of a development are available. Bellevue's parking policies, like Seattle's, may only work effectively in a larger city context with higher transit use, but serve as another benchmark for Leavenworth to consider as it continues to develop.

Comparison to Industry Standards

Another approach for considering updates to Leavenworth's off-street parking requirements is to compare them with established industry standards from the ITE *Parking Generation Manual*, 6th Edition (2023) and the ULI *Shared Parking*, 3rd Edition (2020). The ITE manual provides empirical data on observed peak parking demand for various land uses, based on field studies across the U.S. The ULI manual focuses on methodologies for assessing mixed-use developments,

emphasizing shared parking efficiencies that account for time-of-day or seasonal demand fluctuations and internal trips (e.g., residents patronizing on-site restaurants) or multimodal trips that reduce overall parking demand compared to standalone uses.

This comparison to industry standards focuses on uses currently prevalent and anticipated in Leavenworth's development patterns – residential, hotel, office, retail, restaurant, and industrial uses.

ITE Parking Generation Manual Comparison

Table 3 shows the average peak parking demand rates from the ITE manual compared to Leavenworth's minimum parking requirements.

Land Use	Leavenworth¹	ITE²	% Below Leavenworth
Studio/1-Bedroom/2-Bedroom Apartments	1 per du (<1,500 sf)	0.9 per du	10%
3+ Bedroom Apartments/Single-Family Homes	2 per du (≥1,500 sf)	1.4 per du	30%
Hotel	1 per room ³	0.6 per room	40%
Retail	2 per 1,000 sf	2.8 per 1,000 sf	-
Office	3.3 per 1,000 sf	2 per 1,000 sf	39%
Medical/Dental Office	5 per 1,000 sf	2.6 per 1,000 sf	48%
Restaurant	10 per 1,000 sf ⁴	9.8 per 1,000 sf	2%
Industrial	1 per 1,000 sf	0.7 per 1,000 sf	30%

Notes: du = dwelling units, sf = square feet

1. Leavenworth Municipal Code, Chapter 14.12.150

2. Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Parking Generation Manual*, 6th Edition (2023)

3. Leavenworth's hotel parking minimum includes additional requirements of 0.3 stalls per employee

4. Leavenworth's restaurant minimum requirement only applies to assembly and service area

As shown in the table, Leavenworth's minimum parking requirements often exceed the national average ITE peak parking demand rates, suggesting that Leavenworth's requirements could result in oversupplying parking for developments whose peak parking demand is more closely aligned with these ITE rates.

Leavenworth could consider adjusting its minimums closer to these observed averages while still customizing its requirements to recognize unique travel behavior in the Leavenworth context. For example, Leavenworth's limited airport access and relative lack of transportation network company (TNC) services like Uber or Lyft leads to higher reliance on personal automobiles to access hotels compared to cities in more urban areas. An example of how Leavenworth could update its parking requirements in LMC 14.12.150 is shown in Table 4 below. Further details of how these proposed requirements compare to the City's existing requirements are included as an attachment to this memorandum. This example incorporates consolidating land use categories while addressing the land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030, aligning the independent variables with those commonly found in the ITE manual, and adjusting the requirements closer to the average peak demand rates found in the ITE manual while maintaining requirements uniquely associated with Leavenworth's travel behavior characteristics. Land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030 that cannot be categorized within the land uses in Table 4 would require planning director review or study to determine parking requirements. These example updates to Leavenworth's parking requirements could help right-size parking supply for new developments, supporting the City's policies, goals, and objectives including sustainable growth, multimodal accessibility, and economic vitality.

Table 4. Example Updates to Leavenworth's Off-Street Parking Requirements

Proposed Land Use Categories ¹	Proposed Requirements	Basis for Proposed
<u>Residential</u>		
General Residential	1 per du	No Change ²
Co-Living	0.25 per sleeping unit	No Change
Assisted Living	0.5 per bed	ITE ³
<u>Institutional</u>		
Religious Institution	3 per 1,000 sf	No Change
Library	2.5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Museum	1 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Day Care Center	1 per employee, 1 loading zone per 25 students	No Change
Elementary or Middle School	0.1 per student	ITE
High School or College	0.25 per student	ITE
Auditorium or Theater	0.25 per seat	ITE
<u>Recreational</u>		
Family Entertainment Center	2.75 per 1,000 sf	ULI ⁴
Athletic Club	3.25 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Health/Fitness Club	5.25 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Public Park	0.75 per acre	ITE
RV Park	1 per site	No Change ⁵
<u>Commercial</u>		
General Commercial/Office	2 per 1,000 sf	No Change ⁶
Medical/Dental Office	2.5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Restaurant	9 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Restaurant with Drive Through	5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Hotel	1 per sleeping unit	No Change ⁷
<u>Industrial</u>		
General Industrial	0.75 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Warehousing	0.5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Mini-Warehouse/Vehicle Storage	1.25 per 100 units or storage spaces	ITE

Notes: du = dwelling units, sf = square feet of gross floor area

1. Land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030 not included in this list require Director review or study to determine parking requirements

2. Aligns with current residential requirement for units less than 1,500 sf, per LMC 14.12.150

3. Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Parking Generation Manual*, 6th Edition (2023)

4. Urban Land Institute, *Shared Parking*, Third Edition (2020)

5. Aligns with current requirement for recreational vehicle parks excluding additional visitor requirement, per LMC 18.51.080

6. Aligns with current retail store requirement, per LMC 14.12.150

7. Aligns with current hotel requirement excluding additional employee requirement, per LMC 14.12.150

ULI Shared Parking Manual Comparison

The ULI Shared Parking manual offers a comprehensive framework for calculating peak parking demand in mixed-use developments. The methodology begins with base parking ratios drawn from sources such as ITE, then applies monthly and daily adjustment factors (for example, retail demand peaking in December while residential demand remains steady throughout the year),

incorporates internal and multimodal trips, and combines the adjusted demand rates to arrive at a shared total parking demand that is typically lower than the sum of individual land use requirements.

For mixed-use developments, utilizing this methodology often results in substantial reductions – commonly 20-40% for office/retail/residential mixed developments through off-peak sharing (i.e., office daytime, residential nighttime), with additional reductions achieved through internal and multimodal trips. Leavenworth's current off-street parking requirements lack shared parking provisions for mixed-use developments, so its minimum requirements may potentially exceed what ULI would suggest as the peak parking demand for these developments.

Consideration should be given to incorporating shared parking reduction opportunities into the Leavenworth parking requirements, like provisions already in place in jurisdictions like Snoqualmie (up to 25% reductions). Reductions could be aligned with typical ULI findings or require a shared parking study to validate the proposed reduction based on site-specific time-of-day demand, internal trip levels, and other occupancy patterns. This type of parking requirement reduction opportunity could help incentivize mixed-use infill development within Leavenworth, promoting its multimodal accessibility and sustainable growth goals and objectives.

Recommendations for Updating Leavenworth's Off-Street Parking Requirements

This memorandum recommends updating Leavenworth's off-street parking requirements to support the policies, goals, and objectives described in its long-range planning documents and better align with best practices from other jurisdictions and industry standards. Based on the analysis described in this memorandum, a suite of recommendation options is presented below. Each approach ties directly to the City's policies, goals, and objectives from the Comprehensive Plan and Downtown Strategic Parking Management Plan, such as sustainable development, multimodal accessibility, preservation of the City's historic character, efficient parking supply as a tool for economic vitality, and balancing tourism access with resident quality of life.

Consolidate the Land Uses Included in the Off-Street Parking Requirements

Consolidate the minimum parking requirements in LMC 14.12.150 into broader categories (e.g., combine retail subtypes into general retail), incorporate the land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030, and defer more specialized uses (including specialized uses in LMC 18.25.030) to planning director determination or parking studies. Also, show the parking requirements in a consolidated table like Snoqualmie's.

This recommendation would:

- Increase administrative flexibility by reducing code complexity and the need for frequent amendments
- Minimize barriers for small-scale or innovative developments
- Promote consistent treatment of land uses within broader categories, potentially avoiding definition conflicts
- Potentially require more staff/planning director time to evaluate specialized land uses and review demand studies

Reduce Off-Street Parking Requirements to Align with ITE Rates while Maintaining Requirements Tailored to Leavenworth's Unique Travel Behavior

Revise LMC 14.12.150 to set off-street parking requirements closer to ITE average peak rates where the City's rates exceed the ITE rates, except where Leavenworth's current requirements

better reflect Leavenworth's unique travel behavior like automobile-oriented hotels. See Table 4 as an example.

This recommendation would:

- Align requirements to empirically observed demand
- Potentially reduce development costs by avoiding the oversupply of parking
- Support affordable housing, mixed-use, and infill developments
- Advance Comprehensive Plan goals for sustainable growth
- Potentially decrease impervious surfaces for better stormwater management and environmental quality
- Promote multimodal accessibility by avoiding excess parking and decreasing walking distances between land uses

Provide Additional Parking Requirement Reduction Opportunities

Provide additional parking requirement reduction opportunities for shared parking (either a standard percentage or validated through a study).

This recommendation would:

- Potentially reduce development costs by avoiding the oversupply of parking
- Support affordable housing, mixed-use, and infill developments
- Advance Comprehensive Plan goals for sustainable growth
- Potentially decrease impervious surfaces for better stormwater management and environmental quality
- Promote multimodal accessibility by avoiding excess parking and decreasing walking distances between land uses
- Foster equitable funding of public infrastructure
- Utilize approaches from other jurisdictions with similar parking challenges

Attachment: Example Off-Street Parking Requirements Table

Current Land Use Category	Current Requirement	Proposed Land Use Category	Proposed Requirement
Residential			
Single-, two- and multifamily dwellings	1 per unit (<1,500 sf) 2 per unit (≥1,500 sf)	General Residential	1 per unit
Boardinghouse, lodging or rooming house	2 per 3 guest accommodations 1 per owner/manager and employee	Co-Living	0.25 per sleeping unit
Hotel			
Hotel or motel	1 per sleeping unit 1 per 3 employees	Hotel	1 per sleeping unit
Institutional			
Welfare or correctional institution, sanitarium, nursing home, retirement home, rest home or convalescent home	1 per 5 beds 1 per 3,000 sf	Assisted Living	0.5 per bed
Hospital	1 per bed 1 per 3,000 sf	<i>Requires parking study or director approval</i>	
Places of Public Assembly			
Church	1 per 350 sf	Religious Institution	3 per 1,000 sf
Library, reading room, museum, art gallery	1 per 250 sf	Library	2.5 per 1,000 sf
		Museum	1 per 1,000 sf
Preschool, nursery, day nursery, kindergarten	1 per teacher/supervisor 1 loading zone per 25 students	Day Care Center	1 per employee 1 loading zone per 25 students
Elementary or junior high school	1 per 500 sf	Elementary or Middle School	0.1 per student
High school or college	1 per 250 sf	High School or College	0.25 per student
Auditorium, gymnasium, club, lodge hall, or other place of public assembly	1 per 250 sf	Auditorium or Theater	0.25 per seat
Stadium, arena, theater	1 per 250 sf		
Commercial Amusement			
Bowling alley	1 per 250 sf	Family Entertainment Center	2.75 per 1,000 sf
Dance hall, skating rink	1 per 250 sf		
Outdoor commercial amusement enterprise (except golf course and drive-in theater)	1 per 300 sf of ground area		
Archery club, gun club, tennis club, swimming club, or similar athletic club	1 per 100 sf of clubhouse or 1 per 300 sf of ground area	Athletic Club	3.25 per 1,000 sf
		Health/Fitness Club	5.25 per 1,000 sf
Golf course	1 per 100 yards 1 per 500 sf of clubhouse	Public Park	0.75 per acre
New Land Use Category		RV Park	1 per site

Current Land Use Category	Current Requirement	Proposed Land Use Category	Proposed Requirement
Commercial			
Retail store	1 per 500 sf	General Commercial/Office	2 per 1,000 sf
Retail store exclusively handling bulky merchandise such as automobiles or furniture	1 per 3,000 sf		
Service or repair shop	1 per 600 sf		
Bank, office (except medical or dental)	1 per 300 sf		
Mortuary	1 per 250 sf		
Open-air market, used car sales lot	1 per 1,500 sf of land area		
Medical or dental office	1 per 200 sf	Medical/Dental Office	2.5 per 1,000 sf
Eating or drinking establishments	1 per 100 sf of net floor area	Restaurant	9 per 1,000 sf
		Restaurant with Drive Through	5 per 1,000 sf
Industrial			
Manufacturing, fabricating, assembling, processing, packing, or storage establishments, wholesale establishment, freight depot	1 per 1,000 sf of area used	General Industrial	0.75 per 1,000 sf
		Warehousing	0.5 per 1,000 sf
		Mini-Warehouse or Vehicle Storage	1.25 per 100 units or storage spaces

I. Introduction and Purpose

This document presents suggested code language for updating the City of Leavenworth's off-street parking requirements in LMC Chapter 14.12. The proposed amendments are based on: (1) recommendations from the Leavenworth Parking Code Update Memo (v3, 2026); and (2) state law requirements under RCW 36.70A.622.

The goals of this update include:

- Creating a fee-in-lieu of parking option to address parking minimums in the Central Commercial zone
- Consolidating parking requirements into broader land use categories aligned with LMC 18.25.030
- Right-sizing minimums using ITE Parking Generation Manual (6th Ed., 2023) rates, customized for Leavenworth
- Adding shared parking reduction opportunities for mixed-use developments
- Ensuring compliance with RCW 36.70A.622 under the Growth Management Act
- Supporting Comprehensive Plan goals for sustainable growth, multimodal access, housing affordability, and economic vitality

II. Proposed Amendments to LMC 14.12.150 - Off-Street Parking Number of Stalls Required

A. Suggested Amendment: Purpose Statement (LMC 14.12.010)

ADD the following sentence to LMC 14.12.010:

It is further the intent of this chapter to right-size parking supply to meet actual demand, reduce development costs, support housing affordability, minimize impervious surfaces, and advance the City's multimodal transportation and sustainability goals, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and RCW 36.70A.622.

B. Suggested Amendment: Applicability (LMC 14.12.120)

AMEND LMC 14.12.120 to add language for fee-in-lieu of parking option for new developments less than 10,000 sq ft. Fee TBD by council.

14.12.120. Off-street parking required when.

In all districts, for each new structure or change of use which increases the structure or use in area fifty (50) percent or more, there shall be provided and maintained off-street parking in conformance with this chapter. In the Central Commercial District, new residential units and transient accommodations shall provide required off-street parking in accordance with adopted standards. The City Engineer may authorize a fee-in-lieu of parking for new developments, which are less than ten thousand (10,000) square feet in gross floor area. The fee shall be determined in accordance with the City's most current adopted rate and fee schedule.

C. Suggested Amendment: Consolidated Parking Requirements Table (LMC 14.12.150)

REPLACE the existing LMC 14.12.150 table with the following consolidated table. This revision: (1) consolidates land use categories; (2) addresses all uses in LMC 18.25.030; (3) aligns independent variables with ITE standards (GFA); and (4) adjusts minimums to align with ITE average peak demand rates while reflecting Leavenworth's travel behavior.

14.12.150. Off-street parking number of stalls required.

Standards are as follows. Where square feet are specified, area measured is gross floor area (GFA) unless otherwise noted. Fractional spaces round up to the nearest whole number.

Example Updates to Leavenworth's Off-Street Parking Requirements

Proposed Land Use Categories¹	Proposed Requirements	Basis for Proposed
<u>Residential</u>		
General Residential	1 per du	No Change ²
Co-Living	0.25 per sleeping unit	RCW 36.70A.535
Assisted Living	0.5 per bed	ITE ³
<u>Institutional</u>		
Religious Institution	3 per 1,000 sf	No Change
Library	2.5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Museum	1 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Day Care Center	1 per employee, 1 loading zone per 25 students	No Change
Elementary or Middle School	0.1 per student	ITE
High School or College	0.25 per student	ITE
Auditorium or Theater	0.25 per seat	ITE
<u>Recreational</u>		
Family Entertainment Center	2.75 per 1,000 sf	ULI ⁴
Athletic Club	3.25 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Health/Fitness Club	5.25 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Public Park	0.75 per acre	ITE
RV Park	1 per site	No Change ⁵
<u>Commercial</u>		
General Commercial/Office	2 per 1,000 sf	No Change ⁶
Medical/Dental Office	2.5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Restaurant	9 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Restaurant with Drive Through	5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Hotel	1 per sleeping unit	No Change ⁷
<u>Industrial</u>		
General Industrial	0.75 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Warehousing	0.5 per 1,000 sf	ITE
Mini-Warehouse/Vehicle Storage	1.25 per 100 units or storage spaces	ITE

Notes: du = dwelling units, sf = square feet of gross floor area

1. Land uses listed in LMC 18.25.030 not included in this list require Director review or study to determine parking requirements
2. Aligns with current residential requirement for units less than 1,500 sf, per LMC 14.12.150
3. Institute of Transportation Engineers, *Parking Generation Manual*, 6th Edition (2023)
4. Urban Land Institute, *Shared Parking*, Third Edition (2020)
5. Aligns with current requirement for recreational vehicle parks excluding additional visitor requirement, per LMC 18.51.080
6. Aligns with current retail store requirement, per LMC 14.12.150
7. Aligns with current hotel requirement excluding additional employee requirement, per LMC 14.12.150

E. Retain: Electric Vehicle Charging Station Stalls (LMC 14.12.150.H)

RETAIN and RENUMBER:

H. Where electric vehicle charging stations are provided, accessible EV charging stalls shall be provided at fifty percent (50%) of total required ADA spaces, per LMC 14.12.165.

Also confirm if this needs to be updated to comply with the current IBC

III. Amended Section: Shared Parking Reduction Opportunities (LMC 14.12.070) – Replaces “Join use permitted when.”

Replace existing section with the following:

14.12.070. Shared Parking Reductions.

A. Purpose. This section enables parking reductions for mixed-use developments, recognizing that different uses peak at different times.

B. Standard Reduction. A development with two (2) or more land uses may reduce total required parking by up to twenty-five percent (25%) without further study, provided:

1. Uses have demonstrably different peak parking periods;
2. A shared parking agreement is recorded against all affected parcels;
3. The shared area is within three hundred (300) feet of all uses served;
4. The Community Development Director, working in coordination with the Public Works Director, approves the arrangement.

C. Shared Parking Study. A reduction greater than twenty-five percent (25%) may be approved upon submittal of a Shared Parking Study by a qualified professional using ULI Shared Parking Manual methodology.

The study shall identify peak demands, apply time-of-day and seasonal adjustment factors, and demonstrate no spillover to adjacent properties.

D. Shared Parking Agreement. Any approved reduction requires a recorded agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney. If the arrangement terminates, parking shall be brought into compliance prior to termination.

IV. State Law Compliance: RCW 36.70A.622 - Parking Reform Requirements

A. Key RCW 36.70A.622 Requirements

The following table summarizes primary requirements and corresponding suggested LMC responses:

RCW 36.70A.622 Requirement	Suggested LMC Response
Garages and carports may not be required as a way to meet minimum parking requirements for residential development	No change necessary
Parking spaces that count towards minimum parking requirements may be enclosed or unenclosed	No change necessary

RCW 36.70A.622 Requirement	Suggested LMC Response
Parking spaces in tandem must count towards meeting minimum parking requirements at a rate of one space for every 20 linear feet with any necessary provisions for turning radius	Add Definition: "tandem parking" as having two or more vehicles, one in front of or behind the other, with a single means of ingress and egress. Update Residential Parking standards 14.12.160 to allow tandem parking
Existence of legally nonconforming gravel surfacing in existing designated parking areas may not be a reason for prohibiting utilization of existing space in the parking area to meet local parking standards, up to a maximum of six parking spaces	Update Residential Parking Standards 14.12.160 to allow legally nonconforming gravel surfacing to be utilized – clarify that upgrades to these surfaces require review and potential permitting (e.g. paving, new driveway approaches, etc.)
Parking spaces may not be required to exceed eight feet by 20 feet, except for required parking for people with disabilities	Update Residential parking standards 14.12.160. Current minimum is 8 ½ x 18
Parking spaces that consist of grass block pavers may count toward minimum parking requirements.	Update residential parking standards 14.12.160 to allow grass block pavers as an option for parking stalls (when located outside of the required driveway approach area)

V. Additional Recommended Code Updates

A. Definitions (Title 21)

ADD or AMEND the following definitions:

[REVIEW DEFINITION IN NEW PARKING TABLE TO ALGIN WITH USE CHART – MAY NEED TO UPDATE DEFINITIONS]

“Tandem parking” means having two or more vehicles, parked one in front of or behind the other, with a single means of ingress and egress.

"Shared Parking" means parking used jointly by two or more uses with different peak demand periods.

VI. References

The following sources informed this document:

- City of Leavenworth Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 14.12, Off-Street Parking (current)
- City of Leavenworth Municipal Code (LMC) Title 18, Zoning (LMC 18.25.030)
- Leavenworth Parking Code Update Memo, Version 3 (2026)
- RCW 36.70A.622

RCW 36.70A.622

Residential parking regulation.

(1) Cities and counties planning under this chapter shall enforce land use regulations for residential development as provided in this section:

(a) Garages and carports may not be required as a way to meet minimum parking requirements for residential development;

(b) Parking spaces that count towards minimum parking requirements may be enclosed or unenclosed;

(c) Parking spaces in tandem must count towards meeting minimum parking requirements at a rate of one space for every 20 linear feet with any necessary provisions for turning radius. For purposes of this subsection, "tandem" is defined as having two or more vehicles, one in front of or behind the others with a single means of ingress and egress;

(d) Existence of legally nonconforming gravel surfacing in existing designated parking areas may not be a reason for prohibiting utilization of existing space in the parking area to meet local parking standards, up to a maximum of six parking spaces;

(e) Parking spaces may not be required to exceed eight feet by 20 feet, except for required parking for people with disabilities;

(f) Any county planning under this chapter, and any cities within those counties with a population greater than 6,000, may not require off-street parking as a condition of permitting a residential project if compliance with tree retention would otherwise make a proposed residential development or redevelopment infeasible; and

(g) Parking spaces that consist of grass block pavers may count toward minimum parking requirements.

(2) Existing parking spaces that do not conform to the requirements of this section by June 6, 2024, are not required to be modified or resized, except for compliance with the Americans with disabilities act. Existing paved parking lots are not required to change the size of existing parking spaces during resurfacing if doing so will be more costly or require significant reconfiguration of the parking space locations.

(3) The provisions in subsection (1) of this section do not apply to portions of cities within a one-mile radius of a commercial airport in Washington with at least 9,000,000 annual enplanements.

[[2024 c 274 s 1.](#)]