



City of Leavenworth
Department of Community Development

Planning Commission Meeting
January 15, 2010 (Friday)
3:00 PM
Site Visits – Various Locations in Leavenworth

MINUTES

1. Meeting called to order at 3:05pm
2. Members Present:
 - a. Farzan Farivar
 - b. Marshall West
 - c. Andy Lane
 - d. Pete Olson
3. Members Absent:
 - a. Larry Hayes
4. City Staff Members Present:
 - a. Connie Krueger
 - b. Nicole Hill
5. Underground Parking Regulations Assessment Field Visits:
 - a. City Pool Parking Lot – General Commercial/Multi-family District Area
 - i. The Planning Commission stopped at this location to discuss possible underground parking facility scenarios in relation to a Commercial and Multi-family District area that does not have an alley separating the two districts. Items discussed included:
 1. The current proposed code language that requires compliance with setbacks;
 - a. The staff went through examples and hypothetical scenarios of how compliance with setback regulations might apply to the underground parking facility in different situations. The discussion focused on how that requirement would or would not work, and that creating an exception for compliance with setbacks for the entry and exits of the underground parking facility may be necessary.
 2. The need to define “machinery” further for clarification purposes;

3. Possibly changing the draft regulations to refer to the City and/or the Hearing Examiner when considering the appropriate regulations or exceptions;
 - a. The Planning Commission felt that this change would help create a more flexible consideration process, which may be necessary because of the varying situations within the City.
 4. Making sure that the code language is clear enough that an underground parking facility does not trigger the need for an existing nonconforming structure located aboveground to come into compliance because of the work being done on the underground parking facility;
 5. Whether or not two properties linked by the underground parking facility requires the same ownership;
 - a. No matter if the regulations will or will not allow multiple owners for the properties, the Planning Commission discussed the need for a perpetual parking easement, which would need to be recorded on the property title.
 6. Vent and exhaust pipe locations;
 - a. Locations for vent and exhaust pipes must be directed away from structures or other areas in order to create safe environment in the areas around the underground parking facility.
 7. The impact of mixed uses entering and exiting in commercial and residential zones.
 - a. The Planning Commission discussed the average trips per day for commercial versus residential units to understand the impact of possibly allowing the mixed uses to enter or exit into a certain district. The Planning Commission felt that the regulations should ultimately be based on creating the lowest impact possible.
- b. Behind the Bavarian Lodge – Central Commercial/Multi-family District Area
- i. The Planning Commission continued to discuss different scenarios for underground parking facilities. Items discussed included,
 1. Exceptions to setbacks for the entrance and exit areas, but also limiting the size of those areas;
 - a. The Planning Commission discussed setbacks and entrances in relation to City owned right-of-way, underground easements, and utilities. Regulations might include language such as “the City right-of-way may require no underground setback restriction, but may be mitigated through stabilization, excavation, etc.” The members also discussed these types of regulations in relation to public and private alleys.
 2. The different nuisance issues tied to the various districts and/or different situations, locations, and/or adjacent uses;

3. The lot coverage requirements in relation to the underground parking facility;
 - a. The Planning Commission discussed lot coverage in regards to the aboveground components of the underground parking facility entrances and other elements, and how or if these elements would be included in or have an effect on the lot coverage calculation.
 4. The need for a purpose statement at the beginning of the underground parking code section;
 - a. The Planning Commission and staff discussed the importance of having a purpose statement at the beginning of the new code section in order to avoid future changes to the code and zone map that are inconsistent with the original purpose of creating this code section. This section of code was created to limit rezones that extend the commercial districts of the City and to avoid boundary line adjustments that expand commercial properties into areas outside of the commercial districts identified within the Comprehensive Plan. The City does not want to lose residential area because of these types of commercial expansions.
 5. The residential and commercial impacts in this area of the City versus the previous site location with regards to traffic flows between the two zone districts (commercial and multi-family);
 6. The uniqueness of this property in relation to other properties in the City, and how to write the regulations in a way that accommodates all of the different scenarios within the City, not just this one location.
 - a. The Planning Commission discussed this property and the possible regulations that would be needed for the underground parking facility. The members also further emphasized the need to create a flexible process because of the uniqueness of this property and other properties in the City. This flexibility would probably best be accommodated through the Hearing Examiner/Conditional Use process. The staff also felt that there is possible need to create a section that guides the decision process, such as, “the Hearing Examiner shall consider the following....”
- c. Front Street & Commercial Street – General Commercial/Multi-family District Area
- i. The Planning Commission continued to discuss different scenarios for underground parking facilities at this location. Items discussed included,
 1. Alleys versus public streets; and,

- a. The Planning Commission discussed entering and exiting from a public street and from an alley. Discussion also focused on not allowing at-grade alley crossings.
2. Access aisle standards, including creating a minimum and maximum width and height.

6. Meeting Adjourned at 4:59pm