

City of Langley  
 Comp Plan Review  
 Burt Beusch / 05-15-2017

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Suggestion</u>
LU 1.2	"essential public facilities"	Should examples of public facilities be included?
LU 2.12	"population projections"	This would establish the need for growth planning and feels like it should be toward the beginning of LU2
LU 2.17	"prevent commercial development"	Does current zoning allow commercial development along those roads?
LU 3.2	"innovative planning tools"	Can examples of these tools be added?
LU 3.6 and 3.7	"high quality architecture"	Does a gap exist here that would revise the building code?
LU 4.11	"require visual vegetative buffers"	Can 'regular maintenance' be added
LU 4.13		Is this repetitive with 4.3?
LU 5.6	"invest"	Should this be expanded or examples provided?
Goal GLU 10		Should there be any reference to including Langley Register of Historic Places
T 7.2	"ESA"	Environmentally Sensitive Area? Spell that out
T 7.6	GHG	Greenhouse Gas? Spell that out
POS 5.1	"regulatory and non regulatory"	Underscore intentional?
POS 5.2	"investigate the feasibility"	Underscore intentional?
UCF 1.2	"in partnership with utility providers"	Repeated at beginning and end of statement
UCF 1.4	"Where..."	Can those two 'where' statements be bullet points?
Goal ED 1		Should language include Chamber of Commerce?



City of Langley Comprehensive Goals and Policy 2017 Christy Korrow			
Reference (New or Old)	Comment	Suggestion	Brigid's Response
(New) LU 2.1 a)	"only lands designated as UGA shall be considered for annexation" isn't the UGA synonymus with the city limits now?		No
(New) LU 2.1 d)	define "urban densities"?		Will discuss in background
(New) LU 2.2	what are "green field" lands?		Will include in definition
(New) LU 2.5	the county zones our UGA?		Only unincorporated portion
throughout	decide if you want "city" upper case or lowercase and make consistent		ok
(New) LU 2.15	what are "designated resource lands" development of cultural should include local non-profits, not just economic development stakeholders?		Will include in definition
(New) LU 3.1		Term "community groups" is used in LU 5.4, maybe that could be added?	yes
(New) LU 3.4	climate change, glad you added this. increased density and land use intensity--does this mean cluster the development to leave more space		
(New) LU 3.8		insert comma after "improved,"	yes
(New) LU 4.4	because density is already allowed in multi-family, correct?		JR suggested a similar policy for RM zone land which I think should be added.
(New) LU 4.5		insert hyphen "fair-related"	yes

(New) LU 4.11		sort of repeats LU 2.7, but prob okay	This is more narrow than LU-2.7 and speaks to the previous scenic corridor element
(New) LU 5.5	do we need to define cottage industry?		yes
(New) LU 5.5		add hyphen "small-scale"	ok
(New) LU 6	good goal Inconsistent use of Oxford comma, decide which way to go and make consistent.		need help
LU 6		suggest reorder 1) 6.3, 2) 6.4, 3)6.2, 4)6.1	yes
LU 6.1	needs correction	and where not already established, develop reasonable ...	yes
LU 6.2	Increase admin approval? or decrease?		ok
LU 7.2	one? Is LOS defined on first use elsewhere? First reference to LOS, the	not sure of style here on where you insert full names of acronyms	ok
LU 7.4	impact of, for example, Edge cliff adding ADU to home on septic.		ok
LU 7.6	not sure how it would impede?		ok
LU 8.4	what triggers review?		with priorities as to Comp Plan implementation

LU 8.8	not exactly sure what this means.	also, insert comma after "protection,"	ok
LU 8.12	does "green infrastrucutre" belong here?		yes it fits here
LU 8.17	most in this section begin as an imperative	begin "Develop an urban..." (instead of City should..."	yes
LU 9.3	arts district here?		It's in ED element
LU 9.4	included "community groups"		
throughout	business/ economic stakeholders & community groups/organizations,		need help
LU 11.2	Complete Streets?		add to definitions
LU 12.1	first use of GHG	assess, reduce, minimize make all singular. rewrite for clarity: reduce	ok



		<b>BMR Responses</b>
LU-3.2	CONSIDER use of Form Based Codes as innovative planning tool?	Previously removed the list by PAB.
LU4.15	CONSIDER ADDING similar (LU-4.4)increased density for multi-family. "Higher density development is permitted in multi-family neighborhoods when integrated in a sensitive manner."	OK
LU-4.16	CONSIDER ADDING all for the "missing middle"- triplexes, quadrplexes and small apartment less than 8 units to all Residential Zone.	Missing middle will be discussed in background as the type of density that fits Langley's context. As suggested, it's not a policy.
LU-4.17	CONSIDER ADDING Work with Fairground Operator to establish small year round Tiny House on Wheels Community.	This requires much more discussion and is not included at this time.
LU-5.6	CONSIDER ADDING Allow for increased density in all of the UGA to increase the tax base.	Will discuss in background. However, depending on where it's located development is subsidized by the broader tax base.
LU-9.6 or LU-11.9	CONSIDER ADDING Promote greater walkability for Langley through better pedestrian connections.	Added as LU-11.8

LU-9.7 or LU 11.10		CONSIDER ADDING Promote greater walkability for Langley through increased density and more people living in the urban core.	Combined with above and rewritten Promote greater walkability in Langley by improving pedestrian connections, increasing densities, and permitting a mix of uses.
LU11.11		CONSIDER ADDING Reduce Parking requirements as appropriate to allow reflect current car ownership trends and to increase density.	Goal T-11 and related polices are to do with parking. Also, H-1.1, H-4.1, H-4.3. I think it's covered
LU12.8		CONSIDER ADDING Promote reduced car usage and increased public transit usage to reduce fossil fuel use and decrease greenhouse gases.	Added to LU-12.6
Goal H-1		REVISE to include Tiny House (<400gsf) and Small Houses (<1000gsf) note I think it would be good to define these better in appropriate code location.	Will add tiny home size in background and definition. Small houses are already permitted in the code.
H1.1		ADD Activley promote the "missing middle" of housing, duplex, triplex, quadraplex and small apartment complexes.	Added is H-1.3
H-4.10		CONSIDER ADDING Allow for increased density on existing affordable housing sites.	Added is H-4.10
H-4.11		CONSIDER ADDING Encourage development of more dense housing types such as row house, town house and apartments.	This is addressed H-1.1, H-1.3, H-2.3, H-2.4
H-5.4		CONSIDER ADDING Allow for increased density on existing special needs sites.	There is no special needs housing



T-11.7		Parking. CONSIDER ADDING Parking requirements may be reduced where development includes bike storage and is located within quarter mile of bus stop.	This is the same as T-11.6
UCF-8.3		CONSIDER ADDING Promote active city-wide water conservation thru use of low flow fixtures, appliances and devices	This is getting more specific re. demand side management tools.
LU-2.1D		Define urban densities.	Will add in background and definitions.
		Define feet first policy.	No policy. But they reviewed the CP. Feet First review doc is with public comments.
		Is there a City Map that shows what sidewalks and paths are currently ADA accessible? If not consider creating one.	Map doesn't include ADA compliant sidewalks. That would require more resources to prepare than we have.
		Is there a City Map that shows all approved special historic, historic landmarks, etc? If not consider creating one.	Yes
		Is there a definition of affordable housing that includes ownership or is it only controlled rental units within certain percentage of median income by an approved agency? Can a definition be created for affordable housing ownership?	Yes.



land use	Comment/Question	BMR response
LU-3.2	Does this address density vs rural sprawl?	Yes, if implemented into code.
LU-3.7	Is this regarding the proposed sunrise walkway to join the marina with Seawall Park	No, it's about supporting development of the waterfront generally
LU-3.8	How does this affect Spyhop?	It doesn't buffer requirements would be for no development or redevelopment.
LU-3.14	Can this be discussed/reviewed/reconsidered ?	I'm unclear as no specific concerns are expressed by this comment.
Goal LU-4	Seems to conflict with 84.	No, they are both about supporting new commercial business. LU-3.14 establishes some criteria i.e. don't expand commercial use at the expense of residential use.
LU-4.3	What about tech companies/start-ups/	This policy is about supporting these types of businesses.
LU-7.2	please define 'reasonable use'.	This is defined by by case law and is referenced in Ch. 16 of the LMC. Definition added.
LU-7.15	limiting?	State law requires we protect critical areas.
Goal LU-9 and LU-9.1	How does this relate to the Dog House? Also Dog House and 84, 87,146 and 148?	It doesn't specifically. Ordinance have already been passed to protect historical buildings.
LU-9.7	. definition of 'major collector street.	Collector is defined in Ch 15.01 and used throughout the chapter. The TIB designates roads in the City including Major Collector.

