City of Langley

Design Review Board

AGENDA

September 20, 2012 – 6:30 PM

LANGLEY CITY HALL  112 2nd Street, Langley WA

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes – August 21, 2012

3. Audience Input on Non-Agenda Items

4. DRB-12-041 – New Addition at Island Dance (710 Camano Avenue)

5. DRB-12-040 – New lighting at the Langley Marina (228 Wharf Street)

6. Adjourn

Next Regular Meeting: October 16, 2012
ATTENDANCE
Members Present: Bob Dalton, Paul Sarkis, Ron Kasprisin, Cathy Rooks, and Kari Gunderson (alternate)
Members Absent: Janet Ploof
Staff Present: Jeff Arango

MINUTES
The minutes of July 17, 2012 were approved.

ACTION ITEMS:

DRB-12-037 – Brookhaven Community Building Addition

Tom Lerch presented on behalf of Island County Housing.

Bob Dalton stated that a downshielded light is needed the door.

Ron Kasprisin made a motion to approve the project with the requirement for a downshielded light at pedestrian door. Motion was second by Cathy Rooks. Motion passes 5-0.

DRB-12-38 – New Signage at the Braeburn Restaurant

Outstanding issues that must be addressed are the size of the projecting sign and the placement of patio signs.

Motion by Ron Kasprisin to approve the project subject to staff confirming the size of the projecting sign is in compliance and approving the location of the two patio signs in accordance with the LMC requirements. Motion was second by Paul Sarkis. Motion passes 5-0.

DRB-12-039 – Mixed Use Building at Wharf Street (202 Wharf Street)

Motion by Paul Sarkis to approve as presented. Seconded by Cathy Rooks. Motion passes 5-0.

DRB-12-040 – Langley Marina Phase IA Expansion (228 Wharf Street)

Motion by Cathy Rooks to approve the project as presented with a requirement that the applicant come back to the DRB for approval of the lighting and harbormaster shed.
OTHER ITEMS

Green Alleys

Make more pedestrian friendly. Could paint dumpsters and enclosures artistically.

Develop a comprehensive plan for downtown where we can look at the big picture and system of alleys.

Start with proper maintenance - add dwarf trees between the Methodist Church and the Melsen Alley for screening.

AUDIENCE INPUT

No audience input.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34 pm.
MTTING DATE: September 20, 2012
STAFF CONTACT: Jeff Arango, AICP, CFM - Community Planner (221-4246 ext. 26)
ATTACHMENTS: Sign Permit Application

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This applicant proposes a single 4.5’ x 1.5’ wall mounted sign. The 6.75 sf sign will be mounted above the main entrance to the brick two-story building at the Langley Middle School site along Camano Avenue (See attached photos). No illumination of the sign is proposed.

ANALYSIS

The proposed signs are reviewable by the Design Review Board in accordance with Langley Municipal Code (LMC) Sections 18.34.030(A) and 18.35. The consistency of these signs with LMC Chapter 18.35 is examined below:

1. **Purpose and Intent Statements.** The proposed sign is consistent with the Purpose and Intent statements regarding signage stated within the Langley Municipal Code. The signs are visually appropriate for the unique building-scape of the city, expressive of the identity of the store, without violating the character of the surroundings in which they are placed, and legible at the distance and pace at which they are to be seen.

2. **Size.** The wall sign complies with the size limit for wall signs of 20 square feet.

3. **Placement.** Placement of the signs complies

4. **Lighting.** None Proposed

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

1. The City of Langley received a complete application from the South Whidbey School District and Island Dance on August 20, 2012, for a new wall sign. The total proposed signage area is 6.75 square feet.
2. In accordance with Section 18.34.030(A) and 18.35 of the Langley Municipal Code, planning staff has reviewed the application for consistency with LMC Chapter 18.35 and recommends approval.

Any additional signs to be installed at 710 Camano Avenue must be submitted for approval by the Design Review Board. This includes any temporary, flag, or window signs. According to LMC Chapter 18.35, prohibited signs include, “all signs which have no permanent attachment to a building or the ground, including, but not limited to pole attachments, mobile signs and sandwich board or “A” board signs.”

STAFF RECOMMENDEDATION:

Approve DRB 2012/041 and adopt the findings and conclusions as noted in the Staff Report dated September 17, 2012.
Two story building with one front exit.

Side exit on lower floor. Elevator to 2nd floor.

Staircase exit from second floor.

No entrances or exits on back side of building. The three exits from the second floor are: the outside staircase exit on the north, the inside downstairs exit on the east leading to the front exit and the downstairs exit on the south (as well as the elevator).
Staff Report
DRB-12-040: Phase IA Marina Expansion (228 Wharf Street)

Applicant: Matt Kukuk, Saratoga Environmental; Port of South Whidbey

Zoning District: Central Business District (CB); Wharf Street Overlay (WSO)

Project Description: The project consists of the redeployment of a 400' x 16' floating breakwater to the northeast of the existing small boat harbor. The breakwater will be separated into two sections (approximately 266' x 133') and anchored by 14 steel, 14-inch H piles driven to the mud line. The breakwater will be connected to the existing small boat harbor via an 80’ gangway.

The floating breakwater will be used exclusively for transient moorage and will be able to accommodate larger tour boats and ferries as well as smaller privately owned vessels. Minor upland improvements are also proposed including the reconfiguration of on-site parking to add 7 additional spaces. No landscaping or significant upland improvements are proposed.

Attachments: Site plans, aerial photographs and photographs

ANALYSIS

Structures

The floating breakwater is consistent with the marina use and character of the area. A new structure on the existing timber breakwaters is proposed for the harbormaster. No elevations, materials or color samples were provided of the actual proposed structure. However, a photo of a similar type structure was provided.

Lighting

The applicant proposed lighting during the review of the shoreline permits for the project, but not lighting plans were submitted with the DRB application.

Updated 9/17/12 – The applicant has submitted a request for approval of dock lighting that is well in excess of the Shoreline Master Program requirement that lighting be no more than 3 feet high from the dock surface. The proposed lighting is 12’ off the dock surface and utilizes metal halide fixtures. In letters from the Port of South Whidbey and their lighting engineer
HPE the applicant outlines the reasons for the requested modification to the lighting plan (see attached letters). The floating breakwater also serves a floating dock so the lighting requirement does appear to apply to this project.

The issue with the lighting design was raised in a staff report to the hearing examiner back in March of 2012. The referenced standard is on page 28 of the Langley Shoreline Master Program and states:

Dock lighting shall be designed to shine downward and not exceed a height of three feet above dock and pier surfaces.

The applicant did not request a variance from the hearing examiner and it is unclear under what authority the city may approve the modified lighting plan without the issuance of a variance. The city clearly made a decision during development of the SMP that low-level bollard style lights are to be used for dock lighting.

Landscaping

None proposed. The LMC requires all lots be generously landscaped.

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

1. The City of Langley received a complete application from the Port of South Whidbey on August 14, 2012 to install a new floating breakwater, a new structure for the harbormaster, and to reconfigure the existing parking configuration.

2. In accordance with Section 18.34.030(D) of the Langley Municipal Code Design Review Board approval is required for all development in Central Business District.

3. The DRB reviewed the application at a public meeting held on August 21, 2012 and determined it is consistent with the Langley Municipal Code and the adopted Design Review Standards.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the DRB deny the port’s request for a modified lighting design and suggests the applicant consider applying for a variance.
City of Langley Design Review Board
Mr. Jeff Arango, Director of Community Planning
112 Second Street
PO Box 366
Langley, WA 98260

August 30, 2012

RE: Request to Retain Existing Light Pole Heights
    DRB-12-040: South Whidbey Harbor Wave Attenuator Relocation
    (Proposed Phase 1 Expansion)

Dear Mr. Arango and Design Review Board,

Per City request, our electrical design engineer Ed David PE of Harbor Power Engineers (HPE) has reviewed the facility lighting and fixture heights for the relocated and reconfigured wave attenuator (breakwater) dock facility for the Phase 1 Expansion Project of the South Whidbey Harbor. While initial plans were to simply re-use the existing lighting poles & fixtures on the dock structure as acquired, evaluation of their condition indicated that replacement of those older units would be necessary for on-going maintenance and energy efficiency reasons. In consideration of the Langley Shoreline criteria and input from the Design Review Board and Planning Department, the Port’s direction to HPE was to determine if the existing pole-mounted lighting system could be replaced with a low-height system (3’ height) without serious detrimental impact to functionality, safety and operations.

As HPE conducted their evaluation, the Port also reviewed the existing lighting at the Harbor to provide context. (See attached photo: “Walkway Lights 8-29-12”) The first two pole lights along the main raised walkway (right side of photo) are single-fixture units which are approximately 16’ above the deck surface (height to bottom of lens). The next light is a double-headed fixture above the pay station at the head of the gangway down to the marina which is just over 12’ above the deck (appears on left side of photo). The final three pole lights along the fixed walkway (left center of photo, with flag) are now single-fixture units which are also just over 12’ above the deck. It is important to note that the Port just removed the second fixture off each of those last three poles during our recent electrical upgrade. This was done to eliminate unnecessary light “spilling” down from the raised walkway while still maintaining adequate illumination for safe and secure operations. Located at the raised end of the fixed walkway, these existing lights will generally be at least 10’ above the top of the replacement lights proposed for the breakwater (depending on tides), so this removal of three overhead fixtures was a very visible reduction in existing lighting. In contrast, the proposed lighting for the breakwater will be substantially concealed behind the timber pile “stockade”, as was the case at the time of the photo.

Port Ltr re: light pole heights, 8/30/12
HPE addressed various issues which are affected by the lighting system, including basic operational safety on the dock, apparent visibility of the structure, suitability and constructability for significant changes, and specific security and vessel operator issues. As summarized in the attached letter report from HPE, utilization of only low-height lighting is not recommended for multiple reasons.

Therefore, the Port is proposing to install improved and more efficient pole-mounted lights which approximately match the pre-existing fixture heights. Approval to match those existing fixture heights (with improved shielding) is hereby requested to meet operational needs, safety requirements and engineering constraints. From all of the listed reasons for retaining a significant pole-type lighting system, one of the most important was the as-yet undetermined lighting requirements from potential users such as tour boat and other commercial operators. Since firm arrangements with any of these targeted operations can be established only when a facility is ready to go, it is essential to maintain as much flexibility to meet specific lighting or security requirements. In addition, grant funding is being finalized in order to furnish emergency response vessels for the Sheriff and Fire District, and their operational and security needs for adequate lighting (as for facial recognition, etc) will be significant considerations. Furthermore, while the Port understands that remedial costs are not generally applicable to DRB issues, it’s worth noting that the substantial additional costs to comply with a low-height lighting requirement could force use of reserve funds which might otherwise be used for discretionary efforts such as boater or shoreside amenities, aesthetics or public art.

While the Port certainly understands the importance of Shoreline and other design criteria, the Port’s ability to undertake this major project has been predicated on use of the 400’ breakwater which was acquired “used” from a Port of Bremerton facility. The cost savings from this major acquisition was key to the feasibility of harbor expansion, as the City recognized in the 2007 InterLocal Agreement for harbor transfer by mandating the Port’s use of the breakwater. However, utilization of a pre-existing structure also brings some constraints, as major modification of such an existing lighting system to meet Shoreline criteria is not expected to improve operational or safety characteristics and could have adverse affects. The Port therefore requests approval to retain the existing light pole heights, albeit with improved fixture characteristics.

The Port Commission extends its appreciation in advance for the City’s expedient review of these issues. In particular, since a low-height lighting requirement will mandate major redesign of lighting and other aspects, the Port requests a response at your earliest convenience, as recent federal permitting progress suggests that approval of this phase could finally be imminent. Thanks for your consideration, and please do not hesitate to contact us with any further questions.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Edwin S. Field, PE CCM
Port Manager

Attachments:  A – Photo “Walkway Lights 8-29-12”
B - “Floating Breakwater Lighting” Report from HPE, dated 8/27/12
Cc: Port Commissioners, S.Kinsella/Reid-Middleton, M.Kukuk/Sartoga

Port Ltr re: light pole heights, 8/30/12
Report

TO: Ed Field, P.E.                         DATE: August 27, 2012

FROM: Ed David, P.E.

PROJECT: Langley Small Boat Harbor Expansion  PROJECT NO.: 2010-010

SUBJECT: Floating Breakwater Lighting

Per the Port’s request we have reviewed an alternative lighting scheme for the floating breakwater at the Langley Marina. The alternate scheme would use fixtures with a maximum height of 3-feet above the walking surface of the floating dock. Lighted bollards would be used in lieu of pole mounted fixtures and low level step-lights supplement the bollards as necessary to provide light levels recommended by the Illuminating Engineers Society for pedestrian pathways.

The existing floating breakwater currently has pole mounted HID luminaires installed. The current design scheme replaces the (8) existing lights with an equal number of pole mounted luminaires. New luminaires would be full cut-off - ‘dark sky’ compliant - fixtures with metal halide lamps. Metal halide light source was chosen for good color rendition and lamp life.

![Existing Breakwater Pole Lights](image1)

![Proposed Pole Lights (Current Design)](image2)

After reviewing each scheme, our office is recommending the original design approach using pole mounted luminaires. The current scheme out performs the low level alternate in each of the following areas:
1. Safety: Currently there are pole mounted luminaires installed along the pier. Installing low level lighting on the floating breakwater will create a condition where the visual contrast between the floating breakwater and pier is so great that the floating breakwater will not always be distinguishable to mariners approaching from the water side. The wave barrier and rail on the outboard side of the breakwater float will further screen any low level illumination on the float surface. High seas, fog, or other inclement weather, will worsen the visibility of the floating breakwater.

2. Security: Low level lighting (below 36” in height) will not provide good security lighting on the breakwater floats. Facial recognition will not be possible. A significant portion of the floating breakwater will not be visible from the –lower- shore and marina office due to the elevated pier and wave barrier; activities on the floating breakwater will not be visible from shore at night.

3. Constructability: The existing floating breakwater structures were designed for pole mounted luminaires. Modifications to the existing floats (i.e. cutting, drilling, etc.) are not recommended due to structural considerations. Additional fixtures, wiring, junction boxes, that are necessary for the installation of the low level lights will need to be surface mounted to the outside/top of the dock.

4. Cost: A low level lighting scheme will require approximately (28) light fixtures – vs. (8) pole mounted. The low level fixtures are less expensive per unit but require approximately three times as many fixtures. As noted in the previous paragraph, additional conduit, wires, and junction boxes, are necessary for connecting the low level fixtures. Preliminary estimates indicate the initial cost of the low level scheme is more than double the cost of using pole mounted fixtures ($50k vs. $20k). The cost of maintaining the low level fixtures and additional branch wiring will be higher than the current scheme.

5. Marketability/functionality: Low level lighting is suitable for pedestrian ingress and egress. The low level lighting approach will not meet the operational requirements of some commercial operators. We have not reviewed criteria of potential customers for this dock because the existing design is easily adaptable for most operators (i.e. poles are available for mounting alternate/additional light fixtures). Before approving the implementation of a low level lighting system we recommend that the requirements of potential operators be considered.