

OPB LU 21-012886 DZM GW lighting controls needed to approve landscape modification

mike dowd <dowdarchitecture@gmail.com>

Fri 11/12/2021 2:57 PM

To: Bryant, Hannah <Hannah.Bryant@portlandoregon.gov>

 1 attachments (1 MB)

01988ac5ffeb1665ec52713dc5de9688ee84561f70.jpg;

Design Commission,

In my list of 16 changes to OPB's proposal I asked the Design Commission to consider, two that impacts our home and the park (and its natural habitat and wildlife the most relate to OPB's exterior lighting:

- 3. Change wall light fixture to the same fixture type to be used on east wall**
- 5. Change proposed exterior lights to shielded lights with dimmers and sensors**

There was no discussion of these, other than when one Commissioner asked OPB's attorney if my issues had been addressed, and she incorrectly said they had been.

OPB has proposed changing its east wall exterior fixtures to "dark sky" fixtures. This is a positive step, but not enough. OPB leaves its fixtures on all night, every night, even though there is no activity at the driveway then. The light level is far higher than needed for security. The controls I'm requesting (which dim and turn off lights when they're not needed) would reduce light pollution far better than only switching to dark sky fixtures.

The attached photo shows nighttime lighting at OPB. The main issues are 1) that the light source is visible from our home and the park because people look up into the fixtures from below, and 2) the lights are on brightly when they could be dimmed or off. Again, the dark sky fixtures won't help either of those. The fixtures are also well above the top of the proposed fence.

The parking lot and entry canopy fixtures also contribute to the light pollution, and should be included in being changed.

The lighting is clearly relevant to OPB's request to eliminate the 5'/L2 east buffer. If it were provided, there would be at least 16 large trees along the east property line that would substantially block the lighting from spilling into our property and the park.

The lighting is clearly covered in the "purposes" of the zoning standards that require the landscape buffer:

The setback and landscaping standards: Improve and soften the appearance of parking areas; Reduce the visual impact of parking areas from sidewalks, streets, and especially from adjacent residential zones...

The lighting is an integral component of the parking, loading and driveway areas--it wouldn't be there if they were not--so the "purposes" clearly intend to include lighting as something the landscaping standards intend to buffer adjacent residents and the park from.

To summarize:

--the lighting controls I request are needed to mitigate the absence of the 5'/L2 buffer along the east property line

--the relevant "purposes" of the standard being modified clearly cover lighting

--the dark sky fixtures being proposed will not be effective in reducing light pollution/impacts to us and the park enough to justify replacing the required buffer with a fence and only five trees

--the controls are simple and inexpensive, and would be VERY effective

--the Commission should require them as a mitigation for granting the modification for the landscape buffer

Note: photo is taken from standing next to the gate into our garden--this is what we see every night. The fence won't obstruct any light fixture, and the dark sky fixtures won't hide the light sources, or reduce light amounts going downward or reflecting off the wall or ground.

Michael Dowd, President
Dowd Architecture Inc.
753 S Miles Street
Portland, Oregon 97219
(503) 282-7704
email: dowdarchitecture@gmail.com