

Amelia Brackett Hogstad

From: Mike Kranzdorf <mike@amterre.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 12:02 PM
To: Amelia Brackett Hogstad
Cc: Rob Zuccaro; April Kroner; Austin Brown; Eric J Lund
Subject: Re: Dark Sky Lighting Ordinance at Planning Commission

Categories: case mgmt LR pres etc

Hi Amelia,

The Dark Sky Ordinance presentation and discussion at Planning Commission's July 13 meeting differed significantly from those in previous public meetings and led to surprising recommendations. In the planning commission meeting, access to the night sky was presented as a primary benefit and the commission used this to request faster compliance than any staff recommendations. Previous meetings acknowledged that this is a tertiary and long term benefit that is unachievable without a broader adoption and implementation by neighboring communities.

Security was mentioned as a secondary benefit and Officer Moore did not make a presentation nor was asked for comments. Complaints around the Marshall Fire rebuild and retail vandalism and crime were important topics at prior meetings. Planning commission did not take this topic into sufficient consideration. Similarly, their disregard for the unique needs of downtown reflects a lack of communication and understanding of conditions there.

Costs to the city for strict compliance were discussed, but there was no serious consideration of costs to businesses, where the impact will be greatest. The inefficiency and waste created by early disposal of working fixtures was also not of concern.

The commission's focus on speed of implementation suggests a separation of triggering conditions for single family residential and commercial uses. The 50% threshold may be too large for residential and could be modified without affecting commercial properties. Businesses appear to be overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the definition at 50%.

Option 2 of the ordinance as written is an excellent compromise of societal and business concerns. I hope staff is able to continue to strike this balance with any modifications brought to planning commission's next meeting.

Thank you,

Mike Kranzdorf
Amterre Property Group LLC
720-304-3200

Amelia Brackett Hogstad

From: Amelia Brackett Hogstad
Sent: Wednesday, August 2, 2023 3:57 PM
To: Amelia Brackett Hogstad
Subject: Revised Outdoor Lighting Ordinance

From: Julia Cantarovici <julia@8z.com>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 11:44 AM
To: Citizen Inquiries <info@louisvilleco.gov>
Subject: Re: Revised Outdoor Lighting Ordinance

You don't often get email from julia@8z.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

I wanted to ask why this ordinance is being considered? With all of the significantly increased theft from porches, garages and cars in the last several years, why would we want to limit lighting in our community? It seems like a bad idea to me. I feel it will encourage more theft.

Just my 2 cents worth. 😊

Julia Cantarovici
8z Real Estate
Partner/Broker
Julia.8z.com
720-203-7789

From my iPhone. Please excuse any typos.

On Jul 31, 2023, at 10:29 AM, City of Louisville <info@louisvilleco.gov> wrote:

ECONOMIC
VITALITY

We're here to help your
business thrive.

Revised Outdoor Lighting Ordinance

From: Joshua Cooperman <jhcooperman@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 3, 2023 5:02 PM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Comments on revised dark night sky lighting ordinance

Dear Louisville Planning Commissioners,

I understand that next Thursday evening you will consider a revised dark night sky lighting ordinance. As I learned from an email sent by the City's economic vitality staff, this revised ordinance incorporates compliance option 2, which triggers compliance with the ordinance's regulations upon substantial alterations and additions. In my previous letter I supported this option as well as option 1, namely, some form of amortization.

I wish to bring one further consideration to your attention regarding the various compliance options; I believe that this consideration has not received due attention. City staff estimated the cost to the City of option 1 but did not provide cost estimates for options 2 and 3. No matter which compliance option is ultimately selected, the ordinance requires that all new and replacement lighting comply with its regulations; see section 17.26.030 B. In principle, the City must enforce that replacement lighting complies with the ordinance's regulations. I believe that the City does not require a permit for most replacement lighting, so I do not know how the City plans to enforce compliance. I am wondering how the cost of enforcing compliant replacement lighting overlaps with the cost of implementing amortization. I believe that there may well be significant overlap. If so, then the cost estimate for option 1 is significantly overstated as the City would incur a significant portion of this expense in the absence of option 1.

I will also continue to advocate for the amendments recommended in my previous letter, especially a reduction in the maximum correlated color temperature from 3000 K to 2700 K.

I look forward to Thursday's meeting.

Best,
Josh

==CAUTION: EXTERNAL EMAIL==

This email originated from outside the City of Louisville's email environment. Do not click links or open attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe. Please contact IT if you believe this email is suspicious.