

5327 Susan Way  
Halfmoon Bay, BC  
V0N1Y2  
November 30, 2007

Ms. Lee Turnbull  
Chairperson, Community Services Committee  
SCRD  
1975 Field Rd.  
Sechelt, B.C. V0N3A1

Dear Ms. Turnbull

The new Aquatic Centre recently opened and is a magnificent addition to the Coast and to Sechelt's Downtown.

However, I was alarmed and dismayed to note that twenty-four exterior lights along two sides of the building and in the foyer are not full cut-off fixtures and thus, are totally non-compliant with the Standards and Guidelines that the SCR D Planning Department has been working on since the Board's directive in February 2006. Not only do these lights degrade the streetscape but they will make it very difficult for the Board to demonstrate any credibility when it tries to promote responsible lighting with its new Standards.

At a meeting on November 29 with Councillors Shugar and Nohr, Mr Fenwick, and the Owner's Representative for the project (who said he knew the term/concept "full cut off lighting"), I made the above observations and asked that the lights be replaced. There are already a few lights along those walls that are down-looking. Mr. Fenwick pointed out that replacing them would be expensive and it was suggested that perhaps the lights could be modified to be full cut-off. I was not alone in thinking that a modification would not be possible while maintaining the aesthetics that the building deserves. To suggest that spending the money to replace them would short-change other programmes at the Centre is unfair, as one is a Capital item and the other is an Operating item and I am sure they were budgeted for as such. One solution would be to simply turn them out. The nearby Sechelt Library and City Hall building has no outside lighting on the adjacent wall at all. The nearby Courthouse has some non-compliant lights, but those are not high profile and were likely installed before the paradigm of non-intrusive effective security lighting had evolved.

Mr. Fenwick asked whether such a noble building did not deserve to be illuminated at night. There are several answers to that question. First, decorating with lighting may no longer be the most effective way to meet our energy conservation and green house gas reduction responsibilities. Secondly, the full glass wall that reveals the magnificently decorated pool area surely adequately highlights the function and beauty of the building. Finally, having glaring lights pointing outward from the building not only prevents passers-by from actually seeing the building but also prevents them from seeing potential vandalism occurring in the shadows. Trying to provide public safety on the walkways around a building, on the cheap, by outward-pointing non cut-off lighting mounted on the building is not any longer a viable strategy for producing liveable environments. I had

pointed this out to Mr. Fenwick, as it pertained to the non-compliant outdoor lighting on the new SCRD building on Field Rd., when Mr Nohr and I visited him in February of this year.

Part of my asking for this meeting was to try and understand the process that led to this disaster and I had several questions about the milestones in that process. The meeting was scheduled for only 30 minutes so I was asked to submit my questions in writing and was promised a written answer.

The questions are:

1. What instructions regarding lighting requirements were given to the architect and when, and was the phrase “full cut-off” used?
2. Who approved the architect’s design and when?
3. Were there any subsequent requests for modifications and revisions of any detail at all after the design had been sent to the contractor and is there a record of their timing? i.e. were there opportunities for afterthoughts?

It was suggested that the omission was an oversight by the Board and Senior Staff and should be corrected. Compliant lighting is no more expensive than non-compliant lighting although a retrofit will cost money. Under usual circumstances, I think it unreasonable to ask for retrofits (as I conceded with Mr Fenwick on the SCRD Building) but here, where there was such an opportunity for doing the proper thing going forward, in such a high profile area, which will have a great effect on achieving what the Board wants to accomplish with future lighting, I think the cost of replacing the lights will be a tiny fraction of the total project cost and will yield large positive future consequences.

Yours sincerely,

S. Brian Lucas