

CT: Yes, fixtures, direction, glare, and brightness are unrestricted for facade and landscape if the property is in LZ3 and the lighting is off between midnight and 6:00 AM.

Paul: This statement may imply things might happen that won't. The façade lighting would be designed by a lighting designer who would direct the sources at the surface to be lit, limit the glare because it ruins the lighting effect, and use fixture outputs that will achieve the effect without wasting money.

Yes, our Performance standard is a less restrictive Prescriptive standard (unlimited number of light fixtures, sometimes unrestricted orientation, increased brightness, etc.) than our Prescriptive standard. Glenn H said last meeting Option 1 is Prescriptive and in the past we have been told by the experts that Option 2 will not be used in real life.

Paul: I consider both the performance and prescriptive methods very restrictive. Either method will be more restrictive in certain circumstances (e.g. prescriptive method more restrictive than performance for sites with long setbacks)

Lisa: We've heard from the consultants on more than one occasion that generally the BUG rating will be chosen as the easier of the 2 options under the LEED LPRC. However, this does not imply that Option 1 is less restrictive than Option 2.

The January meeting minutes say 300 Mass Ave, some Harvard housing and our "net zero" Martin Luther King School are all LPRC buildings.

QUESTIONS (some already asked):

Where are additional LPRC buildings in the Boston area?

Lisa: We do not have access to this information. The LEED database is not searchable in this way. Neither the folks from Parsons Brinkerhoff or Glenn were able to provide this answer.

What is the address of the Harvard housing? more than one building?

Lisa: One building at 10 Akron Street

What version of LPRC is the Harvard Housing? somebody said version 3 ...

Lisa: Version 2

What exactly is the difference between version 3 and version 4?

Paul: Is checking confirming what the change(s) are.

Post version 3 on our webpage

CDD will post

Post on the webpage the version 4 tables with the lumen levels for LZ2 and LZ3 filled in.

CDD will post

Where is the definition of the term "properly orientated" used in Table 3 of version 4?

Paul: Properly oriented is defined as the "luminaire when mounted in the same orientation and tilt as specified in the project design" as denoted under the Requirements section on the first page of the LEED LPRC.

I viewed 300 Mass Ave and it seemed that 300 Mass Ave was not lighted as it would normally be. I then realized it is a waste of time to view a LPRC building without the LEED documents that CDD uses to certify the building.

Post the LEED documentation for the three buildings on our webpage.

Lisa: See additional attachment on website with links to these documents.

We will then know which lighting zone a building is in, what it is supposed to look like, what times to view it in case the lights are on clocked dimmers, what LPRC version it is, and whether Option 1 or Option 2 was used. More globally, last time I corrected my question of "what does a LPRC building look like?" to "how bright can a LPRC building be, especially an LZ3 building on the LZ2 boundary?" so to simply everything, create a case study as follows:

Regarding the next four (4) questions below:

Paul: To do any of this analysis we would need the photometric data for all of the luminaires as well as the architectural and electrical drawings to get the structures, mounting, and geometry correct. It would also take a lot of design time to do these case studies.

Lisa: We are having an internal discussion of whether we can do this.

Show the calculations for the LPRC Option 2 vertical illuminances at the lighting boundary for Cambridge Honda at 275 Fresh Pond Parkway (in the Business-A zone which is LZ3) with maximum lighting that conforms to our Prescriptive standard. Show how the lighting boundary is determined as it may not be the property line. Also show the same illuminance calculations for the residential property boundaries across the two streets.

Show the calculations for the LPRC Option 2 vertical illuminances at the lighting boundary and residential boundaries for the same site with maximum lighting that conforms to the LPRC LZ3 Prescriptive standard.

Show the calculations for the LPRC Option 2 vertical illuminances at the lighting boundary and residential boundaries for the same site with maximum lighting that conforms to the LPRC LZ2 Prescriptive standard.

This question is from the January meeting adapted to the case study to simplify the analysis:

Show the calculations for the LPRC Option 2 vertical illuminances at the lighting boundary and residential boundaries for the same site with an array of 1,050 shielded directional fixtures in continuous grid, 4' apart in each direction to a height of 20', shining on a 20' tall screen on which continuously wraps the entire building mounted on the roof 4'

back from the edge of the roof (i.e. the lights are mounted on poles at the edge and are directed towards the screen). Show the results for screens with gains of 1 and 6.

The Zinc analysis for all the options was requested in the January meeting so we can know what so badly bothered residents in a C-1 (currently protected) district about a quarter-mile away. Analysis was requested in January for all the sites photographed by Mr. Taylor but here is reduced to three sites:

Would Lesley, the police station, and Zinc meet any one of the three standards/options (our Prescriptive, Option 1, Option 2) in our new ordinance?

Lisa: A response has been provided to Task Force members previously at the 2/25/2016 meeting and is posted on the website. At this time, Paul did not have any additional thoughts, but we can discuss at 3/10/2016 meeting.

Post the Zinc Special Permit documents on our webpage (we can see the language that works).

Lisa: CDD is posting both the special permit application AND the special permit decision. Please note, as previously stated on several occasions, the rooftop lighting on ZINC was NOT reviewed by the Planning Board because the original application stated unequivocally that they would NOT light the roof.