

Cabinet – 9 September Statements

Statement from Dr G Rider

Response to the briefing document on the review of Dorset's Street Lighting Policy

The briefing document for the review of the street lighting policy contains several errors and illogical statements that I have outlined in detail to Jan Britton and Jack Wiltshire. This is a summary of the issues I have highlighted and which I wish to be revised.

1) 7.1 is incorrect. The classification of Environmental Zones using SQM values, as defined in ILP

Guidance Document GN01, is a **requirement** for compliance with BS5489 when lighting residential roads. It states this in table A5. It is not optional, if the lighting policy is to be compliant with the British Standard.

2) 7.3 is entirely incorrect. Setting the lighting brightness in compliance with the specifications in

BS5489, table A5, will not be unsafe and will not lead to the negative outcomes stated.

3) 5.8 confuses Environmental Zones and areas where different levels of lighting are required

because of different traffic speed and similar considerations, which are specified in BS5489,

Annexe A. The two issues must not be conflated. The Environmental Zone classification modifies

the lighting standard to be used in inherently darker residential areas. The proposed "D" zoning

system is not compatible with BS5489.

4) 5.9 The new lighting policy needs to correctly classify Environmental Zones, as defined in GN01,

because this also sets the maximum spill light that should be produced. In all residential areas of

Dorset the maximum spill light level should be 1 lux, according to current standards, national

guidance and Dorset's lighting policy. Curtains should not be a requirement to block stray light.

5) 5.9 proposes dimming the lights by 50% after 10pm, so presumably this is considered to be safe.

Adopting the P5 lighting standard in residential areas, as rejected in 7.1 and 7.3, would involve

reducing the light intensity at all times by only 40%, which logically cannot be considered unsafe
(and it would not be specified in the British Standard if it were unsafe).

6) The proposal to pay the PFI contractor an additional sum based on a calculation of the anticipated energy saving, in return for replacement of 18500 obsolete lamps at no cost to the Council, is unsound. I have given my reason for this comment to Councillor Suttle.

7) The choice of 2700K for all future LED lighting is arbitrary and does not necessarily deliver the optimum energy saving. The recognised optimum lighting for environmental protection is amber, with a CCT value around 1800K. The 1850K lights currently being evaluated in Swanage meet the requirement for low blue emission and are more energy efficient than the 2700K LEDs detailed in the APSE report submitted as part of the policy review.