

Summary Notes

R.C. Harris Public Advisory Committee

Meeting # 1/10

Tuesday, January 5, 2010

R.C. Harris Public Advisory Committee
Meeting # 6/09
R.C. Harris Water Treatment Plant, Construction Trailer
2710 Queen Street East, Toronto

Tuesday, January 5, 2010
7:00 p.m.

SUMMARY NOTES

ATTENDANCE

Public Advisory Committee

Julie McNeill (co-chair)
Lorraine Mask
Jim Glasspool
Paul Dowsett
David Lewis
Henry Spencer
Jim Tulk

Taylor Hazell Architects Ltd.

Mark Wronski

City of Toronto Staff

Ron Brilliant – Toronto Water: R.C. Harris Water Treatment Plant Manager

Facilitator

Cheryl Dow – Public Consultation Unit

The meeting was called to order at approximately 7:05 p.m.

1. Introductions

All present at the meeting introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Agenda

“Light Fixture Selection” was moved up in the agenda in order to be discussed first. The agenda was approved with this change.

3. Approval of November 18, 2009 Summary Notes

The November 18, 2009 Summary Notes were adopted without amendment.

4. Light Fixture Selection

Mark Wronski displayed a map of the proposed locations for two new light fixtures (**Attachment 1**). **Mark Wronski** explained that one exterior light fixture will be located at the new south entry gates up towards the top of the access road leading down to the south portion of the site and another exterior light fixture will be installed at the top of the stairs leading down to the west parking lot.

Mark Wronski distributed a hand out to PAC members which included information on four light fixture options.

Ron Brilliant said that the light fixtures selected by the PAC at this meeting will be the standard for any future light fixtures.

Mark Wronski explained that all four options are from extremely reputable manufacturers and that the workmanship and quality of materials for each option is very good. They have looked at over a dozen manufacturers fixtures to come up with these light fixture options and that each one represents the kind of aesthetics he is comfortable with.

Julie McNeill asked about the height of the new light poles. **Ron Brilliant** explained that the height has not yet been determined, but the poles will likely be in the range of 15 or 16 feet.

Mark Wronski said that a standard street light is typically in the range of 22 to 24 feet.

Mark Wronski suggested that PAC consider the following when selecting a light fixture:

Existing Historic Exterior Lighting:

- Current historic exterior lighting at the plant ranges from fairly modest to rather elaborate (e.g. the lanterns on the south entrance of the pumping station).

Performance:

- In terms of selecting the two light fixtures, staff would like to ensure that only areas that need to be illuminated are illuminated and that light is not wasted.

Ron Brilliant said that once a light style is selected, the style will be implemented for future lights. **Julie McNeill** said that before selecting a light, she would like to know how many more lights will be installed at the plant. **Ron Brilliant** said they don't know how many lights will be installed in the future.

Mark Wronski provided the PAC with an overview of the four light fixture options:

Fixture No. 1

The Simes Company – Minislot Disk

This fixture is designed for use along laneways or driveways, but not suitable for parking areas. The fixture has a nominal height of 5.0 meters to top of reflector. The reflector is not adjustable and the light is cast concentrically. The fixture will appear to give more glare than other fixtures and the fixture produces a small amount of light pollution upwards to the sky.

A 70 W installation at 5.0 m height throws 1 lux at a distance of 10.0 m out.

The fixture is suitable for wattages up to 150 W.

Additional points discussed at the PAC meeting:

- *Made by a European company*
- *The light source is housed in the top of the pole*
- *Reflector is suspended above the pole*
- *Light is thrown in a symmetrical concentric pattern*

Fixture No. 2

iGuzzini Illuminazione – Flamina Systems

The fixture is mounted on a bracket and is attached to a pole. It is flexible in usage and can be mounted either singly or in paired configurations, and can be oriented either up or down. When directed down the fixture has good light cut-off characteristics with some reduction in light pollution. There may be some direct bulb glare noticed. The fixture itself is fully enclosed and has vandal resistant design features.

The fixture is suitable for wattages up to 150W.

Additional points discussed at the PAC meeting:

- *Attractive because of its elegant bracket and how it is mounted to the pole to the pole*
- *It is simple, elegant and direct and provides a stylish way of connecting an interesting light at the end of the pole*
- *Evokes a street light*
- *Unlike fixture 1, it has a range of photometrics; it can be made to be slightly asymmetrical. Even though it is a globe, it can be shielded to cast light in a specific direction. Can be shaped more than fixture 1.*
- *Wattages on these lights are fairly modest.*

Fixture No. 3 BEGA Lighting – 8200 Pole Top Light

This fixture provides indirect lighting and is specifically designed for streets and open spaces. It offers adjustable light distribution with an adjustable top reflector. There is very minimal or no lamp glare. The fixture is suitable for pole mounting at heights from 3.5 to 7.0 meters, but does not appear to provide significant vandal resistance.

A 70 W installation at 5.0 height throws 1 lux at a distance of 12.0 m out.

The fixture is suitable for wattages up to 150 W.

Additional points discussed at the PAC meeting:

- *Similar to Fixture 1 except it is very directional. The reflector can be straight or tilted to approx. 30 degrees from horizontal.*
- *The light source is housed in the top of the pole*
- *Reflector is elegantly suspended from the light pole*
- *Will cast light in an asymmetrical way forward based on the angle of reflection*
- *If you were looking from Nursewood, and the reflector was in the tilted position, the disc would be parallel to the line of sight reducing somewhat its size and brightness*
- *Up to 150 watts.*

FIXTURE No. 4 BEGA Lighting – 8100 Pole Top Light

This fixture can be installed either as a single or double pole top-mount. The fixture head is adjustable allowing flexible light distribution. It has full light distribution cut-off with no skyward light pollution, although there may be some visible lamp glare. The fixture is suitable for pole mounting at heights from 3.5 to 7.0 meters. The fixture is an enclosed design but does not appear to provide significant vandal resistance.

A 70 W installation at 5.0 m height throws 1 lux at a distance of 15.0 m out.

The fixture is suitable for wattages up to 400W.

Additional points discussed at the PAC meeting:

- *Very discrete.*
- *Width of fixture is 9" wide. Length from pole is less than 2 feet.*
- *Shallow profiled fixture*
- *Somewhat utilitarian and frank in its appearance- very simple connection to the pole*

- *Light can be tilted. Its photometrics are very asymmetrical, and it can be made even more so by tilting the unit.*
- *Very minimal fixture, which is not out of character with the aesthetics for the building.*

A discussion about the options followed:

Lorraine Mask asked about the term light pollution. **Ron Brilliant** said that light pollution is light that is going up into the atmosphere rather than coming down to where you want it. For example if you wanted to light the table, but you started lighting the far side of the room, that extra light is called light pollution. The light that plant staff want is on the ground at the front entrance and down around the stairs. Plant staff don't want any light up or on Nursewood.

Julie McNeill clarified that the task is to light the entry gate and the top of the stairs.

David Lewis asked what colour possibilities there are for the light from these fixtures and said that the orange colour is not particularly the one PAC members want.

Mark Wronski said all fixtures are Metal Halide. There is nothing in the selected fixtures that limits them to high pressure or low pressure sodium lights.

David Lewis said that the colour is critical.

Julie McNeill asked about the pole colour. **Mark Wronski** said they need to explore colour possibilities with the manufacture. Mark said they are happy to enquire about colour possibilities. Mark said that to date we have been focusing our attention on which light fixture option to pursue.

Ron Brilliant asked the group what colours they were thinking about for the poles.

Julie McNeill inquired as to the colour of the metal on the gate.

Mark Wronski said that the filter building windows are green. **Ron Brilliant** pointed out that the railings are black around the plant.

Julie McNeill asked whether the poles will be the same colour as the canopy at the front of the Filter Building.

Mark Wronski said Julie asked a good question and he said the canopy may be green but more thought needs to go into this.

Paul Dowsett asked if the existing lanterns on the south face of filter administration building were always black.

Ron Brilliant said he does not know if the existing lights were black. The lights have been sandblasted many times. Ron Brilliant said they will take a closer look to see if they can determine the original colour.

Action Item: Ron Brilliant will try to determine the original colour of the lights.
--

Julie McNeill said she was looking at some of the light options and she noticed some options appeared to be silver. Ron clarified that they have no intention of going silver, they are thinking of selecting a darker colour, for example black or a dark grey or green.

Mark Wronski said that it seems logical to him that the light poles would be black since the handrail and gate are black. Especially because the lights the PAC are discussing will be close to a handrail.

Paul Dowsett agreed that black poles seemed logical.

David Lewis asked if any thought had been given to putting a light pole at the North East corner for security reasons. Ron Brilliant said that once the light is selected, if other areas are identified for lights, the light the PAC selects will be installed in those additional areas. Ron Brilliant pointed out that the plant does have security issues on the east side of the property and in the future this area may require additional lighting, in particular beside the apartments. **Ron Brilliant** said they have been increasing security in that area.

Henry Spencer commented that he is partial to Fixture 3 because the light pattern can be asymmetrical.

Paul Dowsett said his preference was also for Fixture 3. He likes the simplicity of the engineering; he said he thinks it is very much of our time today, whereas the building is very much of its time in the 30's. Paul said the simplicity of Fixture 3 does not take away from the building at all. The only disadvantage is the note about possible vandalism. **Mark Wronski** clarified that the vandalism comment was made in reaction to the rods that are holding up the reflector. This is 15 feet in the air. It would be difficult for people to shimmy up a pole.

Ron Brilliant pointed out that a lot of the vandalism is related to breaking lights. Ron said he thinks this option is not prone to that.

Ron Brilliant said that the existing lights at the plant are about 360 watts. **Mark Wronski** pointed out that the new lights will be half the watts of the existing lights.

Ron Brilliant said he doesn't think they have any problems with any of the light options and that all options will provide the necessary light patterns.

PAC members voted on their preferred option:

- Light Option 1 – 0 people
- Light Option 2 – 2 people
- Light Option 3 – 4 people
- Light Option 4 – 1 person

Based on the initial vote, Fixture 2 and 3 were the light fixtures that most PAC members preferred.

Following the vote, a discussion occurred:

- Option 2 is more of a bulb structure
- In the up position there is upward light pollution (option 2?)
- Option 3 has two arms on a rotating disk.
- Option 2 could be mounted at the bottom of the stairs
- Option 2 could be mounted on the wall
- Both options are not manufactured in Canada. Mark Wronski explained that he approached Canadian manufacturers but their products were very generic globes and decorative.

The PAC reviewed all options for the lights and the majority of PAC members recommended Fixture # 3 (Attachment 2).

Ron Brilliant explained that the colour of light poles will be dark. Additional research will be undertaken to determine the exact colour.

Action Item:

Plant staff will determine the height of the light and report back on the height. Plant staff will also consider light colour.

Julie McNeill suggested that plant staff also consider lighting for the north east corner of the plant.

Ron Brilliant asked the PAC to look at possibly adding lighting to the north east corner and he requested that PAC members share their thoughts on this issue at the next meeting.

Action Item: Include North East corner lighting as a discussion topic on the next agenda.

5. Plant Updates

4.1) Building Envelope Rehabilitation

Ron Brilliant said that the BER project is proceeding well and is on schedule. Bricks have been received from the brick manufacture and they may have passed the test for standards.

Ron Brilliant explained that plant staff are currently in discussions with a heritage restoration group in the City on heritage facilities concerning the terrace building. The end result will be that the building will look exactly as it did originally. The issue is that the restoration group in the City wants to leave as much of the stone up without removing it and replacing it as possible. From the consultant's viewpoints, it is much easier to tear it down and rebuild it. So the discussion is about what needs to be taken down and what will be rebuilt. Everyone has the same objective in mind – to treat the building with the respect it is due and we have some of the best contractors and consultants working on this in the City. Ron explained that they are working together on this until all agree what should and should not be done. Ron said this part of the project is not scheduled until the last year, so it is not affecting the work progress right now.

Ron Brilliant provided a schedule update. Currently, work is taking place on the east walls of the filter building, and a lot of interior work is taking place inside the filter building. They are also working on the North walls of the Service Building.

Jim Tulk asked if the carbon filter renewal is complete.

Ron Brilliant explained that the work is routine and they have finished renewing the carbon, but as part of this project they decided to completely empty two filters, one in each wing of the building. Ron said that the current filters have carbon on top, then sand, then coarser sand, then gravel/stone, then the bottom piping system. They are taking all that out so they can do a thorough inspection of the filters in each wing. One filter is from the 50's and the other is from the 30's. They want to look at these over the year. This is why the truck that is sucking out stones is still there, it was a little more difficult to pull the stone out from the pipes than anticipated, but Ron expects the truck to be gone within two to three weeks.

4.2) Lighting Upgrades

Lighting upgrade was discussed at the beginning of the meeting.

4.3) Meeting Room

Ron Brilliant told PAC members that the meeting room will likely be ready for PAC meetings within the next couple of meetings. Ron explained that delays occurred because of the strike and

the meeting room having a low priority. The room is totally empty now; they have moved the items previously stored there to the new storage area that has been built. This month the brick walls will be cleaned off and the floor will be painted. The meeting room is in the service building. It is not a fancy room; it is just a regular room with brick walls, concrete floor and concrete ceiling.

Ron Brilliant explained that the construction trailer where the PAC currently meets will probably move in June or July 2010. The reason it has been here so long is because other contractors are on site doing internal work and staff decided instead of bringing more trailers on site, this one can be used.

4.4.) Queen Street Fence

Ron Brilliant reported that the frost fence has been removed. They are building a new steel piping fence. The fence installation will begin over the winter and should be completed by the spring.

Julie McNeill asked if the fence would be at the sidewalk level. **Ron Brilliant** explained that the fence will be put up roughly around where the snow fence is. The steel fencing is just above where the garden is. Once the fence is installed some seating (e.g. park benches) will be installed.

Ron Brilliant pointed out that there are a few pieces of stone that need to be installed. A stone still needs to be installed at the gate end, and a few stones need to be placed at the far end of the staircase. After that the north section will be almost complete.

5. Heritage Inventory Update

Julie McNeill reported that the Heritage Inventory sub committee met to review the Heritage Inventory. Paul took great photos of the plant. The group will continue to give progress reports at future meetings.

Ron Brilliant said that since Jim volunteered to take photos, once it is established what photos will go in the book, Jim, as the photographer, will co-ordinate with Ron to shoot the photos.

6. Light Fixture Selection

Lighting upgrade was discussed at the beginning of the meeting.

7. New Business

No new businesses arose at the meeting.

8. Next Meeting and Agenda Items

The next meeting was set for Tuesday, March 2, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. The heritage sub committee will meet before the March 2, 2010 meeting.

9. Adjournment

Julie McNeill adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:30 p.m.