

# Frequently Asked Questions

- **How much more will it cost to comply with the proposed standards compared to current requirements?**

*According to a sales manager from Musco Lighting, a Triad area lighting design company, the additional cost to comply with the standards for parking lots will be negligible compared to current requirements. The costs to add glare control to stadium lighting would be 25-30% greater than current requirements.*

- **If we removed the current language “Where a bufferyard is required...lighting shall be so shielded and oriented as to cast no direct light on adjacent properties,” how we will regulate currently existing development in the future?**

*Lighting for development existing prior to passing any new lighting ordinance will be grandfathered and will only need to meet the ordinance requirements in place when it was constructed.*

- **The proposed language says “new construction of principal buildings on zoning lots...” What is and what isn’t a principal building? Please provide some examples on when this ordinance would apply and when it wouldn’t.**

*A principal building is one in which the principal use of the zoning lot is conducted. Multiple principal buildings can exist on one zoning lot. For example, a principal building would be a grocery store and an outparcel restaurant building in the same shopping center development. However, if parking lot lighting already exists for the zoning lot, simply adding an outparcel building would not trigger compliance with the lighting ordinance in most cases.*

- **The proposed language for Stadiums and Outdoor Recreation Uses says: “shall apply to new lighting for existing and new accessory fields and courts as well as the uses ....” What is “new lighting,” especially for existing fields? Bulb changes? A few new poles? Completely new or replacement systems?**

*The draft ordinance would only apply to completely new lighting systems or complete replacement of existing lighting systems on site.*

- **Does the BB&T Ballpark, where the Winston-Salem Dash play, meet the proposed requirements?**

*The BB&T Ballpark lighting system, approved in 2007, does not meet all of the requirements in the draft ordinance, but it does come close. The lighting for this facility is required to have a reading of .5 footcandle or less at the property line and a reading of .75 footcandle or less at the public right of way. There are no glare control requirements for the ballpark such as the proposed lighting ordinance would require. As an existing facility with lighting, the ballpark would not be required to retrofit the existing lighting to the new standards unless the entire lighting system were completely replaced.*

- **Does the proposed RJ Reynolds High School stadium submission comply with these standards? If not, would it have to?**

*If a lighting ordinance were passed before the proposed RJ Reynolds High School stadium received permits, the stadium’s lighting would need to comply with the new lighting ordinance. However, a representative from Musco Lighting, who has designed the proposed stadium’s lighting and designed the stadium lighting for the recently constructed Davie County High School, says that the lighting design for the proposed RJ Reynolds stadium meets the proposed ordinance requirements.*

## Draft Lighting Ordinance

# Comparison of Peer Cities' Lighting Ordinances

	Asheville	Cary	Charlotte	Durham	Greensboro	Raleigh	Walkertown	Draft W-S
Applicability	New Development, New lighting, replacement of lighting	New Development and New Lighting	All lighting shielded to not illuminate residential or cause glare	New Development	All new lighting	New lighting, replacement of lighting, changes to fixture types or wattage	New Development + Additions	New Development and new lighting systems for recreation facilities
Lighting Plan Required	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Full Cutoff Fixtures	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maximum Light Reading at Residential Property	.5 footcandle	.5 footcandle	N/A	.5 footcandle	1.0 footcandle	.5 footcandle	.5 footcandle	.5 footcandle
Maximum Light Reading on Property	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Parking Lot Light Height	37'	35'	N/A	30'	35'	30'	25'	30'
Non-Directional Light Height Limit	18'	18'	N/A	15'	N/A	15'	N/A	15'
Other Standards	Maximum lumens specified for fixtures	N/A	N/A	Grandfathers lighting fixtures existing before June 2000	N/A	Maximum lumens for non-cutoff fixtures	N/A	Max candella for recreation uses
Recreation Standards	80' height limit + glare control + limited hours of operation	Glare control + limited hours of operation	No	Light fixtures at least 100' from residential + limited hours of operation	Lighting design must minimize impacts	80' height limit + glare control	N/A	80' height limit + glare control

## Draft Lighting Ordinance

# What about street lights?

The proposed lighting ordinance does not apply to street lights. Due to the current leasing agreement between the City of Winston-Salem and Duke Energy, changing any street light fixtures, even to energy-saving LED fixtures, results in higher expenses to the City and taxpayers. Most of the LED street light fixtures being installed around the city are replacement fixtures for failed mercury vapor fixtures, which are no longer legal to install. New lights are cut-off fixtures designed to limit light trespass. Globe lights and drop-down lens cobra head light fixtures (pictured) are no longer used for new street light installations.

If you have any questions about City street lights, contact City of Winston-Salem Street Lighting Specialist Lisa Jefferson at 336-747-6873.

