Comparison of FAMCO Viking LED W/proof and T5 Fluorescent 28W Weatherproof Luminaires for Carpark Lighting -40 lux



| | Comparable Weather Proof 2x28 W T5- PXXXXX | Famco Weather Proof VIKING LED - FL98016 | Advantages for VIKING |
|--|--|---|---|
| QTY | 15 | 12 | Less Fittings/ Wiring Points/Ob |
| Total Lamp Lumens | 5200 | 4249 | Better Utilisation of Lamp Lum |
| LLF* | 0.75 | 0.8 | Improved Serviceability ie Mai |
| Description | Weatherproof 2x28W T5 Polycarbonate Diffuser | Famco FL98016 - 56 W LED Viking W/proof Poly Carb Lens GRP body | Stabilized body , Structurally D Polycarbonate |
| Luminaire Power (Watts) | 62 | 55 | 7 W saving over T5 twin tube fi |
| No. Lamps | 2 T5 Fluorescent | 2 LED L98016 | Uses LED PCB Strip and Diffuse |
| Replaceable Lamps | Yes | Yes | Replaceable LED Lamp Engine |
| Lum. Efficiency(%) | 60 | 100 | Luminaire Efficient with LED Er scattered 2nd hand reflections |
| Mounting Height(M) Calculation AS1680.2.1 (Lux) | 2.5 | 2.5 | Typical Mounting Height for Co |
| Area 755 Sq.M | 41 | 43 | Conformance to Australian Sta Increase Spacing over carpark |
| Spacing C ₀ | 7.5 M | 10 M | =25% LESS wiring points |
| Spacing C ₉₀ | 7.5 M | 7.5 M | No Change |
| Glare Rating (UGR) AS1680.1 2006 | - Average Over 25 UGR | Average Under 25 UGR | Glare is reduced with LED Opti 2x28W T5 Fluoresent |
| Lighting Power Total (Watts) | 930 | 668 | Total Power Consumtion of LEE |
| LPD Watts/Sq.M. | 1.232 | 0.885 | Decreased lighting power dens Ratings. |
| Energy reduction Methods | Nil | Daylight and Microwave Sensor | Increased Energy Savings upto and switching |
| SERVICEABILITY | | | |
| Lamp Life (Hrs) Lamp Replacements (Based on | 16000 | 50000 | 3 x Life of Fluorescent |
| two years after completed installation and defects) | 30+ | 0 | Zero Lamp replacements of LEI |

*Light Loss Factor Based on Lamp Replacements with Lamp Lumen Depreciation (Fluorescent compared to LED LLD)

| 671mm - 30W / 2100 lm | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | |
| 1273mm - 55W / 4100 lm | | | | |
| |] | | | |
| KING LED vs Fluorescent | | | | |
| ts/Obstructions | | | | |

men output-controlled directions

aintanance Cleaning Cycles Durable with better Impact ratings compared to

e fittings

ser Technology - Resistant to impact(0 Glass)

e -Zero Mercury, Glass , Easy to replace Engineered optics to provide direct Luminance rather than ns.

Covered Carparks.

tandards for Covered Carpark Spaces and Aisles. rk spaces (approx 4 spaces) compared to 3 with Fluorescent

ption in all diections compared with Higher Glare index from

LED Vs Fluoresent is 30% LESS. ensity per square metre = less fittings for better Energy

to 80% compared to Fluorescent Systems by smart dimming

LED* compared to average rated failure rate of Fluorescent.

