

Luminance Contrast Testing

Responsibilities

Building architects, designers, and surveyors have responsibilities under the Premises Standards to ensure compliance. Building Surveyors are also responsible for approving building documentation which can include compliance certificates for structural, mechanical, electrical, and hydraulic services. Luminance contrast compliance certificates can further help to reduce risk and mitigate litigation.



But do you confirm “Luminance Contrast” has been achieved for the following items:

- Stair Nosings - Do they achieve a minimum of 30% luminance contrast?
- Tactile Ground Surface Indicators (TGSIs) -
 - Do pads or tiles achieve a minimum of 30% luminance contrast?
 - Do single colour discrete TGSIs achieve a minimum of 45% luminance contrast?
 - Do the two colour discrete TGSIs achieve a minimum of 60% luminance contrast?
- Contrast Bands (also known as visual indicators or manifestations) - Does the glazing achieve a minimum of 30% luminance contrast in both directions?
- Doorways - Do they achieve the required 30% luminance contrast to adjacent surfaces?
- Toilet Seats - Do they achieve the minimum of 30% luminance contrast to the background?

As a professional, you, your clients, and all parties involved in delivering the project assume a high level of risk for not ensuring these compliances are in place.

Questions to ask

What risk will I carry if minimum luminance contrast levels are not achieved to:

- TGSIs and stair nosings if an individual falls whilst using the stair or ramp?
- Glazing bands and an individual walks into or through a glazed panel?

Toomey v Scolaro's Concrete Constructions

More than five years after a balcony fall that left him a quadriplegic, Cameron Toomey was calm and philosophical about a Supreme Court decision yesterday to award him more than **\$2.2million** damages.

Deprived of a stellar sporting career and needing constant care, Mr Toomey, 30, said worse tragedies had befallen others and he was looking forward to the exciting things in his life. Every day is a bonus," he said outside court yesterday.

As we have learned in the Toomey v Scolaro's Concrete Constructions case, a single stair element not meeting the required levels of compliance can result in many years of litigation through the court system with all associated costs being passed to the responsible parties.

In this particular case, Justice Geoffrey Eames found that the nine defendants in total shared liability which was shared equally divided amongst them. Those responsible included the two friends that were wrestling, as well as the building's architect, builder, developer, manager, and building surveyor.

More information about this case is available on our website at:

http://luminos.com.au/toomey_vs_scolaros/



Quotation

For an obligation free quotation, please contact us directly. Our information can be found above.