

SIGNS

CONTENTS

1	Scope of Report.....	2
2	Hearing and Submitters Heard	2
3	Sub-topic Recommendations.....	3
3.1	Off-site signs	3
3.2	Definitions.....	4
3.3	Overview	5
3.4	Objectives and Policies	6
3.4.1	SIGN-O1	6
3.4.2	SIGN-P1	6
3.4.3	SIGN-P2 and SIGN-P3	6
3.4.4	SIGN-P4 and SIGN P5.....	7
3.5	Rules.....	7
3.5.1	SIGN-R1, SIGN-R2 and SIGN-R3.....	7
3.5.2	SIGN-R4	8
3.5.3	SIGN-R5	8
3.5.4	Non-Notification Provisions	8
3.6	Rule Requirements.....	9
3.6.1	SIGN-REQ1.....	9
3.6.2	SIGN-REQ2, SIGN-REQ3, SIGN-REQ4, SIGN-REQ5, SIGN-REQ6 and SIGN-REQ7	10
3.6.3	New rule requirement.....	11
3.7	Matters for Control or Discretion	11
3.7.1	SIGN-MAT1 and SIGN-MAT2	11
4	Other Matters	11
	Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments.....	13
	Amendments to the PDP Maps	13
	Amendments to the PDP Text	13
	Appendix 2: List of Appearances and Tabled Evidence	22

1 Scope of Report

- [1] This Recommendation Report relates to the Signs chapter of the PDP and contains the Hearing Panel's recommendations to Council on the submissions and further submissions received on that chapter.
- [2] The Hearing Panel members for the Signs chapter were:
- Lindsay Daysh
 - Mark Alexander
 - Raewyn Solomon
 - Rob van Voorthuysen (Chair)
- [3] The initial Section 42A Report and the end of hearing Section 42A Report (Reply Report) for this topic were:
- Signs, 10 March 2022, Craig Friedel
 - Addendum to the S42AReport for Hearing 18, 15 March 2022, Craig Friedel
 - Right of Reply Report, Signs, 8 November 2022, Craig Friedel
- [4] The Hearing Panel's recommended amendments to the notified provisions of the Signs chapter are set out in Appendix 1. Amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that have been adopted by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out and underlining. Further or different amendments recommended by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out, underlining and red font.
- [5] There are no recommended amendments to the notified planning maps.
- [6] Readers should also note that we have, at their request, amended all references to 'Trustpower' to 'Manawa Energy'.
- [7] Further submitters are not listed in the tables in this Recommendation Report because further submissions are either accepted or rejected in conformance with our recommendations on the original submissions to which they relate.

2 Hearing and Submitters Heard

- [8] The hearing for the Signs was held on 7 April 2022. There were 35 submitters on the Signs chapter, however only two submitters¹ eventually wished to be heard. The submitters who appeared at the hearing are listed below, together with an identification of whether they were an original submitter, a further submitter, or both.

Sub #	Submitter	Original	Further
DPR-0250	Go Media Ltd	✓	
DPR-0358	Rolleston West Residential Limited		
DPR-0363	Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited	✓	✓
DPR-0374	Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited		
DPR-0384	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited		

¹ Throughout this Report we count the four 'Carter Group' submitters (DPR-0384, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0374) as one as the relief they sought is identical.

- [9] Some of the submitters were represented by counsel or had expert witnesses appear on their behalf. The counsel and witnesses we heard from are listed in Appendix 2. Copies of all the legal submissions and evidence (expert and non-expert) received are held by the Council. We do not separately summarise that material here, but we refer to or quote from some of it in the remainder of this Recommendation Report.
- [10] We record that we considered all submissions and further submissions, regardless of whether the submitter or further submitter appeared at the hearing and whether or not they were represented by counsel or expert witnesses.
- [11] We note that the SDC has made a substantial amendment to the Signs provisions under clause 16(2) of Schedule 1 of the RMA on 3 February 2021:
- Inserting matters for control or discretion into SIGN-MAT1 which was inadvertently left blank in the notified PDP
- [12] Regarding the amendment, we understand from the Section 42A Report² that submitters RWRL, IRHL, RIHL, and RIDL correctly suggested that matters listed in SIGN-MAT2.1 (1) to (4) should be shifted into and placed under SIGN-MAT1 to correct a drafting error. That clause 16(2) amendment had the potential to raise natural justice issues as submitters did not have the opportunity to scrutinise the revised contents of SIGN-MAT1. However, no submitter raised that as an issue of concern during the hearing.
- [13] In various places throughout this Recommendation Report we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Sections 42A Report. We wish to record that where we say that, it includes the technical reports authored by Gabi Wolfer³ that were appended to the initial Section 42A Report and the Section 42A Report Reply Report.

3 Sub-topic Recommendations

- [14] The main matter of contention for the Signs chapter relates to ‘off-site signs’, including off-site digital signs. We address that matter first before proceeding to address the remaining submissions by sub-topic, using the same headings as the initial Section 42A Report.

3.1 Off-site signs

- [15] As noted by Mr Friedel, Go Media and Carter Group sought changes to the Signs chapter to better enable the establishment and operation of digital off-site signage in the district. That included the provision of new Rule ‘SIGN-R6 Digital Off-site Signs’ and supporting new rule requirement ‘SIGN-REQ8 Digital Off-site Signage’. The submitters also sought changes to SIGN-REQ6 Distracting Features and matters of control or discretion SIGN-MAT1 and SIGN-MAT2.
- [16] The Carter Group and Go Media also requested that off-site signs located in the GIZ and LFRZ that did not satisfy rule ‘SIGN-R2 Temporary Signs’ or the requested new rule ‘SIGN-R6 Digital Signage’ be allocated a permitted activity status, provided that the proposed pre-requisites relating to the number and size of off-site signs, and their visibility from a RESZ (‘Residential Zone’), GRUZ (‘General Rural Zone’) or State Highway 1, were satisfied.

² Paragraph 14.4.

³ SDC’s Senior Urban Designer and Town Planner.

- [17] We received evidence on this matter from the submitters and from Ms Wolfer. We also received, at our request, a post-hearing 'Joint Memorandum of Counsel on behalf of Go Media Limited and Carter Group Limited Submitters'. That Joint Memorandum stated⁴:

"Digital signage are an inevitable future activity in Selwyn. Overall Go Media's requested changes propose controls on use of digital signs to appropriately manage known effects. The changes requested by Go Media are intended to provide clearer direction in the PSDP as to which zones are appropriate for digital signs subject to industry standards (GIZ; TCZ; KNOZ; LFRZ) and those which are sensitive locations and not generally appropriate (RESZ; GRUZ). Non-compliance with these standards will be the trigger for requiring resource consent, and will provide guidance in assessment of effects of future resource consent applications."

- [18] Having considered all of the evidence and legal submissions we agree with and adopt Mr Friedel's Reply Report recommendations (and his associated reasons) to:

- amend SIGN-R5 Off-Site Signs as contained in the Go Media and Carter Group Joint Memorandum to provide for digital off-site signage within the GIZ and LFRZ as a permitted activity where compliance with the related requirements has been satisfied;
- insert new SIGN-R6 Digital Off-site Signs as contained in the Go Media and Carter Group Joint Memorandum to provide for off-site signage within the GIZ, LFRZ, TCZ and KNOZ as a permitted or a controlled activity where compliance with the related requirements has been satisfied;
- amend requirement SIGN-REQ6 Distracting Features as it applies to the GIZ and LFRZ to better enable signage that is not visible from a RESZ, GRUZ or State Highway 1, which is consequential to other proposed amendments relating to off-site and digital off-site signage;
- insert new SIGN-REQ8 Digital Off-site Signage to incorporate industry standards into the PDP as part of the wider suite of provisions for managing digital off-site signage; and
- amend SIGN-MAT1 and SIGN-MAT2 to ensure alignment with the wider framework for managing off-site and digital off-site signage.

- [19] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we are satisfied that Mr Friedel's recommended amendments are the most appropriate options for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

- [20] Consequently, for the following submitter and their submission points we adopt Mr Friedel's recommendations and reasons.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0250	Go Media	001, 002, 003

3.2 Definitions

- [21] The Definitions chapter was subject to its own Hearing (Hearing 2), however there are a number of submissions relating to definitions that were more appropriately considered as part of the Hearing on the Signs chapter. For the following submitters and their submission points

⁴ Paragraph 9.

we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0358	RWRL	043
DPR-0363	IRHL	042
DPR-0370	Fonterra	004, 006
DPR-0374	RIHL	048
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	006
DPR-0384	RIDL	050
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square Limited	005

- [22] In response to the submission of Fonterra, Mr Friedel identified a deficiency in the notified definition of ‘freestanding sign’ and helpfully referred to more appropriate wording used in the Christchurch City Plan and Waimakariri District Plan. Mr Friedel considered that there was no scope to rectify the deficiency. We are of a different view and consider that the notified definition can be clarified by way of a minor clause 16(2) amendment, adopting some of the wording used in the Waimakariri District Plan. We recommend accordingly.

3.3 Overview

- [23] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0358	RWRL	301
DPR-0363	IRHL	290
DPR-0374	RIHL	296
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	136
DPR-0384	RIDL	308
DPR-0441	Manawa Energy	141
DPR-0446	Transpower	126

- [24] We received a tabled statement of evidence from Manawa Energy seeking that the Overview be amended (addition in italics) to refer to “... network utilities, *or necessary for the safe and efficient operation of electricity generation activities* are ... ” on the basis that the Coleridge Hydro Electric Power Scheme does not fit within the definition of a network utility. We acknowledge that fact, but decline to recommend the relief sought by Manawa Energy here because we have recommended (within the Recommendation Report for the Energy and Infrastructure chapter) that the definition of ‘network utility’ be amended to include the words “... *or any person who owns or operates the Coleridge Hydro Electric Power Scheme.*” The result is that permitted activity rule EI-R23 for signs will apply to that Scheme.
- [25] We also note that in Appendix 3 to the Section 42A Report Ms Wolfer recommended a very minor amendment to the wording of the last sentence of the Overview. We consider that her recommendation is an appropriate clarification of the notified text and we recommend that it be made under clause 16(2).

3.4 Objectives and Policies

3.4.1 SIGN-O1

- [26] We note there were eight submitters on the Signs chapter objective, all of whom who either supported the notified provision or sought no amendment of it. For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0353	HortNZ	219
DPR-0358	RWRL	302
DPR-0363	IRHL	291
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	070
DPR-0374	RIHL	297
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	137
DPR-0384	RIDL	309
DPR-0422	NCFE	243

3.4.2 SIGN-P1

- [27] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0204	JP Singh	006
DPR-0215	Winstone	048
DPR-0349	Natalie Edwards	003
DPR-0358	RWRL	303
DPR-0363	IRHL	292
DPR-0370	Fonterra	071
DPR-0374	RIHL	298
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	138
DPR-0384	RIDL	310
DPR-0422	NCFE	244
DPR-0446	Transpower	131

- [28] In response to the submissions of NCFE and Winstone, Mr Friedel initially recommended adding the words 'rural production' to the policy. However, we queried this, noting that the only difference between 'primary production' and 'rural production' is that clause (a) of 'primary production' includes mining and quarrying (not just farm quarries), and therefore encompasses a wider range of activities, and we suggested that it would be better to refer to 'primary production'. Mr Friedel agreed and we recommend accordingly.
- [29] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we are satisfied that our recommended amendment is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

3.4.3 SIGN-P2 and SIGN-P3

- [30] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that in response to the submission of Waka Kotahi this results in a change to SIGN-P2, SIGN-P4 and SIGN-P5 regarding the inclusion of a

reference to ensuring transport safety. We note that Mr Friedel's recommendation regarding SIGN-P2 was contained in the answers to our written questions.⁵

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0358	RWRL	304, 305
DPR-0363	IRHL	293, 294
DPR-0374	RIHL	299, 300
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	139
DPR-0384	RIDL	311, 312

3.4.4 SIGN-P4 and SIGN P5

[31] For the following submitters and their submission points we generally adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0353	HortNZ	220
DPR-0358	RWRL	306, 307
DPR-0363	IRHL	295, 296
DPR-0374	RIHL	301, 302
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	140, 141
DPR-0384	RIDL	313, 314
DPR-0409	Hughes	040
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	010
DPR-0422	NCFE	245

[32] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, we are satisfied that Mr Friedel's recommended amendment to refer to 'transport safety' in both policies in response to the submission of Waka Kotahi is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents. Having said that, we agree with the tabled evidence from Waka Kotahi that consistent language should be used in SIGN-P4 and P5 and that the phrase 'ensure transport safety' is appropriate in both policies.

3.5 Rules

3.5.1 SIGN-R1, SIGN-R2 and SIGN-R3

[33] We note that there were 10 submitters and 21 submission points on these rules of which 18 were in support of the notified provisions. For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	003
DPR-0215	Winstone	049
DPR-0269	Heritage NZ	027
DPR-0358	RWRL	308, 309, 310,
DPR-0363	IRHL	297, 298, 299
DPR-0374	RIHL	303, 304, 305
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	142, 143, 144, 145
DPR-0384	RIDL	315, 316, 317,
DPR-0409	Hughes	041

⁵ Officer's Response to questions from the hearings panel, Craig Friedel, 7 April 2022.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	011

3.5.2 *SIGN-R4*

- [34] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	003
DPR-0358	RWRL	311
DPR-0363	IRHL	300
DPR-0374	RIHL	306
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	146, 147
DPR-0384	RIDL	318

- [35] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submission points we are satisfied that Mr Friedel's recommended amendment to amend SIGN-R4 to include a cross reference to SIGN-R3 and remove the reference to SIGN-REQ5 in response to the submission of Waka Kotahi, is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.
- [36] In saying that we note that Mr Friedel suggested that the requested change would only make sense if the 'and' was replaced with an 'or'. The tabled evidence of Waka Kotahi concurred with the use of the word 'or'. We agree and recommend accordingly.

3.5.3 *SIGN-R5*

- [37] As discussed in section 3.1 of this Recommendation Report, for the Carter Group submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0358	RWRL	312
DPR-0363	IRHL	301
DPR-0374	RIHL	307
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	148
DPR-0384	RIDL	319

3.5.4 *Non-Notification Provisions*

- [38] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provisions.
- [39] In particular, we agree that it is not appropriate to preclude limited or public notification for controlled and restricted discretionary activities on a chapter wide basis. The RMA contains a specific process for determining notification on a case-by-case basis and in our view that statutory process should only be circumvented where there is absolute certainty that potential adverse effects will not affect any other party. Having made this finding, we assess requests for non-notification for individual rules on their merits.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0358	RWRL	419
DPR-0363	IRHL	439
DPR-0374	RIHL	485
DPR-0384	RIDL	518

3.6 Rule Requirements

3.6.1 SIGN-REQ1

[40] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	004
DPR-0204	JP Singh	007, 008
DPR-0215	Winstone	050
DPR-0345	Porters Alpine Resort	033
DPR-0346	Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill	018
DPR-0358	RWRL	313
DPR-0363	IRHL	302
DPR-0370	Fonterra	071
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs	015
DPR-0374	RIHL	308
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	149
DPR-0384	RIDL	320
DPR-0396	Woolworths	027, 028
DPR-0453	LPC	053

[41] In particular:

- we reject the submission of Woolworths and the evidence of Kay Panther Knight that SIGN-REQ1.15 and 21b should both be amended to 27m². It is not appropriate to imply that a sign can have a maximum width of 3m and maximum height of 9m as a permitted activity. Instead, for example, a 3m wide sign can only be 6m height to abide by the 18m² size limit;
- we reject the submissions of the 'Carter Group'⁶ that off-site signs in the GIZ and LFRZ should be a controlled activity where they are not visible from a RESZ, GRUZ or State Highway 1 because that would provide no control on the location of those signs and could conceivably result in an inappropriate proliferation of signs; and
- we also reject the submissions of the 'Carter Group' that free-standing signs in the LFRZ should have no controls on their quantum, area, width or height because, even with the nature of anticipated landuse in the LFRZ, visual amenity is a valid consideration.

[42] We are also satisfied that Mr Friedel's recommended amendment to insert a specific suite of requirements for a new GRUZ-PREC1 in response to the submission of Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents. We note that Mr Friedel's recommendation (which we have adopted) to accept the submission of Ceres Professional Trustee Company & Sally Tothill is contingent on the acceptance of that same submitter's

⁶ RWRL, IRHL, RIHL and RIDL.

submissions on the GRUZ. We record the acceptance of those submissions as is documented in the GRUZ Recommendation Report. For completeness, we also note that we received a letter from the planner representing Ceres Professional Trustee Company & Sally Tothill advising that they supported the Section 42A Report's recommendations, including the correction set out in Mr Friedel's 15 March 2022 addendum.

3.6.2 ***SIGN-REQ2, SIGN-REQ3, SIGN-REQ4, SIGN-REQ5, SIGN-REQ6 and SIGN-REQ7***

- [43] For the following submitters and their submission points we generally adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author, other than references to 'height' should relate to the building facade and not the building frontage. We note that in terms of Waka Kotahi DPR-0375.154 this includes Mr Friedel's detailed answer to our written question.⁷
- [44] We also note Mr Friedel's advice in his Reply Report regarding the removal of any limits on the total maximum area of on-building signage in the GIZ and LFRZ, that Ms Wolfer had confirmed that an error had been made and that the 25% built form requirement in SIGN-Table 1 was intended to apply.⁸ Ms Wolfer also supported the further amendment to the requirement recommended by the Woolworths that applied the 25% total maximum area to the primary and secondary building frontage to replace the current reference to *"...primary building façade..."*.⁹ The replacement of the references to 'façade' with 'frontage' ensures that the term that is defined in the PDP applies to the requirement. We therefore adopt Mr Friedel's recommended amendments regarding the structure of SIGN-TABLE1¹⁰.
- [45] We have rejected the Section 42A Reply Report's recommendation to amend SIGN-TABLE1 to replace the word 'façade' with 'frontage'. The reason being that 'frontage' could inadvertently be taken to mean the horizontal dimension of the building whereas the provision is clearly meant to apply to the vertical dimension.
- [46] We have also rejected the Section 42A Reply Report's recommendation to amend SIGN-REQ6 such that signs with distracting features in the GIZ and LFRZ would not be visible from State Highway 1. In the context of the Rolleston industrial and large format retail areas to the north of SH1, that requirement would be incapable of being complied with.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0145	Bunnings	005
DPR-0204	JP Singh	009
DPR-0250	Go Media	004
DPR-0346	Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill	019
DPR-0358	RWRL	314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319
DPR-0363	IRHL	303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	073
DPR-0374	RIHL	309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	150, 151, 153, 154
DPR-0384	RIDL	321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	003
DPR-0396	Woolworths	029

⁷ Officer's Response to questions from the hearings panel, Craig Friedel, 7 April 2022, page 3 of 4.

⁸ Section 42A Reply Report, Appendix 3 - Section 4, paragraph 4.1.

⁹ Section 42A Reply Report, Appendix 3 - Section 4, paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3.

¹⁰ DPR-0396.029 Woolworths

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0453	LPC	054

- [47] In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for this submission we are satisfied that Mr Friedel's recommendation to amend SIGN-TABLE1 in SIGN-REQ2 by including reference to the new precinct GRUZ-PREC1 in the row for GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZ and DPZ¹¹ is appropriate for the reasons outlined above.

3.6.3 New rule requirement

- [48] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provisions.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0409	Hughes	042
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	012

3.7 Matters for Control or Discretion

3.7.1 SIGN-MAT1 and SIGN-MAT2

- [49] As discussed in section 2 of this Recommendation Report, for the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Point
DPR-0215	Winstone	051
DPR-0250	Go Media	005
DPR-0358	RWRL	320, 321
DPR-0363	IRHL	309, 310
DPR-0374	RIHL	315, 316
DPR-0384	RIDL	327, 328
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	155, 156
DPR-0409	Hughes	043
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	013
DPR-0446	Transpower	133

- [50] We note for completeness that we received a tabled letter from Transpower which advised that the SDC's clause 16(2) amendment resolved the concerns in Transpower's submission.

4 Other Matters

- [51] The recommended amendments to the PDP provisions contained in Appendix 1 are those that result from this Hearing Panel's assessment of submissions and further submissions. However, readers should note that further or different amendments to these provisions may have been recommended by:

- Hearing Panels considering submissions and further submissions on other chapters of the PDP;
- the Hearing Panels considering rezoning requests, and

¹¹ We note the Section 42A Report Addendum corrected an error in the initial Section 42A Report regarding the text that is recommended to be included in SIGN-TABLE 1.

- the Independent Hearing Panel (IHP) considering submissions and further submissions on Variation 1 to the PDP

- [52] Any such further or different amendments are not shown in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report. However, the Chair¹² and Deputy Chair¹³ of the PDP Hearing Panels have considered the various recommended amendments and have ensured that the overall final wording of the consolidated version of the amended PDP is internally consistent.
- [53] In undertaking that 'consistency' exercise, care was taken to ensure that the final wording of the consolidated version of the amended PDP did not alter the intent of the recommended amendments contained in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report.
- [54] No other matters were brought to our attention.

¹² Who is also the Chair of the IHP.

¹³ Who chaired one stream of hearings.

Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments

Note to readers: Only provisions that have recommended amendments are included below. All other provisions remain as notified. Amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that have been adopted by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out and underlining. Further or different amendments recommended by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out, underlining and red font.

Amendments to the PDP Maps

There are no amendments recommended to PDP Planning Maps arising from our recommendations on the submissions and further submissions covered by this Recommendation Report.

Amendments to the PDP Text

Part 1 – Introduction and General Provisions

Interpretation

Definitions	
FREE STANDING SIGN	Any sign which stands upright <u>wholly on its own with its own support structure</u> without having to be attached to any building, post or other structure. ¹⁴

Part 2 – District Wide Matters

General District Wide Matters

SIGN – Signs

SIGN-Overview
<p>Note:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>Any official sign or signs associated with emergency services facilities, and network utilities, or necessary for the safe and efficient operation of electricity generation activities</u> are subject to Rules <u>El-R23 and El-R29</u>¹⁵ in the Energy and Infrastructure Chapter.</p> <p>...</p>

¹⁴ Clause 16(2) amendment in response to DPR-0370.004 Fonterra

¹⁵ DPR-0441.141 Manawa Energy

Signs that are illuminated are also subject to the Light Chapter.¹⁶

SIGN-Objectives and Policies

SIGN-Policies	
SIGN-P1	Enable signs that are an integral component of industrial, commercial, and community activities, <u>primary production</u> ¹⁷ and important infrastructure.
SIGN-P2	Manage the size, design, location, and number of signs to <u>maintain transport safety and</u> ¹⁸ the character and amenity values of the surrounding environment, including the values of Outstanding Natural Landscapes, the coastal environment, and the heritage values of identified heritage items and settings.
SIGN-P4	Provide for temporary signs, including off-site temporary signs, where their duration, size, and number are limited to maintain the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area <u>and ensure transport safety</u> . ¹⁹
SIGN-P5	Avoid off-site signs in Residential and Rural Zones and ensure that off-site signs in all other zones <u>ensure transport safety and</u> ²⁰ are compatible with the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area, particularly where they are visible from any Residential or Rural Zone.

SIGN-Rules

SIGN-R4 Signs adjacent to State Highways or Arterial Roads		
All Zones	<p>Activity status: PER</p> <p>1. Other than a sign listed in SIGN-R1.1 or SIGN-R3,²¹ any sign located on a site adjacent to a State Highway or Arterial Road listed in APP2 – Roading Hierarchy which has a speed limit of more than 60km per hour.</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>And this activity complies with the following rule requirements:</p> <p>...</p> <p>SIGN-REQ5 Real estate signs²²</p> <p>...</p>	...

¹⁶ Clause 16(2) amendment in response to DPR-0250.001 Go Media and the evidence of Gabi Wolfer

¹⁷ DPR-0422.244 NCFF and DPR-0215.048 Winstone

¹⁸ DPR-0375.139 Waka Kotahi

¹⁹ DPR-0375.140 Waka Kotahi

²⁰ DPR-0375.141 Waka Kotahi

²¹ DPR-0375.146 Waka Kotahi

²² DPR-0375.146 Waka Kotahi

SIGN-R5 Off-Site Signs		
GIZ LFRZ	<p>Activity status: PER</p> <p>1. <u>Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2 and any digital off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R6.</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. <u>The off-site sign is not visible from the RESZ, GRUZ or a State Highway;</u> b. <u>The maximum area of a sign of any single off-site sign shall be 18m²;</u> c. <u>The maximum height above ground level at the top of the off-site sign shall be 9m;</u> d. <u>The site shall have a minimum road frontage of 40m per off-site sign; and</u> e. <u>There shall be a maximum of two off-site signs per site.</u></p> <p>And this activity complies with the following rule requirements: SIGN-REQ6 Distracting features SIGN-REQ7 Traffic safety</p>	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>2. <u>Where compliance with any of SIGN-R5.1 is not achieved: RDIS</u></p> <p>Matters for discretion:</p> <p>3. <u>The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-R5.2 is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>SIGN-MAT1</u></p>
All Zones, except RESZ, GRUZ, GIZ, LFRZ	<p>Activity Status: DIS</p> <p>4. <u>Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2 and any digital off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R6.</u></p>	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A
RESZ GRUZ	<p>Activity Status: NC</p> <p>5. <u>Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2 and any digital off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R6.²³</u></p>	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A
SIGN-R6 Digital Off-site Signs		
PREC 6 LFRZ	<p>Activity Status: PER</p> <p>1. <u>Any digital off-site sign.</u></p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. <u>The sign is not visible from a RESZ, GRUZ or a State Highway.</u></p> <p>And the activity complies with the following rule requirements: SIGN-REQ7 Traffic safety SIGN-REQ8 Digital Off-site Signage</p>	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>2. <u>Where compliance with SIGN-R6.1.a is not achieved: RDIS</u></p> <p>3. <u>When any rule requirement listed in this rule is not achieved: Refer to SIGN-Rule Requirements.</u></p> <p>Matters for discretion:</p> <p>4. <u>The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-R6.2 is restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>SIGN-MAT1</u> b. <u>SIGN-MAT2</u></p>

²³ DPR-0250.001 to 003 Go Media, DPR-0358.312 RWRL, DPR-0363.301 IRHL, DPR-0374.307 RIHL and DPR-0384.319 RIDL

<u>GIZ (excluding PREC 6)</u> <u>TCZ</u> <u>KNOZ</u>	<u>Activity Status: CON</u> <u>5. Any digital off-site sign.</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The sign is not visible from a RESZ, GRUZ or a State Highway.</u> <u>And the activity complies with the following rule requirements:</u> <u>SIGN-REQ7 Traffic safety</u> <u>SIGN-REQ8 Digital off-site signage</u> <u>Matters of Control:</u> <u>6. The exercise of control is reserved over the following matters:</u> <u>a. SIGN-MAT1</u> <u>b. SIGN-MAT2</u>	<u>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</u> <u>7. Where compliance with SIGN-R6.5.a is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>8. When any rule requirement listed in this rule is not achieved: Refer to SIGN-Rule Requirements.</u> <u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>9. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-R6.7 is restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>a. SIGN-MAT1</u> <u>b. SIGN-MAT2</u>
<u>All other zones, except RESZ GRUZ GIZ LFRZ TCZ KNOZ</u>	<u>Activity Status: DIS</u> <u>10. Any digital off-site sign.</u>	<u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</u>
<u>RESZ</u> <u>GRUZ</u>	<u>Activity Status: NC</u> <u>11. Any digital off-site sign.</u>	<u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A²⁴</u>

SIGN-Rule Requirements

SIGN-REQ1 Free Standing Signs		
<u>All Zones</u>
<u>GRUZ</u> ... <u>(excluding PREC11)²⁵</u>	...	<u>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</u> <u>12. When compliance with any of SIGN-REQ1.8.-1.12. is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>Matters for discretion:</u>

²⁴ DPR-0250.001, 002 and 003 Go Media²⁵ DPR-0346.018 Ceres & Tothill

		13. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-REQ1. 1213 ²⁶ is restricted to the following matters: a. SIGN-MAT1
PREC11	13A There shall be a maximum of two free standing signs per site. 13B. The maximum area of all signs shall be no more than 12m ² . 13C. The maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign shall be 6m.	Activity status when compliance not achieved: 13D. When compliance of any of SIGN-REQ1.13A, SIGN-REQ1.13B or SIGN-REQ1.13C is not achieved: RDIS Matters for discretion: 13E. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-REQ1.15 is restricted to the following matters: a. <u>SIGN-MAT1.</u> ²⁷
SIGN-REQ2 Built Form - Signs Attached to Buildings		
...
SIGN-TABLE1 Signs Attached to Buildings		
Zone	Total maximum area of signs per building	Maximum height above ground level at top of sign
...
GRUZ (excluding PREC11) ²⁸	3m ² per building and 9m ² per site, whichever is lower.	6m or façade frontage height, whichever is lower
GIZ PORTZ LFRZ ²⁹ DPZ PREC11	Building length along primary and secondary ³⁰ building frontage (m) x 2m = permitted area m ² .	Façade Frontage height
All zones not otherwise specified including KNOZ where not for education purposes	Building length along primary building frontage (m) x 1.5 = permitted area m² Signage does not occupy more than 25% of any the primary and secondary building frontage. ³¹	Façade Frontage height

²⁶ Clause 16(2) correction²⁷ DPR-0346.018 Ceres & Tothill²⁸ DPR-0346.018 Ceres & Tothill²⁹ DPR-0396.029 Woolworths³⁰ DPR-0396.029 Woolworths³¹ DPR-0388.003 Rolleston Square

SIGN-REQ6 Distracting Features		
<u>TCZ</u> <u>NCZ</u> <u>LCZ</u> <u>GIZ</u> <u>CUMZ</u> <u>PORTZ</u>	1.
All zones, excluding <u>TCZ</u> <u>NCZ</u> <u>LCZ</u> <u>LFRZ</u> <u>GIZ</u> <u>CUMZ</u> <u>PORTZ</u>	4.
<u>GIZ</u> <u>LFRZ</u>	6. <u>The sign is not visible from the RESZ or GRUZ or State Highway 1 and does not contain any of the following features:</u> a. <u>Flashing, revolving, or intermittently illuminated lights.</u> b. <u>Moving components.</u> c. <u>Changing images, digital, or LED displays excluding off-site digital signs.</u> d. <u>Sound effects.</u> e. <u>Captive balloons or blimps.</u>	Activity status when compliance not achieved: 7. <u>When compliance with SIGN-REQ6.6 is not achieved: CON</u> Matters for control: 8. <u>The matters of control in relation to SIGN-REQ6.7 are restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>SIGN-MAT2</u>
<u>GIZ</u> <u>LFRZ</u>	9. <u>The sign is visible from the RESZ or GRUZ or State Highway 1 and does not contain any of the following features:</u> a. <u>Flashing, revolving, or intermittently illuminated lights.</u> b. <u>Moving components.</u> c. <u>Changing images, digital, or LED displays excluding digital off-site signs.</u> d. <u>Sound effects.</u> e. <u>Captive balloons or blimps.</u>	Activity status when compliance not achieved: 10. <u>When compliance with SIGN-REQ6.9 is not achieved: RDIS</u> Matters for discretion: 11. <u>The matters of control in relation to SIGN-REQ6.10 are restricted to the following matters:</u> a. <u>SIGN-MAT2³²</u>

³² DPR-0250.003 Go Media, DPR-0358.318 RWRL, DPR-0363.307 IRHL, DPR-0374-313 RIHL and DPR-0384.325 RIDL.

SIGN-REQ7 Traffic Safety				
All Zones	1. A sign, other than a sign provided by the road controlling authority, is: a. Of a colour and design that does not resemble a traffic sign or signal; and b. Is in In a position that does not obscure any traffic sign or signal from a road user's view. 2. All signs visible from a State Highway must comply with the minimum lettering sizes listed in SIGN-TABLE 2. ³³		...	
	SIGN-TABLE2 Design Standards for Signs that are visible from a State Highway			
	<u>Speed Limit of adjoining state highway (km/h)</u>	<u>Business/ Property Name - Minimum Lettering Height (mm)</u>	<u>Main Message - Minimum Lettering Height (mm)</u>	<u>Secondary Message - Minimum Lettering Height (mm)</u>
	<u>50</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>75</u>
	<u>60</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>90</u>
	<u>70</u>	<u>150</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>100</u>
	<u>80</u>	<u>175</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>125</u>
	<u>100</u>	<u>200</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>150</u>
SIGN-REQ8 Digital Off-Site Signage				
GIZ LFRZ TCZ KNOZ	1. <u>The maximum area of any single off-site sign shall be 18m².</u> 2. <u>The maximum height above ground level at the top of the off-site sign shall be 9m.</u> 3. <u>The site shall have a minimum road frontage of 40m per digital sign.</u> 4. <u>There shall be a maximum of two off-site signs per site.</u> 5. <u>Each digital sign shall be subject to a written maintenance programme undertaken by the operator/provider and provided to and certified by the Council.</u> 6. <u>The digital sign shall be located at least 50m from any signalised traffic intersection.</u> 7. <u>The digital sign shall result in no more than 10.0 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light when measured or calculated 2m within the boundary of any adjacent site and road.</u> 8. The digital signage display shall:		Activity status when compliance not achieved: <u>12. When compliance with any of SIGN-REQ8 is not achieved: RDIS</u> Matters for discretion: <u>13. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-REQ8.12 is restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>a. SIGN-MAT 1</u> <u>b. SIGN-MAT 2³⁴</u>	

³³ DPR-0375.154 Waka Kotahi

³⁴ DPR-0250.001, 002 and 003 Go Media

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Not include live broadcast or pre-recorded video displayed on the screen.</u> b. <u>Only include still images displayed for a minimum duration of 10 seconds.</u> c. <u>Not Include movement or animation of the images displayed on the screen.</u> d. <u>Not contain any flashing images, and the screen itself shall not contain any retro-reflective material.</u> e. <u>Not contain transitions between still images apart, from cross-dissolve of a maximum of 0.5 seconds.</u> f. <u>Not contain sound associated with the screen, and no sound equipment is to be installed as part of the screen.</u> <p>9. <u>The screen shall incorporate lighting control to adjust brightness in line with ambient light levels. The consent holder shall submit a certification report from an independent lighting practitioner within thirty working days following the commencement of the display going live, confirming that the requirements of this condition are met.</u></p> <p>10. <u>In the event of digital screen failure, the digital sign screen shall either default to black or switch off.</u></p> <p>11. <u>The digital sign shall not exceed the following luminance values:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>Daytime: 5500 cd/m² maximum; and</u> b. <u>Night-time: 250 cd/m² maximum and 150 cd/m² maximum average.</u> 	
--	---	--

SIGN-Matters for Control or Discretion

SIGN-MAT1 All Signs and Support Structures

1. ~~Whether~~ The scale, design, colour, and location and nature of the sign, accounting for: will have
 - a. impacts on the architectural integrity, amenity values, character values, or visual coherence of:
 - i. The building or site on which the sign is displayed and its ability to accommodate the sign;
 - ii. The surrounding area (including anticipated changes in the area);
 - iii. Heritage buildings or settings, open spaces, protected trees, or areas possessing significant natural or landscape values.
2. ~~Whether the degree of the effects of the sign are increased or lessened due to~~
 - a. ~~The design, dimensions, nature and colour of the sign or support structure;~~
 - b. The amount and nature of existing signs on the building and/or site, and whether the proposed sign will result in visual clutter;

- c. The level of visibility of the sign;
- d. The provision of landscaping or other mitigating features;
- e. The length of the road frontage;
- f. The extent to which the sign adds visual interest or screens unsightly activities;
- g. Whether there are any special circumstances or functional needs relating to the activity, building, site or surroundings, which affect the sign's requirements including operational, safety, directional, and functional requirements; and
- h. The potential of the sign to cause distraction, or confusion to motorists and/or adversely affect traffic safety due to its location, visibility, and/or content including size of lettering, symbols, or other graphics.³⁵

SIGN-MAT2 Flashing, Moving, Changing, Displays

- ~~1. Whether the extent of the effects of the signs are increased or lessened due to:~~
- 1. The design, dimensions, height, location and colour of the sign or support structure.
- 2. The nature of the display, including:
 - a. Image duration;
 - b. Image transitions; and
 - c. The extent or use of any flashing, moving, changing, audible or video displays.
- 3. Sign luminance, including:
 - a. The frequency and intensity of intermittent or flashing light sources, and
 - b. The proposed periods of illumination and frequency of image changes;
 - c. Light intensity and ambient lighting controls.
- ~~2. The prominence of the sign due to its illuminated or animated nature and ability to draw the eye;~~
- 4. The proximity and prominence of the LED or digital display to residential and other sensitive activities within any part of the Residential or Rural Zone and whether the display will create any character, disturbance or amenity effects on the surrounding environment;
- ~~3. For LED or digital displays whether the display includes movement or animation and if so whether such displays increase the sign's visual prominence and potential for distraction;~~
- ~~4. For LED or digital displays whether the sign incorporates lighting controls to automatically adjust the brightness of the screen in line with ambient light levels~~
- 5. Sign maintenance and the management of digital screen failure;
- 6. The potential of the sign to cause confusion to motorists and/or adversely affect traffic safety.³⁶

³⁵ DPR-0358.320 RWRL, DPR-0363.309 IRHL, DPR-0374.315 RIHL and DPR-0384.327 RIDL

³⁶ DPR-0358.321 RWRL, DPR-0363.310 IRHL, DPR-0374.316 RIHL and DPR-0384.328 RIDL

Appendix 2: List of Appearances and Tabled Evidence

Hearing Appearances

Sub #	Submitter	Author	Role
DPR-0250	Go Media Ltd	Alex Booker Michael Gray David Compton-Moen	Counsel Representative Urban Design
DPR-0358 DPR-0363 DPR-0374 DPR-0384	Rolleston West Residential Limited Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	David Compton-Moen Jeremy Phillips	Urban Design Planning

Tabled Evidence

Sub #	Submitter	Author	Role
DPR-0346	Ceres Professional Trustee Company Ltd & Sally Jean Tohill	Nicola Rykers	Planning
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Richard Shaw	Planning
DPR-0396	Woolworths	Kay Panther Knight	Planning
DPR-0441	Manawa Energy	Shelby Macfarlane Hill	Representative
DPR-0446	Transpower NZ Limited	Rebecca Eng	Representative