
OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE HEARINGS PANEL

DATE: 1st of April 2022

HEARING: Signs

HEARING DATE: 7th of April 2022

PREPARED BY: Craig Friedel

Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a written response to the questions posed by the Hearings Panel on the respective section 42A report for the Signs Chapter.

Questions and Answers

Paragraph	Question from the Hearings Panel
11	Request for New Policy - To fill the void in the absence of express direction, is there scope to include the relief Waka Kotahi seeks in Signs Policy 2, to add for instance ... <i>and transport safety</i> ?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<p><i>Waka Kotahi¹ request the inclusion of a new policy, which amongst other matters, seeks to maintain the safety of the land transport network². In reviewing this submission, I consider there is scope through the Waka Kotahi submission to insert "...transport safety..." into policy SIGN-P2 and to accept this submission in part as a consequence. This amendment would improve the effectiveness of the PDP and further reduce the need for the new policy sought by Waka Kotahi.</i></p> <p>SIGN-P2 Manage the size, design, location, and number of signs to maintain <u>transport safety</u> and 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.</p>
11.7	Given that the only difference between the definitions of "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, would it be better to refer to "Primary production" in SIGN-P1?
<i>Officer response:</i>	<p><i>I support replacing the recommended inclusion of "rural production" into policy SIGN-P1 with "primary production", which is the parent definition.</i></p>

¹ DPR-0375.139 Waka Kotahi

² As discussed in paragraphs 11.38 and 11.39 of the section 42A report

Paragraph	Question from the Hearings Panel
	SIGN-P1 Enable signs that are an integral component of industrial, commercial, rural primary production and community activities and important infrastructure.
12.5	When drafting the heritage chapter did Heritage NZ contribute?
Officer response:	<p><i>The Historic Heritage Section 32 Report identifies that Heritage NZ were consulted and that they provided stakeholder feedback supporting the proposed heritage provisions³.</i></p> <p><i>The SIGNS Section 32 Report identifies that a reliance is placed on the Historic Heritage Chapter to manage signs attached to heritage items⁴.</i></p>
12.5.2	Wouldn't it be more helpful to direct those wishing to put signs on a heritage structure for there to be a specific reference to HH-R3 in the primary signs rule?
Officer response:	<p><i>The Proposed District Plan does not typically include specific cross references within rules but relies on the notes to alert Plan User's to other relevant chapters and rules to determine compliance. Note five of the SIGNS - Overview references the Historic Heritage Chapter and rule HH-R3 specifically.</i></p> <p><i>The following amendment is provided should the panel prefer to nest this cross reference within rule SIGN-R1:</i></p> <p>SIGN-R1 General Signs</p> <p>...Activity status: PER</p> <p>1. Any sign: ...</p> <p>(e) For the users of roads, or off-road walking and cycle tracks, and that is for the purpose of direction, track marking, warning, fire restrictions, or interpretation;</p> <p>(f) <u>That satisfies rule HH-R3.</u></p>
13.11.1	What does 'grouped signage' mean?
Urban Design expert response:	The phrase 'grouped signage' is from the Urban Design evidence ⁵ . The term applies to both free-standing and wall mounted types of signage. It is a way to consolidate signage, provide flexibility for changing tenancies and enables signage for shops without a street address.
13.30	If the road reserve is under the authority of Waka Kotahi and they are requesting for no signage overhang in the road reserve of the state highway, then what authority does Council have to reject their request?

³ Section 32 Report - Historic Heritage, P.12.

⁴ Section 32 Report - Signs, P.4

⁵ Section 42A Report - Signs, Appendix 3, paragraph 7.4.

Paragraph	Question from the Hearings Panel
<i>Officer response:</i>	<i>Any signage on a State Highway within the District will continue to require Waka Kotahi approval as the road controlling authority (as per the second note in the SIGN - Overview). The relief was opposed on the basis that the amendments would place an unreasonable consenting burden on applicant's and would require SDC to administer design standards within the district plan on behalf of Waka Kotahi.</i>
13.49	<p>Waka Kotahi⁶ request that changes to requirement SIGN-REQ7 to include standards to improve visibility and safety, including a minimum lettering size for all signs visible from a state highway. For reasons outlined in 13.49, 13.49.1, 13.49.2 the Section 42A Report author rejects the request.</p> <p>Is there a way to accept Waka Kotahi's submission while at the same time avoiding a burden on minor temporary uses?</p>
<i>Officer response:</i>	<p><i>Requirement SIGN-REQ7 has a specific focus on ensuring signage does not resemble traffic signs or signals or in locations they may obscure traffic signs or signals.</i></p> <p><i>In reviewing the additions recommended by Waka Kotahi in their submission, I consider that:</i></p> <p><i>c. The requirement that signs do not obscure driver visibility at accesses, intersection curves, or pedestrian crossings is covered by requirement SIGN-REQ7.1. (c).</i></p> <p><i>d. Compliance with the requirement that signs are located at a right angle to the road may be difficult to achieve based on the orientation of activities relative to the alignment of a State Highway.</i></p> <p><i>e. The need for signs to be setback from any intersection is unclear as it does not prescribe a minimum setback or speed environment.</i></p> <p><i>f. The requirement for signs adjoining State Highways to be suitably frangible upon impact is incorporating standards that are typically required within rather than outside a road corridor.</i></p> <p><i>In respect to the recommended addition of SIGN-REQ7.2, the amendment sought does not include a metric or standard for determining at what point a sign is 'visible' from a State Highway that presents uncertainty for Plan Users. However, it is acknowledged that the Operative District Plan contains rules to manage outdoor signs that are visible from Strategic Roads through minimum lettering and related design standards⁷.</i></p> <p><i>The Signage Baseline Report evaluates the existing Operative District Plan rules relating to this issue against the Christchurch District Plan provisions that had recently been the subject of extensive evidence and mediation⁸. Recommendations 21) and 22) address this matter and do not reference the need for minimum design standards for signs that are visible from a State Highway or Arterial Road. The recommendations relating to the balance of the transport safety matters that were evaluated at the time have been incorporated into rule SIGN-R4 and requirement SIGN-REQ7.</i></p> <p><i>The Signs Section 32 Report identifies that traffic safety is an important consideration when managing signage in the District. The evaluation includes a recommendation that traffic safety is maintained through requirements to ensure</i></p>

⁶ DPR-375.154 Waka Kotahi

⁷ SDP Rural Volume C6 Signs and Noticeboards, 6.4 - Outdoor Signs and Strategic Roads, SDP Township Volume C7 LZ Signs, 7.5 - Outdoor Signs and Strategic Roads and SDP Township Volume C19 BZ Signs Noticeboards, 19.2 Outdoor Signs and Strategic Roads

⁸ SDC Signage Baseline Report, July 2017 - Section 9.2 District Plan provisions, Pg.19 and Section 10.4.8 Transport Safety Matters, Pg.28.

Paragraph	Question from the Hearings Panel
	<p>signage does not obscure or confuse motorists⁹. Once again, these have been incorporated into rule SIGN-R4 and requirement SIGN-REQ7.</p> <p>On balance, I maintain concerns with the specificity of the recommended additions to requirement SIGN-REQ7, including on minor or temporary activities (where they are not subject to the definition of 'Temporary Activities' or the TEMP rules).</p> <p>A further response to this matter can be addressed in the Officer right of reply following the hearing if that would assist the Panel. This response could include technical transport engineering evidence and advice from Waka Kotahi.</p>
General matter	<p>DPR-0422.245 NCF is referenced under both SIGN-P4 and SIGN P5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is that correct?
Officer response:	<p>The Summary of Submissions indicates that DPR-0422.245 NCF only relates to policy SIGN-P4 (Temporary Signs). However, the submission seeks to amend the test for off-site signs within Rural Zones from 'avoid' to 'manage', which is covered by SIGN-P5. The s42 report evaluates the relief sought in the submission against both policies SIGNS-P4 (paragraph 11.24) and SIGNS-P5 (paragraph 11.33) for completeness and in response to this apparent error.</p>
General matter	<p>Could Ms Wolfer's recommendation at her paragraph 9.5 be made as a Schedule 1 clause 16(2) alteration that is of minor effect?</p>
Officer response:	<p>The urban design recommendation acknowledges the submitters request by making it clear that both the Signs and Light chapters apply to illuminated signs. In respect to the first point, objective SIGN-O1 recognises the positive contribution signage makes to the District's economic and community wellbeing, which is further enabled through policy SIGN-P1 (where it is consistent with the remaining policies). I therefore consider that digital signage is appropriately recognised and provided for within the Proposed District Plan. In respect to the second point, the final note in the SIGN - Overview references the Light Chapter to alert Plan User's to the presence of rules within this chapter that must be complied with to be a permitted activity.</p> <p>As a consequence, I do not consider any additional minor changes are necessary, but this matter can be addressed further in the Officer right of reply if that would assist the Panel.</p>

⁹ SDC Signage Section 32 Report, Date - Section 3.2 Evidence Base, P.8 and 6.3 Policies and rules relating to Issues 1 and 2, Pg.20.