

Selwyn District Plan



Section 42A Report

Report on submissions and further submissions

Signs

Craig Friedel

10 March 2022

selwyn.govt.nz/districtplanreview

Contents

List of submitters and further submitters addressed in this report	3
Abbreviations	4
1. Purpose of report.....	5
2. Qualifications and experience	5
3. Scope of report and topic overview.....	6
4. Statutory requirements and planning framework.....	6
5. Procedural matters	8
6. Consideration of submissions	8
7. Definitions relating to signs	8
8. Signs Chapter – Overview	11
9. Signs Chapter – New Provisions for Digital Signage.....	12
10. Signs Chapter – Objective	14
11. Signs Chapter – Policies	15
12. Signs Chapter – Rules	23
13. Signs Chapter – Rule Requirements.....	35
14. Signs Chapter – Matters for Control or Discretion	53
15. Conclusion	57
Appendix 1: Table of Submission Points	58
Appendix 2: Recommended amendments	88
Appendix 3: Supporting Technical Report	91

List of submitters and further submitters addressed in this report

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Abbreviation
DPR-0032	Christchurch City Council	CCC
DPR-0145	Dean Williams, Bunnings Group Limited	Bunnings
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams	-
DPR-0204	JP Singh	-
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	-
DPR-0215	Winstone Aggregates	Winstone
DPR-0250	Go Media Ltd	Go Media
DPR-0269	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Heritage NZ
DPR-0298	Trices Road Re-zoning Group	TRRG
DPR-0345	Porters Alpine Resort	Porters Alpine
DPR-0346	Ceres Professional Trustee Company Ltd & Sally Jean Tohill	Ceres & Tohill
DPR-0349	Natalie Edwards	-
DPR-0353	Horticulture New Zealand	HortNZ
DPR-0358	Rolleston West Residential Limited	RWRL
DPR-0363	Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited	IRHL
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	Fonterra
DPR-0371	Christchurch International Airport Limited	CIAL
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs South Island Limited & Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited	Foodstuffs
DPR-0374	Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited	RIHL
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Waka Kotahi
DPR-0384	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	RIDL
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square Limited	RSL
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	Woolworths
DPR-0407	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Forest & Bird
DPR-0409	Hughes Developments Limited	Hughes
DPR-0410	Urban Estates Limited	Urban Estates
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora - Homes & Communities	Kāinga Ora
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers of New Zealand - North Canterbury	NCFF
DPR-0441	Trustpower Limited	Trustpower
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Transpower
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttelton Port Company Limited	LPC
DPR-0456	Four Stars Development & Gould Developments Ltd	Four Stars
DPR-0461	Dunweavin 2020 Ltd	Dunweavin
DPR-0492	Kevler Development Ltd	Kevler
DPR-0493	Gallina Nominees Ltd & Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie

Please refer to **Appendix 1** to see where each submission point is addressed within this report.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used throughout this report are:

Abbreviation	Full text
CRPS	Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013
DPR	District Plan Review
IMP	Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013
Planning Standards	National Planning Standards
NESETA	National Environmental Standard for Electricity Transmission Activities
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020
PDP	Proposed Selwyn District Plan
RMA or Act	Resource Management Act 1991
SDC	Selwyn District Council
SDP	Operative Selwyn District Plan

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 This report is prepared under section 42A of the RMA in relation to the Signs Chapter in the PDP. The purpose of this report is to provide the Hearings Panel with a summary and analysis of the submissions received on this topic and to make recommendations on either retaining the PDP provisions without amendment or making amendments to the PDP in response to those submissions.
- 1.2 The recommendations are informed by both the technical information provided by Ms Gabi Wolfer, Senior Urban Designer/Town Planner at SDC (see **Appendix 3**) and the evaluation undertaken by myself as the planning author. In preparing this report I have had regard to the section 42A report on Strategic Directions prepared by Mr Robert Love, the Overview section 42A report that addresses the higher order statutory planning and legal context, also prepared by Mr Love, and the Part 1 section 42A report prepared by Ms Jessica Tuilaepa.
- 1.3 The conclusions reached and recommendations made in this report are not binding on the Hearings Panel. It should not be assumed that the Hearings Panel will reach the same conclusions having considered all the information in the submissions and the evidence to be brought before them, by the submitters.

2. Qualifications and experience

- 2.1 My full name is Craig Robert Friedel. I work for Harrison Grierson as a Technical Lead – Planning, Associate. I am engaged by the Council as a consultant planner and have been assisting on the Signage topic since December 2021. My qualifications include a Bachelor of Geography from the University of Canterbury and a Postgraduate Diploma in Environmental Policy and Planning and Master's in Environmental Policy and Management (Distinction) from Lincoln University. I have been a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute since 2009.
- 2.1 I have 16 years' experience as a resource management planner, working for local authorities and a multi-disciplinary consultancy. I was also previously employed by SDC as a Senior Strategy and Policy Planner between 2008 to 2018. During this time, I prepared structure plans, growth strategies, residential and commercial zone changes to the SDP, processed private plan change requests and was involved in the initial phases of the DPR.
- 2.2 In my current role, I have assisted SDC with the initial preparation of the Urban Growth, Monitoring and Transport chapters in the PDP, processed resource consent applications and private plan change requests and prepared technical reports on urban growth-related issues. I am currently assisting with the Council's spatial planning works programme and preparing evidence for the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori in the PDP.
- 2.3 I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I have complied with it when preparing this report. Having reviewed the submitters and further submitters relevant to this topic I advise there are no conflicts of interest that would impede me from providing independent advice to the Hearings Panel.

3. Scope of report and topic overview

- 3.1 This report considers the submissions and further submissions that were received in relation to the Signs Chapter and the signage definitions in the Definitions Chapter.
- 3.2 Recommendations are made to either retain provisions without amendment, or delete, add to, or amend the provisions. All recommended amendments are shown by way of strikeout and underlining in **Appendix 2** to this Report. Footnoted references to a submitter number, submission point and the abbreviation for their title provide the scope for each recommended change. Where it is considered that an amendment may be appropriate, but it would be beneficial to hear further evidence before making a final recommendation, this is made clear within the report. Where no amendments are recommended to a provision, submissions points that sought the retention of the provision without amendment are not footnoted.
- 3.3 Clause 16(2) of the RMA allows a local authority to make an amendment to a proposed plan without using a Schedule 1 process, where such an alteration is of minor effect, or may correct any minor errors. A number of alterations have already been made to the PDP using clause 16(2) and these are documented in reports available on the Council's website. Where a submitter has requested the same or similar changes to the PDP that fall within the ambit of clause 16(2), then such amendments will continue to be made and documented as clause 16(2) amendments and identified by way of a footnote in this section 42A report.

4. Statutory requirements and planning framework

Resource Management Act 1991

- 4.1 The PDP must be prepared in accordance with the Council's functions under section 31 of the RMA; Part 2 of the RMA; the requirements of sections 74 and 75, and its obligation to prepare, and have particular regard to, an evaluation report under section 32 of the RMA, any further evaluation required by section 32AA of the RMA; any national policy statement, the New Zealand coastal policy statement, national planning standards; and any regulations¹. Regard is also to be given to the CRPS, any regional plan, district plans of adjacent territorial authorities, and the IMP.
- 4.2 As set out in the [‘Overview’ Section 32 Report](#), and [‘Overview’ s42a Report](#), there are a number of higher order planning documents and strategic plans that provide direction and guidance for the preparation and content of the PDP. These documents are discussed in more detail within this report where relevant to the assessment of submission points. This report also addresses any definitions that are specific to this topic, but otherwise relies on the section 42A report that addresses definitions more broadly.
- 4.3 The assessment of submission points is made in the context of the section 32 evaluations already undertaken with respect to this topic, being:
 - [Strategic Directions](#)
 - [Signs](#)

¹ Section 74 RMA

- 4.4 All recommended amendments to provisions since the initial section 32 assessment was undertaken must be documented in a subsequent section 32AA evaluation and this has been undertaken for each sub-topic addressed in this report.

National Planning Standards

- 4.5 As set out in the [PDP Overview Section 42A Report](#), the Planning Standards were introduced to improve the consistency of council plans and policy statements. The Planning Standards were gazetted and came into effect on 5 April 2019. The PDP must be prepared in accordance with the Planning Standards.
- 4.6 The Planning Standards require that signage provisions are addressed in a general district-wide matters Signs Chapter. The Planning Standards also contain the definitions of ‘sign’ and ‘official sign’, with the PDP adopting these definitions.

National Policy Statement

- 4.7 The following national instruments are relevant to this topic:
- National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities Regulations 2009 (NESETA).
 - National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).
- 4.8 Clauses 23 and 24 of the NESETA set out permitted and restricted discretionary standards for signs affixed to transmission line support structures. There is a note in the Signs Chapter overview which explains that the NESETA “... manages the size and area of signs on a transmission line support structure of an existing transmission line to identify the structure or its owner, or to help with safety or navigation”.
- 4.9 The NPS-UD recognises the national significance of urban environments and provides direction on planning to establish well-functioning urban environments. While SDC is identified as a Tier 1 local authority, the Tier 1 urban environment referred to in Table 1 of the NPS-UD is Christchurch. For the purposes of applying the NPS-UD, the ‘urban environment’ is considered to explicitly relate to the Greater Christchurch sub-region, as shown on Map A within Chapter 6 of the CRPS. The NPS-UD provides policy direction on the whole district.
- 4.10 Objective 1 of the NPS-UD aims to achieve well-functioning urban environments across New Zealand and Objective 4 seeks to ensure urban environments, develop and change over time in response to diverse and changing needs of people, communities, and future generations. Signage is required for health and safety, wayfinding and direction, and advertising, and thereby contributes to the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of people and communities in the district. One of the key considerations for signage is the extent to which they fulfil these roles whilst maintaining the amenity of urban environments.
- 4.11 There are no other relevant National Policy Statements or National Environmental Standards.

5. Procedural matters

- 5.1 At the time of writing this section 42A report there has not been any pre-hearing conferences, clause 8AA meetings or expert witness conferencing in relation to submissions on this topic. No other procedural matters have arisen.

6. Consideration of submissions

Overview of submissions

- 6.1 There are 168 submission points received in relation to the Signs Chapter. The common themes in the submissions relate to:

- Signage in the GIZ and LFRZ areas;
- Digital and LED signage displays;
- Real estate advertising signs;
- The size and location of signage on buildings; and
- Signage and traffic safety.

- 6.2 Although submitters are seeking changes relating to these themes, the majority of submissions received to the Signs Chapter are in support and request the provisions in the chapter to be retained as notified.

Structure of this report

- 6.3 This report first evaluates the submissions received on the definitions and then addresses the higher order framework that affects the whole chapter, followed by the provisions within the Signs Chapter in the order that these appear in the PDP.
- 6.4 The assessment of submissions generally applies the following format: Submission Information; Analysis; and Recommendation and Amendments. Where an amendment is recommended the applicable section 32AA assessment will follow on from the Recommendations section for that issue.

7. Definitions relating to signs

Introduction

- 7.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to the PDP definitions of 'Primary Building' 'frontage', 'Area of a Sign', 'Free Standing Sign', and 'Off-site Sign'.

Submissions

- 7.2 Eight submission points and 20 further submission points were received in relation to this subtopic.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	043	Primary Building Frontage	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams	FS380	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS455	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS412	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept submission in part
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS460	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept submission in part
DPR-0492	Kevler	FS390	Primary Building Frontage	Support	Accept submission in part
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS436	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.
DPR-0363	IRHL	042	Primary Building Frontage	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams	FS701	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS626	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS579	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept submission in part
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS619	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO
DPR-0492	Kevler	FS234	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS813	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.
DPR-0370	Fonterra	006	Free Standing Sign	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Any sign which stands upright without having to be that is not attached to any building, post or other structure.
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS739	Free Standing Sign	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part
DPR-0370	Fonterra	004	Area of a Sign	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Retain as notified
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS737	Area of a Sign	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part
DPR-0374	RIHL	048	Primary Building Frontage	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams	FS515	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS883	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS730	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept submission in part
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS762	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.
DPR-0492	Kevler	FS078	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS639	Primary Building Frontage	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	006	Off-Site Sign	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	050	Primary Building Frontage	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square Limited	005	Primary Building Frontage	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

7.3 The majority of submissions to the Signs definitions are in support and seek to retain the provisions as notified. I recommend the submissions from RWRL², IRHL³, Fonterra⁴, RIHL⁵, Waka Kotahi⁶, RIDL⁷, and Rolleston Square⁸ in support are accepted.

7.4 Fonterra⁹ recommends amendments to the definition of ‘free-standing signs’ as follows: “Any sign which stands upright ~~without having to be~~ that is not attached to any building, post or other structure”. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

7.4.1 I understand that Fonterra’s wording changes are intended to improve the clarity of the definition. However, the use of more directive wording (for example, “...that is not...”) generates another definitional issue as virtually all free-standing signs are required to be attached to poles or other support structures. This issue already arises with the notified definition as freestanding signs are typically required to be attached to poles or structures to keep them upright.

7.4.2 I consider that freestanding signs are defined more clearly in other district plans within the Canterbury region. For example, in the Christchurch District Plan ‘freestanding signs’ are defined as “... a sign which is fixed to the ground rather than a building. It may be erected on a pole or other support structure”. The corresponding Waimakariri Proposed District Plan

² DPR-358.043 RWRL

³ DPR-363.042 IRHL

⁴ DPR-370.004 Fonterra

⁵ DPR-374.048 RIHL

⁶ DPR-375.006 Waka Kotahi

⁷ DPR-384.050 RIDL

⁸ DPR-386.005 Rolleston Square

⁹ DPR-370.006 Fonterra

definition states that “... any sign which stands wholly on its own with its own support structure(s). it includes any sign affixed to a trailer or vehicle that has the primary purpose of advertising.”

- 7.4.3 In my view the PDP definition of ‘freestanding sign’ ideally requires further amendment using wording that is consistent with either the Christchurch or Waimakariri District Plans. However, there is insufficient scope in the Fonterra submission to undertake this and I do not consider this can be addressed through a clause 16(2) amendment as the entire definition requires redrafting. As such, this matter is outside of the scope provided in the submission, is not a minor error or alteration with minor effect so cannot be addressed under clause 16(2) and may need to be addressed through a subsequent plan process.

Recommendation

- 7.5 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.
- 7.6 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

8. Signs Chapter – Overview

Introduction

- 8.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to the Overview section of the chapter.

Submissions

- 8.2 Seven submission points were received in relation to this subtopic.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	301	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	290	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	296	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0384	RIDL	308	Support	Retain as notified
DPR375	Waka Kotahi	136	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0441	Trustpower	141	Support in Part	Signs associated with emergency services facilities, <u>renewable electricity generation</u> , and network utilities are subject to Rule EI-R23 in the Energy and Infrastructure Chapter.
DPR-0446	Transpower	126	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

- 8.3 RWRL¹⁰, IRHL¹¹, RIHL¹², Waka Kotahi¹³, Transpower¹⁴ and RIDL¹⁵ support the Overview section of the Signs Chapter and request it is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

¹⁰ DPR-358.301 RWRL

¹¹ DPR-363.290 IRHL

¹² DPR-374.296 RIHL

¹³ DPR-375.136 Waka Kotahi

¹⁴ DPR-0446.126 Transpower

¹⁵ DPR-384.308 RIDL

- 8.4 Trustpower¹⁶ requests the inclusion of the term “*renewable electricity generation*” in the Overview section of the Signs Chapter. Trustpower state that electricity generation is not a network utility and request that it is specifically included for clarity. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

8.4.1 Rule EI-R23 manages signage that is either an official sign, is displayed on an emergency services facility site or on a network utility as a permitted activity. I consider that this rule achieves the relief being sought by the submitters and avoids the duplication that could arise with an amended Overview Statement.

8.4.2 Renewable electricity generation is no longer the exclusive domain of network utility operators such as Trustpower. If amended, the reference would apply to all households and businesses that utilise a wind turbine, solar panels or other sources of renewable energy sources, which could undermine the effectiveness of the Signs Chapter.

Recommendation

- 8.5 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.
- 8.6 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

9. Signs Chapter – New Provisions for Digital Signage

Introduction

- 9.1 This section responds to the submission points across the Signs Chapter that request new provisions for digital signage.

Submissions

- 9.2 Three submission points and four further submissions points were received in relation to this subtopic.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0250	Go Media	001	SIGN	Oppose In Part	Amend the plan to recognise the positive effects of digital advertising and expressly enable this signage in the District.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS180	SIGN	Oppose	Reject the proposal to expressly enable digital signage.
DPR-0250	Go Media	002	SIGN	Oppose In Part	Considers that off-site signs should not be treated differently from any other sign, including due to the environmental effects being no different to any other sign.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS181	SIGN	Oppose	Reject the proposal to expressly enable off-site signage.
DPR-0250	Go Media	003	New	Oppose In Part	Amend the Rules to provide for off-site digital advertising as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with

¹⁶ DPR-441.141 Trustpower

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
					rule requirements which reflect recognised industry standards (including industry size requirements). Where compliance cannot be achieved with specified rule requirements, resource consent should be required as a restricted discretionary activity.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS182	New	Oppose	<i>Reject the request for off-site digital signs to be a permitted activity and retain the existing discretionary and non-complying statuses for offsite signs.</i>
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS312	New	Support	Adopt

Analysis

- 9.3 The submissions from Go Media¹⁷ request the inclusion of new provisions that address LED and digital display signage, including as a permitted activity where recognised industry standards are met. Go Media consider that the PDP should expressly recognise the positive effects of digital advertising and expressly enable this type of signage in the district.
- 9.4 As a new advertising medium LED and digital displays are becoming commonplace across the country. Given it is relatively new technology, many existing district plans do not specifically reference digital signage. The PDP is an opportunity to ensure the Council has a planning regime in place to appropriately manage digital signage. In my view, the PDP achieves this by establishing an objective and policies that apply to all types of signage and through the rules, requirements and matters for control and discretion in the Signs Chapter for effectively managing these activities, (including SIGN-REQ6 and SIGN-MAT2). The urban design report (in **Appendix 3**) notes that illuminated signs are also recognised and managed in the LIGHT Chapter, which includes rules and requirements to manage artificial outdoor lighting and incorporates controls based on where the activity occurs. This evaluation also reiterates the need for signage, including illuminated signs, to be managed through a resource consent process to avoid visual clutter and maintain the visual relationship between signage and the activity being advertised.
- 9.5 On this basis, I recommend the submissions are rejected for the following reasons:
- 9.5.1 Referencing industry standards is appropriate to ensure consistent design and operation of digital signage (for example, avoiding light spill effects that are effectively managed under the LIGHT Chapter rules and requirements). In my view, industry standards do not resolve the planning issue of ensuring that digital signage is appropriate in the specific context of the character and amenity of the surrounding area. The appropriateness of digital signage within any given site will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis to recognise the context of the location, which is what the PDP facilitates through the resource consent process.
- 9.5.2 Digital signage is still an evolving medium and I consider controls are necessary, particularly to ensure transport safety and amenity are maintained. As time goes on, it is likely that more

¹⁷ DPR-250.001, DPR-250.002, DPR-250.003 Go Media

existing signage will be replaced by digital signage, particularly in the district's larger centres. At this point in time, the cumulative effects of this change on transport safety, as well as the general amenity and character of surrounding areas, are not known and there should be scope in the PDP to evaluate these through a resource consent process.

- 9.5.3 The submitter considers that digital signs should be a permitted activity but has not provided details on any requested wording changes.

Recommendation

- 9.6 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.
- 9.7 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

10. Signs Chapter – Objective

Introduction

- 10.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to objective SIGN-O1, the single objective in the Signs Chapter.
- 10.2 Objective SIGN-O1 provides a succinct statement of the PDP's objective in managing signage.

Submissions

- 10.3 Eight submission points and one further submission point were received in relation to this subtopic.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0353	HortNZ	219	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0358	RWRL	302	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	291	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	070	Support In Part	Not specified.
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS802	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part
DPR-0374	RIHL	297	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	137	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	309	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0422	NCFF	243	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

- 10.4 HortNZ¹⁸, R WRL¹⁹, IRHL²⁰, Fonterra²¹, RIHL²², Waka Kotahi²³, RIDL²⁴ and NCFF²⁵ have lodged submissions that either fully support or support in part the existing wording. All the submitters request the objective is retained as notified.

¹⁸ DPR-353.219 HortNZ

¹⁹ DPR-358.302 RWRL

²⁰ DPR-363.291 IRHL

²¹ DPR-370.070 Fonterra

²² DPR-374.297 RIHL

²³ DPR-375.137 Waka Kotahi

²⁴ DPR-384.309 RIDL

²⁵ DPR-422.243 NCFF

- 10.5 I recommend the submissions in support from HortNZ, RWRL, IRHL, Fonterra, RIHL, Waka Kotahi, RIDL and NCFF are accepted. All submissions on objective SIGN-O1 are in support and no further changes or amendments are considered necessary.

Recommendation

- 10.6 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain objective SIGN-O1 as notified.
- 10.7 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

11. Signs Chapter – Policies

Introduction

- 11.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to policies SIGN-P1 to SIGN-P5. The five PDP policies implement objective SIGN-O1 by enabling signage that is an integral component of industrial, commercial, community activities, and Important Infrastructure, managing signage located in areas with high environmental values, providing for temporary signage, managing signage attached to buildings and avoiding off-site signs in residential and rural zones.

Submissions

- 11.2 32 submission points and five further submission points were received in relation to this subtopic.

Policy SIGN-P1 (Enable signs as a component of specified activities)

- 11.3 Policy SIGN-P1 enables signs that are an integral component of industrial, commercial, and community activities and Important Infrastructure.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0204	JP Singh	006	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0215	Winstone	048	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Enable signs that are an integral component of industrial, commercial, <u>primary production or mineral extraction</u> and community activities and important infrastructure.
DPR-0349	Natalie Edwards	003	Support In Part	Not specified.
DPR-0358	RWRL	303	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	292	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0370	Fonterra	071	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Enable signs that are an integral component of industrial, commercial, and community activities and important infrastructure, <u>including health and safety signs, directional signs and any signage required by regulatory purposes</u> .
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS803	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS111	Support	Allow the submission point.
DPR-0374	RIHL	298	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	138	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	310	Support	Retain as notified

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0422	NCFF	244	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Enable signs that are an integral component of industrial, commercial, <u>rural production</u> and community activities and important infrastructure.
DPR-0446	Transpower	131	Support	Retain as notified.

Analysis

- 11.4 JP Singh²⁶, RWRL²⁷, IRHL²⁸, RIHL²⁹, Waka Kotahi³⁰, Transpower³¹ and RIDL³² have lodged submissions that support policy SIGNS-P1 being retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part.
- 11.5 The submission from Natalie Edwards³³ supports policy SIGN-P1 in part. The submission considers that the policy this is restrictive for sites that do not have a road frontage, particularly if they are small entities. It is understood that this submission relates to site specific zoning request and how the Signs Chapter applies to small, relatively contained, non-rural sites. This issue is evaluated in Section 13 in respect to the submission³⁴ received on the GRUZ-PREC1. As a result, I recommend this submission is accepted in part based on my recommendations relating to the Ceres & Tothill submission.
- 11.6 NCFF³⁵ and Winstone³⁶ request the addition of “*Rural Production*”, “*Primary Production*” and “*Mineral Extraction*” to the listed activities in policy SIGN-P1. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part for the following reasons:
- 11.6.1 These activities are separately defined in the Definitions Chapter and each definition encompasses several subsidiary activities for example, “*Forestry Quarrying*” or “*Free Range Poultry Farming*” is a subset of “*Rural Production*”. I note that “*Mineral Extraction*” is defined as “*any mining or quarrying activity*”, which is a subset of the “*Primary Production*” definition. Rural or primary production activities do not fit within the existing activities listed in policy SIGNS-P1 of industrial, commercial or community activities.
- 11.6.2 Policy SIGN-P1 is an enabling policy that includes a closed list of specific activities. In my view the policy therefore needs to ensure it has sufficient breadth to cover signage for both urban and rural activities. The policy needs to comprehensively address rural-based activities, which would be better achieved by including the additional activities sought by the submitters to implement the economic wellbeing component of objective SIGN-O1.
- 11.7 On this basis, I recommend policy SIGN-P1 is amended to include a reference to “*rural production*” and “*primary production*”, noting that “*primary production*” is a subset of “*rural production*” and “*mineral extraction*” is a subset of the “*primary production*” definition so are covered by association.

²⁶ DPR-0204.006 JP Singh

²⁷ DPR-0358.303 RWRL

²⁸ DPR-0363.292 IRHL

²⁹ DPR-0374.298 RIHL

³⁰ DPR-0375.138 Waka Kotahi

³¹ DPR-0446.131 Transpower

³² DPR-0384.310 RIDL

³³ DPR-0349.003 Natalie Edwards

³⁴ DPR-346.018 Ceres & Tothill

³⁵ DPR-422.244 NCFF

³⁶ DPR-215.048 Winstone

I note that the rules and assessment criteria establish a different management regime for signage in urban and rural zones and this is discussed in later sections of this report.

11.8 Fonterra³⁷ request the inclusion of specific wording in policy SIGN-P1 for signage relating to health and safety, directional signage and “*any other signage required by regulatory purposes*”.

11.8.1 I recommend this submission is rejected. The definition of ‘sign’ that is prescribed in the Planning Standards already includes these matters, making any further specificity in the wording of policy SIGN-P1 unnecessary.

Recommendations and amendments

11.9 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel:

a) Amend policy SIGN-P1 as shown in **Appendix 2** to ensure it has sufficient breadth to cover signage for rural production activities.

11.10 The recommended amendments to policy SIGN-P1 are set out in **Appendix 2**.

11.11 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

11.12 The scale of change does not require a section 32AA evaluation as the recommended changes further strengthen the outcomes rather than change them.

Policy SIGN-P2 (Character and amenity values)

11.13 Policy SIGN-P2 manages the size, design, location, and number of signs to maintain the character and amenity values of the surrounding environment.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	304	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	293	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	299	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0384	RIDL	311	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

11.14 Submissions from RWRL³⁸, IRHL³⁹, RIHL⁴⁰, and RIDL⁴¹ support the retention of policy SIGN-P2 and request it is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

Recommendation

11.15 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

11.16 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

³⁷ DPR-370.071 Fonterra

³⁸ DPR-358.304 RWRL

³⁹ DPR-363.293 IRHL

⁴⁰ DPR-374.299 RIHL

⁴¹ DPR-384.311 RIDL

Policy SIGN-P3 (Signs attached to buildings)

11.17 Policy SIGN-P3 provides direction relating to the management of the size, design, location, and number of signs attached to buildings.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	305	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	294	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	300	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0384	RIDL	312	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

11.18 RWRL⁴², IRHL⁴³, RIHL⁴⁴, and RIDL⁴⁵ have lodged submissions in support and request policy SIGN-P3 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

Recommendation

11.19 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

11.20 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

Policy SIGN-P4 (Temporary Signs)

11.21 Policy SIGN-P4 provides for temporary signs, including off-site signs, where their duration, size, and number are limited to maintain the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0353	HortNZ	220	Oppose In Part	Amend to consider situations where off-site signs in the rural environment might be appropriate.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS185	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0358	RWRL	306	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	295	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	301	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	140	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 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 maintain the safe, effective and efficient operation of the land transport network.</u>
DPR-0384	RIDL	313	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0409	Hughes	040	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	010	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0422	NCFF	245	Oppose In Part	Delete reference to “avoid” and amend to consider situations where such signage may be appropriate in the rural environment. “Control” may be an appropriate alternative term.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS205	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.

⁴² DPR-358.305 RWRL

⁴³ DPR-363.294 IRHL

⁴⁴ DPR-374.300 RIHL

⁴⁵ DPR-384.312 RIDL

Analysis

- 11.22 Submissions from RWRL⁴⁶, IRHL⁴⁷, RIHL⁴⁸, Hughes⁴⁹, Urban Estates⁵⁰, and RIDL⁵¹ support policy SIGN-P4 and request it is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part.
- 11.23 HortNZ⁵² request that policy SIGN-P4 is amended to consider situations where off-site signs in the rural environment might be appropriate. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:
- 11.23.1 Based on the section 32 evaluations completed to date I am satisfied that the existing wording in policy SIGN-P4 is appropriate in terms of balancing the provision of temporary signage in the rural environment with the maintenance of the character and visual amenity values of this area.
 - 11.23.2 Significant changes in character and amenity can occur if signs are poorly managed. For example, a proliferation of signage can create visual clutter and change the amenity of rural environments to one that has a more overt commercial character that could progressively undermine the amenity attributed to these areas.
 - 11.23.3 The submission from HortNZ does not outline any potential wording changes.
- 11.24 The NCF⁵³ submission appears to relate to policy SIGN-P5 as the requested relief does not correspond to the wording in policy SIGN-P4. I consider this submission in the following section in the context of evaluating the submissions received on policy SIGN-P5.
- 11.25 Waka Kotahi⁵⁴ requests the inclusion of additional wording in policy SIGN-P4 to ensure the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the land transport network is maintained. I recommend this submission is accepted in part for the following reasons:
- 11.25.1 The Signs Chapter has a single objective (SIGN-O1) which states that “*Signs contribute to the District’s economic and community wellbeing, and transport safety*”. The five policies directly implement the economic and community wellbeing aspect with an emphasis placed on maintaining character and amenity values. However, transport safety is not directly referenced in the policies other than in the context of Important Infrastructure, which includes the strategic transport network. Consideration of transport safety can be inferred from references in the other policies to design controls. For example, policy SIGN-P3 ensures signage is proportionate to building scale and is not the primary visual element, or policy SIGN-P5, which seeks to avoid off-site signs in residential and rural zones. However, to assist with the implementation of objective SIGN-O1, I support the inclusion of a reference to transport safety in policy SIGN-P4.

⁴⁶ DPR-358.306 RWRL

⁴⁷ DPR-363.295 IRHL

⁴⁸ DPR-374.301 RIHL

⁴⁹ DPR-409.040 Hughes Development

⁵⁰ DPR-410.010 Urban Estates

⁵¹ DPR-384.313 RIDL

⁵² DPR-353.220 HortNZ

⁵³ DPR-422.245 Federated Farmers

⁵⁴ DPR-375.140 Waka Kotahi

11.25.2 While I agree with its intent, I consider that the wording in Waka Kotahi's requested relief is unnecessarily detailed for a policy. In my view, Waka Kotahi's relief could be achieved through the addition of the words "*...and ensure transport safety*" at the end of policy SIGN-P4. In practice, temporary signs will need to meet rule SIGN-R4 and requirements SIGN-REQ6 and SIGN-REQ7 by ensuring the proposed sign is not of a colour and design that resembles a traffic sign or signal and is not in a location that obscures a traffic sign or signal from view. The inclusion of the words "*and ensure transport safety*" in policy SIGN-P4 will assist decision makers when determining the appropriateness of a sign that does not meet this rule and or the related requirements.

Recommendations and amendments

11.26 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel:

- a) Amend policy SIGN-P4 as shown in **Appendix 2** to ensure transport safety is included in the policy direction regarding temporary signs.

11.27 The recommended amendments to policy SIGN-P4 are set out in **Appendix 2**.

11.28 It is recommended that the submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

11.29 The scale of change does not require a section 32AA evaluation as the recommended amendments further strengthen the outcomes sought rather than fundamentally changing them.

Policy SIGN-P5 (Off-Site Signs)

11.30 Policy SIGN-P5 directs that off-site signage should be avoided in residential and rural zones. Where signage is located in other zones, the policy aims to ensure that it is compatible with the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area, particularly where they may be visible from the RESZ or GRUZ.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	307	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	296	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	302	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	141	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Avoid off-site signs in Residential and Rural Zones and ensure restrict that off-site signs in all other zones are compatible with to maintain the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area, particularly where they are visible from any Residential or Rural Zone, and ensure the safe, effective and efficient operation of the strategic transport network.
DPR-0422	NCFF	245	Oppose In Part	Delete reference to "avoid" and amend to consider situations where such signage may be appropriate in the rural environment. "Control" may be an appropriate alternative term.
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS163	Oppose	Disallow the submission point.
DPR-0384	RIDL	314	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

11.31 Submissions from RWRL⁵⁵, IRHL⁵⁶, RIHL⁵⁷, and RIDL⁵⁸ request policy SIGN-P5 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part.

11.32 Waka Kotahi⁵⁹ requests wording changes to policy SIGN-P5 to emphasise the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the strategic transport network. I recommend this submission is accepted in part for the following reasons:

11.32.1 The direction in objective SIGN-O1 is to ensure signs contribute to economic and community wellbeing and transport safety. I acknowledge there is an absence of express direction in the existing policies regarding transport safety. However, Waka Kotahi's requested wording changes remove the enabling aspects in policy SIGN-P5, including for signs located in the LFRZ or GIZ zones that are not visible from any residential or rural zone. In my view, a reference to ensuring transport safety is also better placed in policy SIGN-P2 as a material consideration (alongside character and amenity value considerations) in managing the size, number, location, and number of signs. However, there are no submission points seeking this relief.

11.32.2 Waka Kotahi's requested relief also extends beyond a consideration of transport safety to require a consideration of the effects of signs on the "*effective and efficient operation of the strategic transport network*". Under objective SIGN-O1, transport network effectiveness and efficiency are a subset of economic and community wellbeing and is implemented in policy SIGN-P1 by enabling signs that are an integral component of "*Important Infrastructure*" (which includes the strategic transport network). Accordingly, I do not consider that an outright restriction of off-site signs in all zones outside the residential and rural zones under policy SIGN-P5 is necessary to ensure transport network efficiency and effectiveness.

11.32.3 To achieve objective SIGN-O1 I support an amended policy SIGN-P5 that includes a reference to transport safety. The wording changes are within the scope of Waka Kotahi's submission. The inclusion of this reference to transport safety addresses the existing policy gap by providing a rationale for the transport-related rules and requirements that follow in the Signs chapter.

11.32.4 The remainder of the wording changes sought by Waka Kotahi significantly amend the intent of policy SIGN-P5 to maintain the character and visual amenity values across the district, with a particular emphasis on the amenity of the residential and rural zones. These changes are not supported as a result.

11.33 As noted above in the analysis of the submissions received on policy SIGN-P4, NCF⁶⁰ request that policy SIGN-P4 is amended by deleting the "*avoid*" reference and to amend the wording to consider situations where such signage may be appropriate in the rural environment. NCF state that

⁵⁵ DPR-358.307 RWRL

⁵⁶ DPR-363.296 IRHL

⁵⁷ DPR-374.302 RIHL

⁵⁸ DPR-384.314 RIDL

⁵⁹ DPR-375.141 Waka Kotahi

⁶⁰ DPR-422.245 NCF

“control” may be an appropriate alternative term. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

11.33.1 Off-site signs in the rural environment are likely to generate adverse effects on the amenity and character of this environment. It is therefore appropriate to avoid off-site signs located in rural zones as they may not relate to a rural activity and introduce a commercial element into an environment that is otherwise free of overt advertising material.

Recommendations and amendments

11.34 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel:

- a) Amend policy SIGN-P5 as shown in **Appendix 2** to ensure transport safety is included in the policy direction regarding off-site signs.

11.35 The recommended amendments to policy SIGN-P5 are set out in **Appendix 2**.

11.36 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

11.37 The scale of change does not require a section 32AA evaluation as the recommended changes further strengthen the outcomes sought rather than changes them.

Signs Chapter: New Policy

11.38 A submission from Waka Kotahi⁶¹ seeks to include a new policy to manage the size, design, content, location, and number of signs to maintain the safe, effective, and efficient operation of the land transport network. Waka Kotahi contend that the current policy framework enables signage where it is an integral part of Important Infrastructure (policy SIGN-P1), but does not manage adverse effects on the safe, effective, and efficient functioning of the land transport network resulting from other signage.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	139	Policies	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Insert as follows: <u>Manage the size, design, content, location and number of signs to maintain the safe, effective and efficient operation of the land transport network.</u>

Analysis

11.39 I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

11.39.1 As discussed above in relation to policy SIGN-P5, the direction in objective SIGN-O1 is to ensure signs contribute to economic and community wellbeing and transport safety.

11.39.2 I acknowledge that there is an absence of express direction in the existing SIGN policies regarding transport safety. However, as noted above, Waka Kotahi’s requested relief also extends beyond a consideration of transport safety to require a consideration of the effects

⁶¹ DPR-375.139 Waka Kotahi

of signs on the “*effective and efficient operation of the strategic transport network*”. Under objective SIGN-O1, transport network effectiveness and efficiency are a subset of economic and community wellbeing, which in my view is implemented in policy SIGN-P1 by enabling signs that are an integral component of “*Important Infrastructure*” (which includes the strategic transport network).

Recommendation

11.40 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

11.41 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

12. Signs Chapter – Rules

Introduction

12.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to rules SIGN-R1 to R5.

Submissions

12.2 38 submissions points and 36 further submission points were received in relation to this subtopic.

SIGN-R1 General Signs

12.3 Rule SIGN-R1 includes a list of permitted activity qualifiers, which includes signage for direction and wayfinding, official signs including road signs, community information, and signage within building that is not affixed to a window.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0269	Heritage NZ	027	Oppose In Part	Amend the Signs section of the Proposed Plan to clarify that the addition of a sign to a heritage building is not a permitted activity.
DPR-0358	RWRL	308	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	297	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	303	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	142	Support In Part	Amend Rule SIGN-R1.1 to include: That is an official sign <u>(including LED signs used for official sign purposes)</u> ;
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	143	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0384	RIDL	315	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0215	Winstone	049	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

12.4 Submissions from RWRL⁶², IRHL⁶³, RIHL⁶⁴, Waka Kotahi⁶⁵, Winstone⁶⁶ and RIDL⁶⁷ support rule SIGN-R1 and request it is retained. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

⁶² DPR-0358.308 RWRL

⁶³ DPR-0363. 297 IRHL

⁶⁴ DPR-0374.303 RIHL

⁶⁵ DPR-375.143 Waka Kotahi

⁶⁶ DPR-0215.049 Winstone

⁶⁷ DPR-0384.315 RIDL

12.5 Heritage NZ⁶⁸ requests rule SIGN-R1 is amended to clarify that the addition of a sign to a heritage building is not a permitted activity. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

12.5.1 Under rule HH-R3, alterations or additions to a heritage item listed in schedule HH-SCHED2 require a restricted discretionary activity consent. The definition of ‘alteration’ includes “...the addition of any signs to a building”. The definition includes any works which result in changes to the heritage fabric of the building. Rule SIGN-R1 is preceded by explanatory text alerting plan users of the need to review other parts of the PDP to determine if a consent is required.

12.5.2 The scope of rule SIGN-R1 includes signage that is commonly found on heritage items, including official signs such as plaques or directional signage for visitors. Depending on their location or method of fixture, these signs may not require a consent as they do not constitute alterations to a heritage item. I consider the existing explanatory text is sufficient to direct plan users to review other chapters such as the heritage chapter and then ascertain whether a consent is required. A blanket statement in rule SIGN-R1 requiring all signage additions to heritage buildings needing resource consent preempts this assessment and is not supported.

12.6 Waka Kotahi⁶⁹ request that rule SIGN-R1.1 is amended by including an additional reference to LED signs used for official sign purposes. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

12.6.1 ‘Official Sign’ is defined in the NPS and PDP as “... all signs required or provided for under any statute or regulation, or are otherwise related to public safety”. This definition includes all signs that meet the stated purposes, regardless of the type of display or whether it is illuminated. For this reason, I do not consider it is necessary to include express references to LED signs in rule SIGN-R1.

Recommendation

12.7 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

12.8 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGN-R2 Temporary Signs

12.9 Rule SIGN-R2 provides for temporary signs where they comply with controls on the location, duration, number of signs, and requirements SIGN-REQ1-4 and SIGN-REQ6-7.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	309	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	298	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	304	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	144	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	316	Support	Retain as notified

⁶⁸ DPR-269.027 Heritage NZ

⁶⁹ DPR-375.142 Waka Kotahi

Analysis

12.10 Submissions from RWRL⁷⁰, IRHL⁷¹, RIHL⁷², Waka Kotahi⁷³, and RIDL⁷⁴ request rule SIGN-R2 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

Recommendation

12.11 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

12.12 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGN-R3 Temporary Real Estate Advertising Signs

12.13 Rule SIGN-R3 provides for temporary real estate advertising signs where they comply with the controls on duration, location, and requirements SIGN-REQ5-7.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	310	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	299	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	305	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	145	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	317	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

12.14 Submissions from RWRL⁷⁵, IRHL⁷⁶, RIHL⁷⁷, Waka Kotahi⁷⁸, and RIDL⁷⁹ request rule SIGN-R3 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

Recommendation

12.15 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

12.16 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGN-R4 Signs Adjacent to State Highways or Arterial Roads

12.17 Rule SIGN-R4 manages signs adjacent to state highways or arterial roads that have speed limits of more than 60 km per hour. Except for signs listed in rule SIGN-R1.1 (for example, official signs), all signs must meet the entry conditions in rule SIGN-R4.1(a) and (b) be classified as a permitted activity. In general, the entry conditions in (a) require the road boundary setback rules for a building to be met and (b) the sign to be located more than either 100m or 200m (depending on zone location) in front of any official traffic sign or signal.

⁷⁰ DPR-358.309 RWRL

⁷¹ DPR-363.298 IRHL

⁷² DPR-374.304 RIHL

⁷³ DPR-375.144 Waka Kotahi

⁷⁴ DPR-384.316 RIDL

⁷⁵ DPR-358.310 RWRL

⁷⁶ DPR-363.299 IRHL

⁷⁷ DPR-374.305 RIHL

⁷⁸ DPR-375.145 Waka Kotahi

⁷⁹ DPR-384.317 RIDL

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0145	Bunnings	003	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0358	RWRL	311	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	300	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	306	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	146	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 1. Other than a sign listed in SIGN-R1.1 <u>and</u> SIGN-R3, 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.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	147	Support	Retain R4.2 as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	318	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

12.18 Submissions from Bunnings⁸⁰, RWRL⁸¹, IRHL⁸², RIHL⁸³, Waka Kotahi⁸⁴ and RIDL⁸⁵ support rule SIGN-R4 as notified and request it is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part.

12.19 Waka Kotahi⁸⁶ requests that rule SIGN-R4 is amended by including an additional exception for temporary real estate advertising estate signs. I recommend this submission is accepted in part for the following reasons:

12.19.1 The relief sought by Waka Kotahi will reduce the level of compliance required in respect to real estate signs. This is on the basis that the submitter considers that any effects can be effectively managed through rule SIGN-3 that manages temporary real estate advertising signs. I support this relief as it reduces unnecessary duplication within the PDP, while maintaining its intent to effectively managing potential adverse effects on the land transport network associated with temporary signs. I consider that a consequential change should also be made to remove the reference to requirement SIGN-REQ5, which is contained within rule SIGN-R3 and avoids unnecessary duplication.

12.19.2 In terms of drafting, I note that Waka Kotahi's relief is for "*Other than a sign listed in SIGN-R1.1 and SIGN-R3*". Rules SIGN-R1.1 and SIGN-R3 manage distinctly different signage related effects without cross-over, so these are not conjunctive. Therefore, the requested change would only make sense if the "*and*" is replaced with an "*or*". Waka Kotahi may wish to address this point in their evidence.

Recommendations and amendments

12.20 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel:

⁸⁰ DPR-145.003 Bunnings

⁸¹ DPR-358.311 RWRL

⁸² DPR-363.300 IRHL

⁸³ DPR-374.306 RIHL

⁸⁴ DPR-375.147 Waka Kotahi

⁸⁵ DPR-384.318 RIDL

⁸⁶ DPR-375.146 Waka Kotahi

- a) Amend rule SIGN-R4 as shown in **Appendix 2** to include a cross reference to rules SIGN-R3 and remove the reference to requirement SIGN-REQ5.

12.21 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

12.22 The scale of change does not require a section 32AA evaluation as the recommended change reduces the scope of rule SIGN-R4 by relying on rule SIGN-R3 to manage potential effects associated with real estate signs to avoid duplication.

SIGN-R5 Off-Site Signs

12.23 Rule SIGN-R5 classifies permanent off-site signs in the RESZ and GRUZ zones as a non-complying activity, and as a discretionary activity in all other zones. Temporary off-site signs are addressed by rule SIGN-R2.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	312	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, GRUZ, <u>GIZ, LFRZ</u> ... <u>GIZ, LFRZ Activity Status: PER</u> <u>5. Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS186	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0363	IRHL	301	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, GRUZ, <u>GIZ, LFRZ</u> ... <u>GIZ, LFRZ Activity Status: PER</u> <u>5. Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS190	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0374	RIHL	307	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, GRUZ, <u>GIZ, LFRZ</u> ... <u>GIZ, LFRZ Activity Status: PER</u> <u>5. Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS194	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	148	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	319	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, GRUZ, <u>GIZ, LFRZ</u> ... <u>GIZ, LFRZ Activity Status: PER</u> <u>5. Any off-site sign, excluding any temporary off-site sign provided for in SIGN-R2.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS199	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.

Analysis

12.24 The submission from Waka Kotahi⁸⁷ supports rule SIGN-R5 and requests it is retained. I recommend this submission is accepted.

⁸⁷ DPR0375.148 Waka Kotahi

12.25 RWRL⁸⁸, IRHL⁸⁹, RIHL⁹⁰, and RIDL⁹¹ request that permanent off-site signs in the GIZ and LFRZ zones are classified as a permitted activity. I recommend their submissions to amend rule SIGN-R5 are rejected for the following reasons:

12.25.1 The requested relief does not link this reclassification to a permitted activity with any entry conditions or rule requirements. The suggested amendments represent a fundamental change to the intent and direction of the Signs Chapter, to the extent that they do not achieve the related objective and policies. I can find no support for the requested change in the section 32 analysis prepared for the Signs Chapter.

12.25.2 Rule SIGN-R5 implements policy SIGN-P5 that seeks to ensure off-site signs in the GIZ and LFRZ zones (amongst other zones) are compatible with the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area, particularly where they are visible from any residential or rural zone. I consider this is an efficient and effective approach to achieve objective SIGN-O1 and the related policies.

Recommendation

12.26 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

12.27 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGNS Rules - Non-Notification Provisions

12.28 Four submitters request that a non-notification clause is inserted into the controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules SIGNS-R1 to R5.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	419	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Insert the following words, or words to the like effect, to all controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules: <u>Applications shall not be limited or publicly notified, on the basis of effects associated specifically with this rule and the associated matters of control or discretion.</u>
DPR-0032	CCC	FS205	Non-notification clauses	Oppose In Part	Do not limit notification where neighbouring properties, communities, or the wider district are potentially directly affected, and the adverse effects are potentially more than minor or where the Act requires notification.
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS936	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission

⁸⁸ DPR-358.312 RWRL

⁸⁹ DPR-363.301 IRHL

⁹⁰ DPR-374.307 RIHL

⁹¹ DPR-384.319 RIDL

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0371	CIAL	FS057	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS353	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Retain relevant provisions without a non-notification clause.
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	FS010	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Reject the submission in full.
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	FS130	Non-notification clauses	Support	Not Specified
DPR-0453	LPC	FS057	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0456	Four Stars	FS026	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS212	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Allow the submission on controlled activity. Disallow the submission point that notification is not required for all restricted discretionary applications.
DPR-0453	LPC	FS153	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0456	Four Stars	FS055	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission
DPR-0363	IRHL	439	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Insert the following words, or words to the like effect, to all controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules: <u>Applications shall not be limited or publicly notified, on the basis of effects associated specifically with this rule and the associated matters of control or discretion.</u>
DPR-0032	CCC	FS234	Non-notification clauses	Oppose In Part	Do not limit notification where neighbouring properties, communities, or the wider district are potentially directly affected, and the adverse effects are potentially more than minor or where the Act requires notification.
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS965	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission
DPR-0371	CIAL	FS155	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS354	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Retain relevant provisions without a non-notification clause.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	FS012	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Reject the submission in full.
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	FS159	Non-notification clauses	Support	Not Specified
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS212	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Allow the submission on controlled activity. Disallow the submission point that notification is not required for all restricted discretionary applications.
DPR-0453	LPC	FS153	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0456	Four Stars	FS055	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission
DPR-0374	RIHL	485	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Insert the following words, or words to the like effect, to all controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules: <u>Applications shall not be limited or publicly notified, on the basis of effects associated specifically with this rule and the associated matters of control or discretion.</u>
DPR-0032	CCC	FS272	Non-notification clauses	Oppose In Part	Do not limit notification where neighbouring properties, communities, or the wider district are potentially directly affected, and the adverse effects are potentially more than minor or where the Act requires notification.
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS999	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission
DPR-0371	CIAL	FS086	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS355	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Retain relevant provisions without a non-notification clause.
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	FS006	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Reject the submission in full.
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	FS193	Non-notification clauses	Support	Not Specified
DPR-0453	LPC	FS086	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0456	Four Stars	FS089	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0384	RIDL	518	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Insert the following words, or words to the like effect, to all controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules: <u>Applications shall not be limited or publicly notified, on the basis of effects associated specifically with this rule and the associated matters of control or discretion.</u>
DPR-0032	CCC	FS307	Non-notification clauses	Oppose In Part	<i>Do not limit notification where neighbouring properties, communities, or the wider district are potentially directly affected, and the adverse effects are potentially more than minor or where the Act requires notification.</i>
DPR-0298	TRRG	FS1026	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept submission
DPR-0371	CIAL	FS119	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS356	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Retain relevant provisions without a non-notification clause.
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	FS008	Non-notification clauses	Oppose	Reject the submission in full.
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	FS227	Non-notification clauses	Support	Not Specified
DPR-0453	LPC	FS119	Non-notification clauses	Support In Part	Accept in part
DPR-0456	Four Stars	FS123	Non-notification clauses	Support	Accept the submission

Analysis

12.29 RWRL⁹², IRHL⁹³, RIHL⁹⁴, and RIDL⁹⁵ consider that inadequate use is made of non-notification clauses.

12.30 The submitter's request that all controlled and restricted discretionary activity rules should be provided with a direction and clear wording as to the effect of the non-notification clause for applications.

12.31 In evaluating these submissions, I note that PART1 Section 42A report states that: *"It became apparent after considering the submission points, that these are unable to be dealt with in bulk through the PART 1 hearing and instead should be considered at the chapter level, therefore, the decision was made to re-notify these submission points across the relevant chapters."* This is a logical

⁹² DPR-358.419 RWRL

⁹³ DPR-363.439 IRHL

⁹⁴ DPR-374.485 RIHL

⁹⁵ DPR-384.518 RIDL

approach as the activities classified in the PDP as restricted discretionary activities do not share identical characteristics and may generate different adverse effects. In some circumstances it will be appropriate that an activity can always be determined on a non-notified basis. For other activities, such as signage, it will not be appropriate to consider applications on a non-notified basis due to the relative risk that potential adverse effects could be more than minor.

12.32 I recommend the above submissions are rejected for the following reasons:

12.32.1 Signage is an advertising medium and by its nature is intended to be highly visible and effective in conveying messages or information to the public. Signage that does not meet the rules or requirements in the Signs Chapter may generate adverse effects that are more than minor in their scale. Given the inherently public nature of signs, as a matter of policy it is inappropriate for the PDP to state that signs requiring consent as a restricted discretionary activity will be determined on a non-notified basis. Similarly, it is inappropriate to identify a confined default group of people (for example, owners or occupiers of neighbouring sites) as it may be difficult to gauge the extent of adverse effects in all circumstances based on the site context alone.

12.32.2 A particular characteristic of signage is the risk of cumulative adverse effects arising from the size, design, location, and number of signs impacting on the character and amenity of the local environment that need to be effectively managed. This involves the ability for SDC to seek affected party approvals or public notification based on potential adverse effects.

12.32.3 Signs may also generate potential adverse effects that are of low probability but high impact. This is particularly relevant when considering the effects of signs on transport safety.

Recommendation

12.33 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

12.34 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

New Rule: Proposed SIGN-R6

12.35 Two submitters request the inclusion of an additional rule to manage temporary sales signage with residential, commercial, or industrial areas.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0409	Hughes	041	New	Oppose	Insert new rule as follows: <u>SIGN-R6 Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings within a residential, commercial or industrial development</u> <u>Activity status: PER ALL ZONES</u> <u>1. Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings within a residential, commercial or industrial development</u> <u>Where:</u>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
					<u>a. The sign shall be removed within one month of all properties or buildings being sold.</u> <u>b. The sign displays the name and contact details of the Organisation that erected the sign.</u> <u>c. The road boundary setback rules for a building in the zone in which the sign is located area met.</u> <u>d. The sign is freestanding</u> <u>And this activity complies with the following rule requirements:</u> <u>SIGN-REQ6 Distracting features</u> <u>SIGN-REQ7 Traffic safety</u> <u>SIGN-REQ8 Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</u> <u>2. When compliance with any of SIGN-R6.1 is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>3. When compliance with any rule requirement listed in this rule is not achieved: Refer to SIGN - Rule requirements</u> <u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>4. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN- R6.2 is restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>a. SIGN-MAT1</u>
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS158	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS158	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS158	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS158	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	011	New	Oppose	Insert new rule as follows: <u>SIGN-R6 Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings within a residential, commercial or industrial development</u> <u>Activity status: PER ALL ZONES</u> <u>1. Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings within a residential, commercial or industrial development</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The sign shall be removed within one month of all properties or buildings being sold.</u> <u>b. The sign displays the name and contact details of the Organisation that erected the sign.</u> <u>c. The road boundary setback rules for a building in the zone in which the sign is located area met.</u> <u>d. The sign is freestanding</u>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
					<u>And this activity complies with the following rule requirements:</u> <u>SIGN-REQ6 Distracting features</u> <u>SIGN-REQ7 Traffic safety</u> <u>SIGN-REQ8 Temporary Signs</u> <u>advertising the sale of properties or buildings</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</u> <u>2. When compliance with any of SIGN-R6.1 is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>3. When compliance with any rule requirement listed in this rule is not achieved: Refer to SIGN - Rule requirements</u> <u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>4. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN- R6.2 is restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>a. SIGN-MAT1</u>
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS159	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS159	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS159	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS159	New	Support	Adopt

Analysis

12.36 Hughes Development⁹⁶ and Urban Estates⁹⁷ request the inclusion of new rule SIGN-R6 to recognise the importance of temporary signage and to enable the provision of information to the public about the availability of properties and buildings for sale and lease. I recommend their submissions are rejected for the following reasons:

12.36.1 The requested relief does not achieve the objective and policies of the Signs Chapter. The inclusion of the rule would undermine the effectiveness of policy SIGNS-P4 where the duration, size and number of temporary signage is managed to maintain the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area.

12.36.2 The proposed rule provides for freestanding signs, thereby permitting real estate signage at locations that may be some distance from the actual property for sale. This could result in a proliferation of signage along key transport routes or other areas which have high population numbers or locations with high amenity.

12.36.3 The proposed requirement that the sign shall be removed within one month of all properties or buildings being sold means the actual duration is essentially unlimited, which could give rise to adverse effects.

12.36.4 The scope of the proposed rule appears to anticipate and provide for billboard-style signs that are used to market large 'greenfield' subdivisions during the construction and section sale phases of developments. While I acknowledge signage of this nature may be

⁹⁶ DPR-409.041 Hughes Development

⁹⁷ DPR-410.011 Urban Estates

appropriate, this may not be the case in all circumstances. To ensure the effects on the local environment are appropriately addressed, and consent and compliance costs are minimised, a consent for the signage can be obtained as part of the overall bundle of subdivision and land use consents that will be required for the new development.

Recommendation

12.37 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

12.38 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

13. Signs Chapter – Rule Requirements

Introduction

13.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to SIGN-Rule Requirements which apply to all signs across the district.

Submissions

13.2 50 submission points and 41 further submission points were received in relation to this subtopic.

SIGN-REQ1 Free Standing Signs

13.3 SIGN-REQ1 establishes the rule requirements for free standing signs.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0145	Bunnings	004	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0204	JP Singh	007	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0204	JP Singh	008	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0215	Winstone	050	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0345	Porters Alpine Resort	033	Oppose In Part	Exempt SKIZ from SIGN-REQ1.29.
DPR-0407	Forest & Bird	FS818	Oppose	Reject the submissions
DPR-0346	Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill	018	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: SIGN-REQ1 Free Standing Signs <u>GRUZ (excluding GRUZ-PREC1)</u> 8. There shall be a LFRZ GIZ PORTZ DPZ <u>GRUZ-PREC1</u> 14. There shall be a maximum of one free standing sign per vehicle access to the site... or alternatively a new rule requirement: <u>GRUZ-PREC1</u> <u>There shall be a maximum of two free standing signs per site. The maximum area of a sign shall be 6m². The maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign shall be 6m.</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</u> <u>When compliance with any of SIGN-REQ1.X not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>Matters for discretion: The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN-REQ1.X is restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>a SIGN-MAT1</u>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams	FS022	Neither Support Nor Oppose	The decision affecting rezoning including zone provisions, any access and the general layout of the proposed Rural Industrial Precinct should ensure that development of the site is appropriate and will integrate with the future proposed development of our land in Marsh's Road being proposed for GIZ through Submission 157.
DPR-0358	RWRL	313	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 14. There shall be a maximum of one free standing sign per vehicle access to the site, <u>except in the LFRZ where there shall be a maximum of one freestanding sign per tenancy.</u> 15. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum area of a sign shall be 18m ² . 16. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum width of a sign shall be 3m. 17. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign shall be 9m.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS187	Oppose	Reject requested amendments.
DPR-0363	IRHL	302	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 14. There shall be a maximum of one free standing sign per vehicle access to the site, <u>except in the LFRZ where there shall be a maximum of one freestanding sign per tenancy.</u> 15. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum area of a sign shall be 18m ² . 16. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum width of a sign shall be 3m. 17. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign shall be 9m.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS191	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS804	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs	015	Support	Retain SIGN-REQ1.20-1.21 as notified.
DPR-0374	RIHL	308	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 14. There shall be a maximum of one free standing sign per vehicle access to the site, <u>except in the LFRZ where there shall be a maximum of one freestanding sign per tenancy.</u> 15. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum area of a sign shall be 18m ² . 16. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum width of a sign shall be 3m. 17. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign shall be 9m.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS195	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	149	Support	Retain REQ1.1 as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	320	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 14. There shall be a maximum of one free standing sign per vehicle access to the site, <u>except in the LFRZ where there shall be a maximum of one freestanding sign per tenancy.</u> 15. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum area of a sign shall be 18m ² . 16. <u>Except for the LFRZ, the</u> The maximum width of a

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
				sign shall be 3m. 17. Except for the LFRZ, the maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign shall be 9m.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS200	Oppose	Reject the requested amendment.
DPR-0370	Fonterra	071	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0396	Woolworths	027	Oppose	Amend SIGNS-REQ1.15 to allow the maximum area of a sign in the LRFZ or GIZ to be 27m ²
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS163	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS163	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS163	Support	Adopt
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS163	Support	Adopt
DPR-0396	Woolworths	028	Oppose	Amend SIGNS-REQ1.21. b. to allow the maximum area of a sign in the TCZ to be 27m ²
DPR-0453	LPC	053	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

- 13.4 Bunnings⁹⁸, JP Singh⁹⁹, Winstone¹⁰⁰, Fonterra¹⁰¹ and LPC¹⁰² support SIGN-REQ1 and request it is retained as notified. Foodstuffs¹⁰³ request requirement SIGN-REQ1.20-1.21 is retained as notified and Waka Kotahi¹⁰⁴ requests SIGN-REQ1.1 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part.
- 13.5 Porters Alpine¹⁰⁵ opposes requirement SIGN-REQ1 in part and requests that the SKIZ is exempted from requirement SIGN-REQ1.29. The submitter considers that requirement SIGN-REQ1 should be clarified to provide for wayfinding, health and safety and warning of natural hazards. I recommend this submission is rejected as the signs, as described, are already identified as permitted activities under rule SIGN-R1. Under rule SIGN-R1c. official signs including signage related to aspects of public safety are permitted, as are signs for the purpose of direction, track marking, or interpretation under rule SIGN-R1e.
- 13.6 Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill¹⁰⁶ opposes in part requirement SIGN-REQ1 and requests that the provisions are amended to exclude the GRUZ-PREC1 area, or alternatively introduce new dimensional standards. The submitter considers that requirement SIGN-REQ1 should be amended to include a Rural Services Precinct being sought through submissions to be in line with the GIZ and to recognise the site's proximity to a heavy industrial area. A further submission from Kevin & Bonnie Williams¹⁰⁷ does not specifically address signage but seeks to ensure that consistent and appropriate provisions are established and applied to their proposed GIZ site as well as for the proposed GRUZ-PREC1.
- 13.7 The primary submission from Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill is contingent on a separate decision by the Hearings Panel to rezone the area from GRUZ to GRUZ-PREC1. If the Panel determines to

⁹⁸ DPR-145.004 Bunnings

⁹⁹ DPR-204.007, DPR-204.008 JP Singh

¹⁰⁰ DPR-215.050 Winstone Aggregates

¹⁰¹ DPR-0370.071 Fonterra

¹⁰² DPR-453.053 Midland Port & Lyttleton Port

¹⁰³ DPR-373.015 Foodstuffs

¹⁰⁴ DPR-375.149 Waka Kotahi

¹⁰⁵ DPR-345.033 Porters Alpine

¹⁰⁶ DPR-346.018 Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill

¹⁰⁷ DPR-157.FS022 Kevin & Bonnie Williams

rezone the area to GRUZ-PREC1, then as a consequential decision I recommend that the submission on requirement SIGN-REQ1 is accepted in part for the following reasons:

- 13.7.1 The requested relief doubles the number of signs and signage area that is permitted in the GRUZ area. Although this increase is inappropriate for the GRUZ area in general, it is supported in this case due to the specific circumstances of the site proposed for rezoning to GRUZ-PREC1. The urban design report (refer **Appendix 3**) evaluates the submission and the receiving environment, concluding that the site is within a confined area, surrounded and contained on all sides by substantial roading infrastructure that includes State Highway 1, and is adjacent to an existing industrial area.
- 13.7.2 The number, height and dimensions for signage proposed for the GRUZ-PREC1 is less than the permitted activity standards for signage in a GIZ area. The urban design report notes this will provide a degree of transition from the GIZ area and acknowledges that the GRUZ-PREC1 has different site characteristics.
- 13.8 Submissions from RWRL¹⁰⁸, IRHL¹⁰⁹, RIHL¹¹⁰, and RIDL¹¹¹ request that SIGN-REQ1 is amended in relation to the LFRZ. The submitters consider that there should be greater provision for freestanding signs in this environment because of the nature of the activities, presence of large sites and buildings in the zone and the low sensitivity of the surrounding land use activities.
- 13.9 The PDP has a single LFRZ, located in Rolleston across State Highway 1 from the town centre, which is encompassed within the GIZ and POTZ. The management of signs in the PDP is strongly linked to the amenity values of the surrounding environment. In this context, I consider that the local environment in and around the LFRZ could accommodate the signage amendments requested by the submitters. However, the submitters have not provided an independent urban design or landscape assessment to justify the changes, which in turn limits my ability to confirm my support for the requested changes. The submitters may wish to engage an expert in either of these disciplines to provide evidence at the hearing in support of the relief that is being sought.
- 13.10 At this point in time, I recommend that the submissions from RWRL, IRHL, RIHL, and RIDL are rejected on the basis that insufficient evidence has been presented to justify the requested changes. The LFRZ abuts State Highway 1 and I note that Waka Kotahi¹¹² is opposed to the requested relief. I recommend the submitters also specifically address the issue of traffic safety as a topic in their evidence.
- 13.11 Woolworths¹¹³ request that requirement SIGN-REQ1.15 is amended to allow the maximum area of a sign in the LRFZ or GIZ to be 27m². Woolworths¹¹⁴ also request that requirement SIGNS-REQ1.21. b is amended to allow signs with a maximum area of 27m² in the TCZ from 18m². The submitter states that the GIZ and LRFZ can accommodate greater signage without detriment. They note that a 27m² size sign should also be permitted in the TCZ because a 3m wide and 9m in

¹⁰⁸ DPR-358.313 RWRL

¹⁰⁹ DPR-363.302 IRHL

¹¹⁰ DPR-374.308 RIHL

¹¹¹ DPR-384.320 RIDL

¹¹² DPR-375.FS187, DPR-375.FS191, DPR-375.FS195, DPR-375.FS200 Waka Kotahi

¹¹³ DPR-396.027 Woolworths

¹¹⁴ DPR-396.028 Woolworths

height is provided for as a permitted activity. I recommend the submissions are rejected for the following reasons:

13.11.1 The urban design report (refer to **Appendix 3**) confirms that the dimensional standards are intended to encourage the consolidation of signage, particularly in high amenity environments such as the TCZ. Grouped signage also improves legibility and maintains character through a reduction in visual clutter. This is in keeping with the character of Selwyn's town centre environments.

13.11.2 The majority of the GIZ areas are relatively small and are predominately located adjacent to residential or rural areas, where the proposed amendment may give rise to adverse effects.

13.11.3 While signage is an anticipated and necessary element of the town centre environment, these obvious benefits need to be balanced against the sensitive nature of receiving environments, which is why the proposed provisions are more permissive in the GIZ and less so in the TCZ.

13.11.4 The increase in height will have either a direct (in the case of the TCZ) and/or indirect (in the case of the GIZ) effect on maintaining the amenity values of the zone and potentially the receiving environment in the vicinity.

Recommendations and amendments

13.12 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel:

- a) Amend requirement SIGN-REQ1 as shown in **Appendix 2** to provide for signs in the GRUZ-PREC1 area. This amendment is consequential to a decision by the Panel to accept submissions requesting the inclusion of the GRUZ-PREC1 area in the PDP.

13.13 The recommended amendments to requirement SIGN-REQ1 are set out in **Appendix 2**.

13.14 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

13.15 The scale of change does not require a section 32AA evaluation as the recommended changes further strengthen the outcomes sought rather than changes them. If the Panel determines to accept the submissions requesting the inclusion of the GRUZ-PREC1 into the PDP, then the recommended amendments to requirement SIGN-REQ1 will ensure the PDP has appropriate provisions in place to manage the effects of signs in the zone, commensurate with its site context.

SIGN-REQ2 Built Form – Signs Attached to Buildings

13.16 Requirement SIGN-REQ2 manages signs attached to buildings by stipulating the total maximum area of signs per building and the maximum height above ground level at the top of the sign.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0145	Bunnings	005	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0204	JP Singh	009	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0346	Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill	019	Oppose In Part	Amend SIGN-TABLE 1 as follows GRUZ (<u>excluding</u> GRUZ-PREC1) GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZ, DPZ, <u>GRUZ-PREC1</u>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams	FS023	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<i>The decision affecting rezoning including zone provisions, any access and the general layout of the proposed Rural Industrial Precinct should ensure that development of the site is appropriate and will integrate with the future proposed development of our land in Marsh's Road being proposed for GIZ through Submission 157.</i>
DPR-0358	RWRL	314	Support In Part	Amend as follows: SIGN - TABLE1 - Signs Attached to Buildings GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZDPZ ... <u>LFRZ No limit on the size or number of signs attached to buildings. Façade height.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS188	Oppose	<i>Reject requested amendments.</i>
DPR-0363	IRHL	303	Support In Part	Amend as follows: SIGN - TABLE1 - Signs Attached to Buildings GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZDPZ ... <u>LFRZ No limit on the size or number of signs attached to buildings. Façade height.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS192	Oppose	<i>Reject the requested amendment.</i>
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	073	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh	FS805	Oppose In Part	<i>Reject submission in part</i>
DPR-0374	RIHL	309	Support In Part	Amend as follows: SIGN - TABLE1 - Signs Attached to Buildings GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZDPZ ... <u>LFRZ No limit on the size or number of signs attached to buildings. Façade height.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS196	Oppose	<i>Reject the requested amendment.</i>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	150	Support	Retain REQ2.1 as notified.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	151	Oppose In Part	Amend to consider the combined provision for signage on a site.
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	FS001	Support In Part	<i>Rolleston Square seeks that the submission point be allowed in full (subject to the changes it seeks to REQ2 and SIGNTABLE1 (DPR0386.003)).</i>
DPR-0384	RIDL	321	Support In Part	Amend as follows: SIGN - TABLE1 - Signs Attached to Buildings GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZDPZ ... <u>LFRZ No limit on the size or number of signs attached to buildings. Façade height.</u>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS202	Oppose	<i>Reject requested amendments.</i>
DPR-0386	Rolleston Square	003	Oppose In Part	Amend SIGN -TABLE1 as follows: All Zones not otherwise specified to allow for 40% of primary building facade Amend to clarify that signage attached to windows does not count towards the allowance for signage attached to buildings in SIGN-TABLE1 for all zones not otherwise specified.
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS164	Support	<i>Adopt</i>
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS164	Support	<i>Adopt</i>
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS164	Support	<i>Adopt</i>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS204	Oppose In Part	<i>Council should carefully consider the implications of the requested relief and how the number and size of signs attached to buildings will be appropriately managed to minimise adverse effects on the safety of road users.</i>
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS164	Support	Adopt
DPR-0396	Woolworths	029	Oppose	Amend SIGN-TABLE1 by deleting reference to GIZ and LFRZ being subject to 'Building length along primary building frontage (m) x 2m = permitted area m ² ' from the 'total maximum area of signs per building' column
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS165	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS165	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS165	Support	Adopt
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS198	Oppose In Part	<i>Council should carefully consider the implications of removing the restriction on the size and number of signs within the GIZ and LFRZ and how the size and number of signs attached to buildings within these zones will be appropriately managed to minimise adverse effects on the safety of road users.</i>
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS165	Support	Adopt
DPR-0453	LPC	054	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

13.17 JP Singh¹¹⁵, Bunnings¹¹⁶, Fonterra¹¹⁷, Waka Kotahi¹¹⁸ and LPC¹¹⁹ request that requirement SIGN-REQ2 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part.

13.18 A submission from Waka Kotahi¹²⁰ requests that requirement SIGN-REQ2 is amended to consider the combined provision for signage on a site. I do not support the inclusion of additional requirements to manage the cumulative effects of signs attached to buildings. This is on the basis that there are appropriate standards detailed in SIGN-TABLE1 to effectively manage the size, scale and location of the signage that can be attached to buildings as a permitted activity. I consider there is also sufficient scope provided within matters of discretion SIGN-MAT1 to effectively evaluate any adverse cumulative effects on a case-by-case basis where resource consent is required. The introduction of further development controls and requirements to manage cumulative effects is likely to be less consistent with the outcomes expressed in objective SIGN-O1 and policy SIGN-P1. I recommend the submission is rejected on the basis of the above evaluation.

13.19 Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill¹²¹ request that table SIGNS-TABLE1 in requirement SIGN-REQ2 is amended to exclude the GRUZ-PREC1 from the GRUZ area reference and to include it in the list of commercial/industrial zones (currently GIZ, PORTZ, LFRZ, and DPZ). This submission is contingent on the Panel's decision to rezone land to GRUZ-PREC1. If the Panel determines to accept submissions requesting this rezoning, I recommend the submission is accepted as a consequential matter. It will

¹¹⁵ DPR-204.009 JP Singh

¹¹⁶ DPR-0145.005 Bunnings

¹¹⁷ DPR-370.073 Fonterra

¹¹⁸ DPR-375.150 Waka Kotahi

¹¹⁹ DPR-453.054 Midland Port & Lyttleton Port

¹²⁰ DPR-375.151 Waka Kotahi

¹²¹ DPR-346.019 Ceres Professional & Sally Tothill

ensure that the rezoned land has appropriate signage provisions applying to a site that has a commercial/industrial rather than rural character.

13.20 The first part of Rolleston Square's¹²² submission requests that table SIGNS-TABLE1 is amended to allow signage for up to 40% of the building façade.

13.20.1 The urban design evaluation (in **Appendix 3**) confirms that applying a percentage of the front façade to establish the maximum of signage attached to a building is supported. However, the requested maximum of 40% coverage is seen as excessive, as it will result in signage covering nearly half of the front façade.

13.20.2 Ms Wolfer considers that the 25% maximum coverage is appropriate as it enables signage, while effectively managing visual amenity (refer to **Appendix 3**). The maximum of 25% coverage is consistent with Council's 2011 Design Guide for Commercial Development so should be contained in the PDP. The Guide also recommends that signage should not obscure any features, such as windows, doors, or decorative elements.

13.21 I therefore recommend that the submission is accepted in part and that SIGN-TABLE 1 is amended to identify that *"signage does occupy more than 25% of the primary building façade"* (refer to **Appendix 2**).

13.22 Rolleston Square¹²³ also request that requirement SIGN-REQ2 is amended to clarify that signage attached to windows does not count towards the allowance for signage attached to buildings in table SIGN-TABLE1 for all zones not otherwise specified. I recommend this part of Rolleston Square's submission is rejected in part for the following reasons:

13.22.1 The urban design report (in **Appendix 3**) notes that active frontage can only be achieved if glazing within openings is transparent, unobstructed, and free of advertisement. Signage should therefore not be placed within the openings to achieve visual coherence and optimise passive surveillance along public areas.

13.22.2 The inclusion of signage over windows is contrary to the *"active frontage"* requirements for town centres in the PDP.

13.23 The submission from Woolworths¹²⁴ requests that the references to the GIZ and LFRZ in table SIGNS-TABLE1 are deleted. Similarly, submissions from RWRL¹²⁵, IRHL¹²⁶, RIHL¹²⁷, and RIDL¹²⁸ request that table SIGNS-TABLE1 in requirement SIGN-REQ2 is amended to remove the limits on the size and number of signs attached to buildings in the LRFZ. I recommend these submissions are accepted in part for the following reasons:

13.23.1 The urban design report (in **Appendix 3**) notes that signage needs to be in proportion to the size of buildings. Signage is a complementary component to add legibility to the built form, amongst other outcomes, and should be incorporated into the overall design. Using the

¹²² DPR-386.003 Rolleston Square

¹²³ DPR-386.003 Rolleston Square

¹²⁴ 396-029 Woolworths

¹²⁵ DPR-358.314 RWRL

¹²⁶ DPR-363.303 IRHL

¹²⁷ DPR-374.309 RIHL

¹²⁸ DPR-384.321 RIDL

length of buildings only for “all zones not otherwise specified to establish the total maximum area of signs per building” is not recognised as best practice and should be amended to consider the height of the façade also.

13.23.2 Whilst the GIZ and LFRZ’s are less sensitive receiving environments than other zones, the absence of any maximum area of signs per building could result in the worst-case scenario of 100% of a building’s front façade being used for signage. This outcome would be contrary to best practice urban design and could undermine the effectiveness of the PDP.

13.23.3 The recommended changes recognise the appropriateness of prescribing a 25% maximum signage allocation and that this should be applied to the primary building façade to more effectively and efficiently manage the effects of signs attached to buildings.

Recommendations and amendments

13.24 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel:

- a) Amend table SIGN-TABLE1 in requirement SIGN-REQ2 by including references to GRUZ-PREC1 and stating the maximum percentage of signage on the primary building façade of buildings in all zones except the KNOZ, as shown in **Appendix 2**. This is to ensure the Signs Chapter is updated should the Panel determine to accept the request to include a GRUZ-PREC1 area into the PDP and to provide better clarity on the maximum percentage of signs permitted on building facades. The amendments also integrate best practice urban design and concepts from Council’s adopted design guide into the PDP.

13.25 The recommended amendments to requirement SIGN-REQ2 are set out in **Appendix 2**.

13.26 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

13.27 The scale of change does not require a section 32AA evaluation. The section 32 report notes that the level of detail of analysis is moderate and there is no assessment of specific metrics such as maximum percentages for signage coverage on building facades. This is because the potential adverse effects of signs are primarily related to localised amenity considerations. As such, the signs topic does not have regional significance. Whilst signs are found throughout the district, it is not one of the key resource management issues identified for the district compared with topics such as the management of urban growth or agricultural intensification. For completeness, I consider that the prescription of the 25% maximum coverage of the front building façade is more effective in aligning the PDP with contemporary best practice urban design and Council’s Commercial Design Guide.

SIGN-REQ3 Built Form – Signs Mounted and Affixed to Verandahs or Overhanging Road Reserve

13.28 Requirement SIGN-REQ3 manages signage that is mounted and affixed to verandah or overhangs the road reserve in all zones.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	315	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	304	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	310	Support	Retain as notified

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	152	Support In Part	Amend as follows: <u>7. No sign shall overhang the road reserve of a state highway.</u>
DPR-0384	RIDL	322	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

13.29 Submissions from RWRL¹²⁹, IRHL¹³⁰, RIHL¹³¹, and RIDL¹³² request that requirement SIGN-REQ4 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

13.30 Waka Kotahi¹³³ requests that requirement SIGN-REQ3 is amended to include a further criterion to manage signage that overhangs the road reserve of a state highway. I recommend this submission is rejected. The dimensional criteria in requirements SIGN-REQ4.1 and SIGN-REQ4.6 would apply to signage that overhangs the road reserve, which in my view appropriately manages the potential traffic effects on the state highway network. The urban design report (in **Appendix 3**) reiterates that safety and legibility have been effectively balanced with the functional aspects of signage. Therefore, the granting of the relief sought by Waka Kotahi may undermine the ability of the PDP to facilitate these balanced outcomes. It is also understood that any structure within a designated State Highway would need approval from Waka Kotahi as the Requiring Authority and as the road controlling authority who administer the land.

Recommendation

13.31 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the SIGN-REQ3 provisions as notified.

13.32 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGN-REQ4 Built Form – Signs Projecting from the Face of a Building

13.33 Requirement SIGN-REQ4 manages signs that project from the face of buildings located in all zones.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	316	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	305	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0374	RIHL	311	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0384	RIDL	323	Support	Retain as notified

¹²⁹ DPR-358.315 RWRL

¹³⁰ DPR-363.304 IRHL

¹³¹ DPR-374.310 RIHL

¹³² DPR-384.322 RIDL

¹³³ DPR-375.152 Waka Kotahi

Analysis

13.34 RWRL¹³⁴, IRHL¹³⁵, RIHL¹³⁶, and RIDL¹³⁷ request that requirement SIGN-REQ4 is retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted. All submissions on requirement SIGN-REQ4 are in support and no further changes or amendments are considered necessary.

Recommendation

13.35 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

13.36 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGN-REQ5 Real Estate Signs

13.37 Requirement SIGN-REQ5 manages real estate signs, with more specific controls where they are placed within or outside the RESZ.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	317	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 5. The maximum area... ... All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 9. During a subdivision... ... <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> <u>12. There shall be no limit on real estate signs.</u>
DPR-0363	IRHL	306	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 5. The maximum area... ... All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 9. During a subdivision... ... <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> <u>12. There shall be no limit on real estate signs.</u>
DPR-0374	RIHL	312	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 5. The maximum area... ... All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 9. During a subdivision... ... <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> <u>12. There shall be no limit on real estate signs.</u>
DPR-0384	RIDL	324	Support In Part	Amend as follows: All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> 5. The maximum area... ... All Zones, except RESZ, <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u>

¹³⁴ DPR-358.316 RWRL

¹³⁵ DPR-363.305 IRHL

¹³⁶ DPR-374.311 RIHL

¹³⁷ DPR-384.323 RIDL

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
				9. During a subdivision... ... <u>GIZ, CMUZ</u> <u>12. There shall be no limit on real estate signs.</u>

Analysis

13.38 Submissions from RWRL¹³⁸, IRHL¹³⁹, RIHL¹⁴⁰, and RIDL¹⁴¹ request the inclusion of a new matter of control and discretion stating there shall be no limit on real estate signs in the GIZ and CMUZ areas. The submitters consider that controls on real estate signs in the GIZ and CMUZ are unnecessary. I recommend these submissions are rejected for the following reasons:

13.38.1 The objective and policies seek to ensure that signage maintains the character and amenity values of the surrounding environment. This is implemented by the rules which seek to ensure a consistent approach to managing signage throughout the district is applied, including by controlling the size, location, and number of signs on sites. The single differentiation in requirement SIGN-REQ5 is between signs located in the RESZ and those located in all other zones. Creating further exemptions for real estate signs in the GIZ and CMUZ is contrary to this consistent and efficient approach that provides certainty to plan users. The submission is also not supported by specialist design advice or analysis of the effect of the change.

13.38.2 Most townships and settlements within the district contain a GIZ leading to issues of consistent plan administration as adjacent sites with similar character and amenity located in proximity to a RESZ would be subject to different dimensional requirements that may increase the risk of adverse effects arising (for example, where one site is in a GIZ, while the others in a NCZ, LCZ, or TCZ area).

Recommendation

13.39 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

13.40 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

SIGN-REQ6 Distracting Features

13.41 Requirement SIGN-REQ6 manages signage to ensure it does not incorporate distracting features, with a distinction made between the CMUZ, GIZ and PORTZ and all other zones to recognise the context and the nature of receiving environments.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0250	Go Media	004	Oppose	Delete SIGN-REQ6
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS166	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS166	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS166	Support	Adopt

¹³⁸ DPR-358.317 RWRL

¹³⁹ DPR-363.306 IRHL

¹⁴⁰ DPR-374.312 RIHL

¹⁴¹ DPR-384.324 RIDL

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS183	Oppose	Reject the request for the deletion of RULE-REQ3.
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS166	Support	Adopt
DPR-0358	RWRL	318	Support In Part	<p>Amend as follows: CMUZ, GIZ, PORTZ</p> <p>1. The sign does not contain any of the following features:</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. Changing images, digital, or LED displays <u>except where they meet the following standards:</u></p> <p>i. <u>The display shall result in no more than 10.0 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light when measured or calculated 2 metres within the boundary of any adjacent site and/or arterial road.</u></p> <p>ii. <u>No live broadcast or pre-recorded video shall be displayed on the screen. Only still images shall be displayed with a minimum duration of 7 seconds.</u></p> <p>iii. <u>There shall be no movement or animation of the images displayed on the screen.</u></p> <p>iv. <u>The material displayed on the screen shall not contain any flashing images and the screen itself shall not contain any retro-reflective material.</u></p> <p>v. <u>There shall be no transitions between still images apart from cross-dissolve of a maximum of 0.5 seconds.</u></p> <p>vi. <u>The screen shall incorporate lighting control to adjust brightness in line with ambient light levels.</u></p> <p>vii. <u>The display shall not be located on or adjacent to a state highway with a speed limit that is greater than 70km/hr.</u></p> <p>...</p>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS189	Oppose	Reject the request for off-site digital signs to be a permitted activity and retain the existing discretionary and non-complying statuses for offsite signs.
DPR-0363	IRHL	307	Support In Part	<p>Amend as follows: CMUZ, GIZ, PORTZ</p> <p>1. The sign does not contain any of the following features:</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. Changing images, digital, or LED displays <u>except where they meet the following standards:</u></p> <p>i. <u>The display shall result in no more than 10.0 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light when measured or calculated 2 metres within the boundary of any adjacent site and/or arterial road.</u></p> <p>ii. <u>No live broadcast or pre-recorded video shall be displayed on the screen. Only still images shall be displayed with a minimum duration of 7 seconds.</u></p> <p>iii. <u>There shall be no movement or animation of the images displayed on the screen.</u></p> <p>iv. <u>The material displayed on the screen shall not contain any flashing images and the screen itself shall not contain any retro-reflective material.</u></p> <p>v. <u>There shall be no transitions between still images apart from cross-dissolve of a maximum of 0.5</u></p>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
				<u>seconds.</u> <u>vi. The screen shall incorporate lighting control to adjust brightness in line with ambient light levels.</u> <u>vii. The display shall not be located on or adjacent to a state highway with a speed limit that is greater than 70km/hr.</u> ...
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS193	Oppose	<i>Reject the request for off-site digital signs to be a permitted activity and retain the existing discretionary and non-complying statuses for offsite signs.</i>
DPR-0374	RIHL	313	Support In Part	Amend as follows: CMUZ, GIZ, PORTZ 1. The sign does not contain any of the following features: ... c. Changing images, digital, or LED displays <u>except where they meet the following standards:</u> <u>i. The display shall result in no more than 10.0 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light when measured or calculated 2 metres within the boundary of any adjacent site and/or arterial road.</u> <u>ii. No live broadcast or pre-recorded video shall be displayed on the screen. Only still images shall be displayed with a minimum duration of 7 seconds.</u> <u>iii. There shall be no movement or animation of the images displayed on the screen.</u> <u>iv. The material displayed on the screen shall not contain any flashing images and the screen itself shall not contain any retro-reflective material.</u> <u>v. There shall be no transitions between still images apart from cross-dissolve of a maximum of 0.5 seconds.</u> <u>vi. The screen shall incorporate lighting control to adjust brightness in line with ambient light levels.</u> <u>vii. The display shall not be located on or adjacent to a state highway with a speed limit that is greater than 70km/hr.</u> ...
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS197	Oppose	<i>Reject the request for off-site digital signs to be a permitted activity and retain the existing discretionary and non-complying statuses for offsite signs.</i>
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	153	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0384	RIDL	325	Support In Part	Amend as follows: CMUZ, GIZ, PORTZ 1. The sign does not contain any of the following features: ... c. Changing images, digital, or LED displays <u>except where they meet the following standards:</u> <u>i. The display shall result in no more than 10.0 lux spill (horizontal and vertical) of light when measured or calculated 2 metres within the boundary of any adjacent site and/or arterial road.</u>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
				<u>ii. No live broadcast or pre-recorded video shall be displayed on the screen. Only still images shall be displayed with a minimum duration of 7 seconds.</u> <u>iii. There shall be no movement or animation of the images displayed on the screen.</u> <u>iv. The material displayed on the screen shall not contain any flashing images and the screen itself shall not contain any retro-reflective material.</u> <u>v. There shall be no transitions between still images apart from cross-dissolve of a maximum of 0.5 seconds.</u> <u>vi. The screen shall incorporate lighting control to adjust brightness in line with ambient light levels.</u> <u>vii. The display shall not be located on or adjacent to a state highway with a speed limit that is greater than 70km/hr.</u> ...
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS203	Oppose	Reject the request for off-site digital signs to be a permitted activity and retain the existing discretionary and non-complying statuses for offsite signs.

Analysis

13.42 Waka Kotahi¹⁴² request that requirement SIGN-REQ6 is retained as notified. I recommend this submission is accepted.

13.43 Go Media¹⁴³ requests SIGN-REQ6 is deleted. Go Media consider that LED and digital displays should not be included under a requirement managing distracting features. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

13.43.1 In general terms, there is a need to recognise and provide for signs due to the wide range of business, community, and health and safety benefits, while managing the extent and effects of signage. This is especially important in more sensitive environments due to the potential adverse effects on amenity, character, and traffic safety that can be generated by inappropriately designed and located signs.

13.43.2 The urban design report (in **Appendix 3**) identifies that LED and illuminated signage is brighter and more visually prominent than static signage, particularly at night. As a result, this form of signage can contribute to a range of potential adverse effects that need to be managed through the Signs and Light Chapters of the PDP, including specifically adverse amenity and spill effects.

13.43.3 Unless appropriately managed using the matters for control and discretion in SIGN-MAT2, LED and digital displays may contribute to the adverse effects that are detailed in the section 32 report and urban design report (refer to **Appendix 3**). A range of factors, including signage style, size, and location, mean that each application needs to be assessed on their individual merits based on the type and scale of the sign and site context. Classifying LED

¹⁴² DPR-375.153 Waka Kotahi

¹⁴³ DPR-250.004 Go Media

and digital displays as a restricted discretionary activity ensures that any potential adverse effects relating to the illuminated features of the sign can be assessed and determined through the consenting process.

13.43.4 Digital signage is a new medium and unless managed appropriately may result in adverse effects, including cumulative effects, through an increase in numbers of digital signage and to transport safety.

13.44 Submissions from RWRL¹⁴⁴, IRHL¹⁴⁵, RIHL¹⁴⁶, and RIDL¹⁴⁷ request that additional criteria is included in requirement SIGN-REQ6 for the CMUZ, GIZ and PORTZ. The submitters consider that digital and LED displays are a common signage medium, and that provision should be made for these as a permitted activity in the CMUZ, GIZ and PORTZ subject to performance standards. I recommend these submissions are rejected for the following reasons:

13.44.1 The CMUZ and GIZ areas include all of Selwyn's TCZ, LCZ and NCZ, and most townships in the district include land that is identified as GIZ. As identified in the evaluation of the Go Media submission points above, enabling digital signage in all locations within these zones does not achieve the objective and policies of the Signs Chapter to manage the size, location, and design of signs to maintain the character of the surrounding environment. Digital signage is a new medium and unless managed appropriately may result in adverse effects, including cumulative effects, through an increase in numbers of digital signage and to transport safety.

13.44.2 I acknowledge that the PORTZ area, and its surrounding GIZ and LFRZ, is a different environment to most of the other CMUZ and GIZ areas identified in the balance of Selwyn district on account of the different scale and nature of the land uses within these areas. The submitters may wish to consider narrowing the scope of their relief to the specific location of the PORTZ, GIZ and LFRZ that is in Rolleston. This would address my concerns regarding the application of the requested relief more generally across the district.

13.44.3 At this stage, I am not proposing to recommend accepting in part the submissions to accommodate this specific location, as I consider a stronger rationale needs to be established by the submitter before the relief being sought can be fully evaluated. Independent urban design or landscape architect advice is likely to assist the Panel with determining whether this change to the PDP is appropriate.

Recommendation

13.45 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

13.46 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

¹⁴⁴ DPR-358.318 RWRL

¹⁴⁵ DPR-363.307 IRHL

¹⁴⁶ DPR-374.313 RIHL

¹⁴⁷ DPR-384.325 RIDL

SIGN-REQ7 Traffic Safety

13.47 Requirement SIGN-REQ7 manages signage to ensure it does not compromise the safety and efficiency of the transport network across all zones.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0358	RWRL	319	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0363	IRHL	308	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	154	Support In Part	Amend to include standards to improve visibility and safety, including a minimum lettering size. Refer to original submission for full decision requested.
<i>DPR-0358</i>	<i>RWRL</i>	<i>FS167</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Adopt</i>
<i>DPR-0363</i>	<i>IRHL</i>	<i>FS167</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Adopt</i>
<i>DPR-0374</i>	<i>RIHL</i>	<i>FS167</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Adopt</i>
<i>DPR-0384</i>	<i>RIDL</i>	<i>FS167</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Adopt</i>
DPR-0374	RIHL	314	Support	Retain as notified
DPR-0384	RIDL	326	Support	Retain as notified

Analysis

13.48 Submissions from RWRL¹⁴⁸, IRHL¹⁴⁹, RIHL¹⁵⁰ and RIDL¹⁵¹ support requirement SIGN-REQ7 and request the provisions are retained as notified. I recommend these submissions are accepted.

13.49 Waka Kotahi¹⁵² request that requirement SIGN-REQ7 is amended to include standards to improve visibility and safety, including a minimum lettering size for all signs visible from a state highway. If accepted, all signs in the district would need to meet the dimensional requirements or obtain a resource consent. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

13.49.1 The existing wording in requirement SIGN-REQ7.1 contains sufficient detail to ensure signage that may adversely affect traffic safety is identified and managed through a consent process. If this regime is introduced into the PDP, then quite minor temporary uses (such as a child's lemonade stand for example) are likely to require consent. A minor breach to the standards, for example a 5mm encroachment into the minimum size requirements, would require resource consent despite it likely having an inconsequential effect on transport safety.

13.49.2 The level of specificity sought by the submitter is less efficient or effective when compared to the existing provisions in requirement SIGN-REQ7. One of the key considerations is the cost, including Council's compliance costs, of implementing the change. The current requirement enables the Council to effectively administer its District Plan and to monitor the outcomes of the proposed provisions in a clear and consistent manner.

Recommendation

13.50 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

¹⁴⁸ DPR-358.319 RWRL

¹⁴⁹ DPR-363.308 IRHL

¹⁵⁰ DPR0374.314 RIHL

¹⁵¹ DPR-384-.326 RIDL

¹⁵² DPR-375.154 Waka Kotahi

13.51 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

New Rule Requirement: Proposed SIGN-REQ8

13.52 Two submitters request the inclusion of an additional requirement into the Signs chapter to manage temporary signs.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0409	Hughes	042	New	Oppose	Insert new rule requirement as follows: <u>SIGN-REQ8 Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings within a residential, commercial or industrial development ALL ZONES</u> <u>1.The maximum area of a sign shall not exceed 8m².</u> <u>2.There shall be no more than two signs per development</u> <u>3.The maximum width of the sign is 4m.</u> <u>4.The maximum height above ground shall be 5m</u> <u>5.When compliance with SIGN-REQ8.1, 8.2, 8.3 or 8.4 is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>6. The exercise of discretion in relation to SIGN- REQ8 is restricted to the following matters:</u> <u>SIGN-MAT1</u>
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS160	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS160	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS160	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS160	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	012	New	Oppose	Insert new rule requirement as follows: <u>SIGN-REQ8 Temporary Signs advertising the sale of properties or buildings within a residential, commercial or industrial development ALL ZONES</u> <u>1.The maximum area of a sign shall not exceed 8m².</u> <u>2.There shall be no more than two signs per development</u> <u>3.The maximum width of the sign is 4m.</u> <u>4.The maximum height above ground shall be 5m</u> <u>5.When compliance with SIGN-REQ8.1, 8.2, 8.3 or 8.4 is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>Matters for discretion:</u> <u>6. The exercise of discretion in relation</u>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
					to SIGN- REQ8 is restricted to the following matters: SIGN-MAT1
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS161	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS161	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS161	New	Support	Adopt
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS161	New	Support	Adopt

Analysis

13.53 Hughes Development¹⁵³ and Urban Estates¹⁵⁴ request the inclusion of a new requirement to manage temporary signs. This request complements their submission requesting the inclusion of new rule SIGN-R6. As noted above, the submitters consider that signs are an important and efficient method of providing information to the public about the availability of properties and buildings for sale and lease and a specific rule is required. I recommend these submissions are rejected for the following reasons:

13.53.1 The proposal does not implement the objective SIGN-O1 and the policies, in particular policy SIGN-P4, which provide for temporary signs where their duration, size and number are limited to maintain the character and visual amenity values of the surrounding area.

13.53.2 The proposed amendment would result in a significant increase in the maximum dimensional standards and number of signs allowed across all zones. For example, in the REZ area, the permitted maximum size of a real estate sign would be increase from 3m² to 20m². This is inconsistent with the PDP's approach of managing the effects of signs in accordance with amenity and character values of the local area and could give rise to adverse effects on the environment.

Recommendation

13.54 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

13.55 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

14. Signs Chapter – Matters for Control or Discretion

Introduction

14.1 This section responds to the submission points relating to the Matters for Control and Discretion for signs.

Submissions

14.2 16 submission points and five further submission points were received in relation to this subtopic.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0215	Winstone	051	SIGN-MAT1	Neither Support	Not specified

¹⁵³ DPR-409.042 Hughes Development

¹⁵⁴ DPR-410.012 Urban Estates

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
				Nor Oppose	
DPR-0250	Go Media	005	SIGN-MAT2	Oppose	Delete SIGN-MAT2
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS162	SIGN-MAT2	Support	Adopt
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS162	SIGN-MAT2	Support	Adopt
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS162	SIGN-MAT2	Support	Adopt
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS184	SIGN-MAT2	Oppose	Reject the request for the deletion of SIGN-MAT2.
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS162	SIGN-MAT2	Support	Adopt
DPR-0358	RWRL	320	SIGN-MAT1	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0358	RWRL	321	SIGN-MAT2	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0363	IRHL	309	SIGN-MAT1	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0363	IRHL	310	SIGN-MAT2	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0374	RIHL	315	SIGN-MAT1	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0374	RIHL	316	SIGN-MAT2	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	155	SIGN-MAT1	Support	Retain as notified.
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	156	SIGN-MAT2	Support In Part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether the extent of the effects of the signs are increased or lessened due to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1.a.</u> The frequency and intensity of intermittent or flashing light sources, and the proposed periods of illumination and frequency of image changes; <u>2.b.</u> The prominence of the sign due to its illuminated or animated nature and ability to draw the eye; <u>3.c.</u> The proximity of the display to residential and other sensitive activities and whether the display will create any disturbance or amenity effects; <u>d.</u> The proximity of the sign to the <u>roading network</u>. <u>E.</u> For LED or digital displays whether the display includes movement or animation and if so whether such displays increase the sign's visual

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
					prominence and potential for distraction; 5.f. 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. <u>g. The use of sound effects</u>
DPR-0384	RIDL	327	SIGN-MAT1	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0384	RIDL	328	SIGN-MAT2	Support In Part	Amend these provisions so as to delete matters (1)-(4) listed under SIGN-MAT2 and place them under SIGN-MAT1.
DPR-0409	Hughes	043	SIGN-MAT1	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Not specified
DPR-0410	Urban Estates	013	SIGN-MAT1	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Not specified
DPR-0446	Transpower	133	SIGN-MAT1	Support In Part	Amend to include appropriate matters to guide decision making.

Analysis

14.3 Go Media¹⁵⁵ request that SIGN-MAT2 is deleted. They consider that LED and digital displays should not be included under a requirement for managing distracting features and that a non-complying activity resource consent in all zones excluding CMUZ, GIZ and PORTZ is inappropriate. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:

- 14.3.1 As identified in previous assessments on the appropriateness of managing LED and illuminated signs, the urban design report (in **Appendix 3**), acknowledges that there are benefits relating to this type of signage for the district. However, signage can also contribute to potential adverse effects due to its visual prominence and potential to create nuisance and generate light spill that needs to be managed under the PDP.
- 14.3.2 Ensuring transport safety is a key consideration when managing potential adverse effects relating to LED and digital signage as well as addressing any nuisance or amenity effects that may result from the use of illuminated, moving images.
- 14.3.3 Deleting SIGN-MAT2 does not implement the objective SIGN-O1 and the policies in the Signs Chapter, which ensure that signage contributes to the district's well-being and transport safety through controls which manage their size, location, duration, and design to maintain character and amenity of the local environment.

¹⁵⁵ DPR-0250.005 Go Media

- 14.4 Submissions from RWRL¹⁵⁶, IRHL¹⁵⁷, RIHL¹⁵⁸, and RIDL¹⁵⁹ request the matters listed in SIGN-MAT2.1 (1) to (4) are deleted and placed under SIGN-MAT1. The submitters note that a drafting error has resulted in the matters for SIGN-MAT1 being listed under SIGN-MAT2 (numbered 1 to 4). This is acknowledged and has been addressed as a Clause 16(2) amendment in the council report dated 3 February 2021¹⁶⁰. I recommend these submissions are accepted as a result.
- 14.5 Waka Kotahi¹⁶¹ requests SIGN-MAT1 is retained as notified. I recommend this submission is accepted in part. Waka Kotahi¹⁶² also requests the inclusion of additional criteria in SIGN-MAT2 to address the effects of signs by considering their proximity to the road network and use of sound effects. I recommend this submission is rejected for the following reasons:
- 14.5.1 The additional criteria repeat the matters for control and discretion in SIGN-MAT2 and MAT4. In particular, Waka Kotahi's concerns regarding the proximity of signs to the road network is addressed in SIGN-MAT1.4 which states that *"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."*
- 14.5.2 Depending on the zoning, under requirement SIGN-REQ6, signage that incorporates audible sound requires a restricted discretionary or non-complying activity resource consent. For a restricted discretionary activity application, the exercise of discretion is limited to the matters outlined in SIGN-MAT2. In my view including the term *"use of sound effects"* adds little if anything to the existing criteria in SIGN-MAT2.
- 14.6 Submissions from Winstone¹⁶³, Hughes Developments¹⁶⁴ and Urban Estates¹⁶⁵ neither support nor oppose SIGN-MAT1. The submitters note that there are no matters listed under SIGN-MAT1. This is acknowledged and has been addressed as a clause 16(2) amendment. In the absence of any other requested changes, I recommend these submissions are accepted.
- 14.7 Transpower¹⁶⁶ request that SIGN-MAT1 is amended to include matters to guide decision making. Transpower notes that the exercise of discretion in rule EI-R23.2 is restricted to the matters in SIGN-MAT1. Transpower does not oppose the cross reference to SIGN-MAT1 but notes that this provision does not appear to include any text. I recommend this submission is rejected as SIGN-MAT1 (subject to the clause 16(2) amendment) contains a comprehensive list of assessment matters for assessing the effects of signage. It is not clear what additional wording changes Transpower are requesting. Transpower may wish to address this in their evidence.

Recommendation

- 14.8 I recommend, for the reasons given above, that the Hearings Panel retain the provisions as notified.

¹⁵⁶ DPR-0358.320, DPR-358.321 RWRL

¹⁵⁷ DPR-363.309, DPR-363.310 IRHL

¹⁵⁸ DPR-374.315, DPR-374.316 RIHL

¹⁵⁹ DPR-384.327, DPR-384.328 RIDL

¹⁶⁰ Selwyn District Council - Clause 16(2) amendments

¹⁶¹ DPR-375.155 Waka Kotahi

¹⁶² DPR-375.156 Waka Kotahi

¹⁶³ DPR-215.051 Winstone Aggregates

¹⁶⁴ DPR-409.043 Hughes Developments

¹⁶⁵ DPR-410.013 Urban Estates

¹⁶⁶ DPR-446.133 Transpower

- 14.9 It is recommended that submissions and further submissions are either accepted, accepted in part, or rejected as shown in **Appendix 1**.

15. Conclusion

- 15.1 For the reasons set out in this report, I consider that the amended provisions will be efficient and effective in achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this plan and other relevant statutory documents.