

Before the Independent Hearings Panel at Gore District Council

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of Hearing Submissions and Further submissions on the Proposed
Gore District Plan.

Hearing Stream 5

Right of Reply of Victoria Woodbridge on behalf of Gore District Council

**Prepared in consultation with Helen Dempster of New Zealand Transport Agency Waka
Kotahi**

Date: 31 October 2024

Introduction:

1. My full name is Victoria Emily Jane Woodbridge. My Section 42A report sets out my qualifications and experience as an expert in planning.
2. I have prepared this right of reply in respect of Hearing Stream 5 to respond to Minute 22 issued by the Panel on 03 October 2024.
3. I confirm that we are continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's practice Note 2023, as applicable to this independent hearing panel.
4. This reply has been prepared in consultation with Helen Dempster on behalf of New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA) and is therefore, a joint response.
5. Minute 22 sought comment on three matters:
 - a. The recommendation to include a reference to when the permission from NZTA is required for signs within, or partly within the State Highway noting that there is no kerb along the state highway at Hokonui Drive.
 - b. Whether the 80metre minimum spacing in a 50kph environment is correct in SIGN-Table-2.
 - c. Management of digital signs which may be inside the windows of buildings.

Overview (point 'a' of Minute 22)

6. The Section 42A report recommended to accept in part NZTA's submission (s112.131) in respect referring to when permission is required for signs which may be located within, or partly within, the State Highway. In the s42A at paragraph 117, pages 26 – 27 the following is recommended:

Signs located within, or partly within, the State Highway will require the permission of the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi as road controlling authority regardless of the provisions in this District Plan. This does not apply to any sign constructed, maintained and displayed behind the kerbline of any State highway in an area where a 50 kilometre per hour, or lesser, speed limit applies, which are regulated by the territorial authority.
7. The Panel have identified that along Hokonui Drive there is a 50 kph speed limit, however, there is no kerb along the state highway and as such there could be confusion with the above wording.
8. Upon further investigation and consultation with both Council staff (Mr Murray Hassler) and NZTA it appears that NZTA has not delegated roading functions to Gore District Council in respect of the road reserve for State Highways with a speed limit of 50 kilometres per hour. Therefore, Ms Dempster and I are in agreement that the second sentence of the recommended amendment to the overview is not in fact correct and should be deleted.

9. We therefore recommend the following amendment (Section 42A text in red and amended text in purple):

Signs located within, or partly within, the State Highway will require the permission of the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi as road controlling authority regardless of the provisions in this District Plan. This does not apply to any sign constructed, maintained and displayed behind the kerbline of any State highway in an area where a 50 kilometre per hour, or lesser, speed limit applies, which are regulated by the territorial authority.

SIGN-TABLE 2 (point 'b' of Minute 22)

10. The Panel has queried whether the requirement for 80 metre minimum spacing for roads with a 50 kph speed limit as recommended for SIGN-TABLE 2.
11. The NZTA submission (s112.131) sought the following:

SIGN-Table 3 Minimum separation distances between signs adjoining a state highway	
Posted Speed Limit (km/hr)	Minimum Spacing (m)
<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>60</u>	<u>55</u>
<u>70</u>	<u>60</u>
<u>80</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>100</u>	<u>80</u>

12. The Supplementary Evidence dated 13 September 2024 recommendation at paragraph 25, page 4 was to accept the submission and amend SIGN-TABLE 2 to align with NZTA submission. However, I unfortunately quoted the incorrect spacing for the 50kph speed limit. In order to correct the error, I recommend a further amendment as follows (supplementary evidence text in green and right of reply text in purple):

SIGN-Table 2 Minimum distances between signs on sites adjoining the state highway	
Posted Speed Limit (km/hr)	Minimum ~~Visibility Distances~~ Spacing (m)
<u>50</u>	<u>80-50</u>
<u>60</u>	<u>105-55</u>
<u>70</u>	<u>130 60</u>
<u>80</u>	<u>175 70</u>
<u>100</u>	<u>250 80</u>

13. An updated copy of the Sign Chapter is provided at Appendix 1.

SIGN-R7 (point 'c' of Minute 22)

14. The Panel have requested I confer with Helen Dempster, representing NZTA, on the matter of digital signs within windows of buildings. Ms Dempster and I met on the 21 October 2024 along with Mr Glenn Connelly, Safety Engineer for NZTA.
15. We acknowledge that there may be instances where digital signs within the windows of buildings on the commercial centre zones may be appropriate as a permitted activity and therefore recommend an amendment to SIGN-R7 as follows (green text supplementary evidence, purple text amendments):

SIGN-R7 Digital Signs

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

1. The *sign* is not located within the *national grid*; and
 2. All *Signs* Standards are complied with.
 3. The *sign* is not visible from a state highway except
 - a. The *sign* is located within a *building*; and
 - b. The *sign* relates to the activity undertaken on the *site*;
and
 - c. The *sign* has a static image which does not change more than twice per day.
 - d. All *Signs* standards are complied with.
16. We consider that the above exemptions to digital signs, coupled with the requirement to comply with all SIGN standards would allow for small scale signs within buildings, typically in the commercial centres but in other zones where digital signs are provided for whilst managing adverse effects on road safety.

Section 32AA Evaluation

17. No s32AA evaluation is considered necessary for the amendment to the overview wording as recommended at paragraph 8 as this amendment was assessed under s32AA within the s42A report and the amendment is to that recommendation rather than the notified PDP.
18. No s32AA is considered necessary for the correction to SIGN-TABLE 2 which corrects a typo with the amendments to the table assessed under s32AA in the s42A report.
19. In respect of the recommended amendments to SIGN-R7 the amendment to restrict digital signs which were visible from the state highway was assessed within the Supplementary Evidence dated 13 September 2024. However, the further amendment recommended within this report is considered to be more appropriate to achieve the objectives because it allows for digital signs adjoining the state highway on a limited basis to consistent with the purpose and character of commercial and industrial zones

whilst managing adverse effects on traffic safety. Therefore, the amendment is considered to be more efficient and effective at achieving the objectives and the risk of not making the amendment is that signage for businesses within the commercial centres which may not actually impact on traffic safety is unnecessarily captured by the need for resource consent.

Name and Title	Signature	Date
Victoria Woodbridge Consultant Planner on behalf of Gore District Council		31 October 2024
Helen Dempster New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi		31 October 2024