

**QUEENSTOWN-LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL  
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN HEARING – STREAM 15**

**IN THE MATTER**

of a hearing on submissions to the Proposed District Plan Stage 2 and Variation 1 pursuant to clause 8B of the First Schedule to the Resource Management Act 1991

**BOOKS & TOYS (WANAKA) LIMITED**

Submitter #2510

---

**EVIDENCE OF ERIN QUIN  
(PLANNER/URBAN DESIGNER)**

**6<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

---

# 1. Introduction

- 1.1 My name is Erin Quin. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Planning (Hons), and a Masters in Urban Design from the University of Auckland. I am an Associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have been practicing as a resource management planner since 2005, having held previous resource management planning positions with Manukau City Council and XPlan Limited in Auckland as well as previously working as a Resource Management Planner for Vivian and Espie Limited prior to completing my urban design degree. I have been practicing as an urban designer since 2009 having held previous positions with Motu Design Ltd in Auckland where I was also engaged as a specialist urban design consultant for the Auckland Council Built Environment Unit. I am employed as a planner and urban designer by Vivian and Espie Limited, a resource management, urban design and landscape planning consultancy based in Queenstown.
- 1.2 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained within the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and agree to comply with it. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on information I have been given by another person. I confirm that I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed herein.

# 2. Submissions

- 2.1 This evidence addresses the section 42A report prepared by Amanda Leith on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council specifically in response to submissions of Books & Toys (Wanaka) Limited (#2510) and Wanaka Flooring Xtra (#2128) which sought changes with respect to signage platforms, sale signage and display signage.
- 2.2 Books & Toys (Wanaka) Limited filed a further submission in support of the Wanaka Flooring Xtra submission (#2128).

## **Signage Platforms**

- 2.3 In part 10.5 of her report Ms. Leith recommended an amendment to Rule 31.5.1 to exclude the signage types listed as permitted and controlled activities within Tables 31.7 – 31.9 based on Submissions #2510 and #2128 in respect to signage platforms. I support this, however find the proposed amendment ambiguous. Further clarification would ease practical interpretation of the rule for approved signage platforms. Chapter 2 decided in Stage 1 of the district plan review defines a signage platform as a physical area identified for the purpose of signage.

- 2.4 The wording of 31.7.7 states that any sign or signage platform that does not comply with Rules 31.7.1 to 31.7.6 is discretionary. It remains unclear if signs replaced within an approved signage platform need to comply with Rule 31.7.7, which also means 31.7.1 to 31.7.6 in order to retain permitted status.
- 2.5 For clarity, I recommend that an amendment to Table 31.5 be made specifically for signage within an approved signage platform to be a permitted activity as follows;

Table 31.5	Activity Status	Non-Compliance Status
<u>31.5.xx</u>	<p>All new and replacement signs located within an approved signage platform.</p> <p>Advice Note: Conditions of consent for an approved signage platform must be complied with for the permitted activity status to apply to any subsequent change to the content of the signage platform.</p>	<u>P</u>

### Sale Signage

- 2.6 I support the recommendation from Ms. Leith that an amendment be made to Rule 31.7.5(c) based on Submissions #2510 and #2518 with respect to sale signage which sought to base restrictions not on occurrences but on length of time per year. Ms. Leith goes on to state in 11.4 of her report;

*11.4 In my opinion, the length of time a sale sign is displayed on a site for a promotion is an easier standard to monitor and enforce than the limitation on the number of occurrences that the signage can be in place for across a year. If the number of occurrences per site per year is removed from Rule 31.6.5, then the potential adverse effects resulting from the display of the sale signage would be limited to a two week period (as per the notified Chapter 31) which is considered to be a suitable temporary timeframe for promotional signage.*

*11.5 I also consider that it is necessary to identify a minimum time period between each two week period that sale signage can be displayed. For ease of monitoring, I recommend a two week period be required between the display of sale signage. I consider that the Books & Toys (Wanaka) Ltd (2510) and Wanaka Flooring Xtra (2128) submissions which oppose the restriction on the limitation of sale signage to four occurrences per year provides scope for this recommendation.*

- 2.7 I support Ms. Leith's findings and the amendment stated in 11.7 of her report which seeks deletion of Rule 13.6.5(c) and recommends retention of the remainder of the standard rule subject to the insertion of a requirement of a minimum two week break between the display of sale signage which in my opinion

is a reasonable interim break period between sale signage as suggested where any potential adverse effects of such signage is restricted to a two week duration.

### **Display Signage**

- 2.8** Books and Toys Wanaka (Ltd (2510) opposed Rule 31.7.5(b) in relation to the restriction placed upon signage located within the interior of the building which are visible from a public place and Wanaka Flooring Xtra (2128) also opposed merchandising that can be seen through a window as not achieving the proposed objectives of the Proposed District Plan.

For clarity Rule 31.7.5(b) states the following;

*“b. signs shall not exceed 50% coverage of glazing. This applies to individual or partitioned glazed areas located within the ground floor area. Signs not attached to glazing that are sited within the enclosed interior of a building and are not directly visible from a public place, are not subject to part (b) of this rule.”*

- 2.9** Ms. Leith addressed both submissions and considered that displays within premises intended to attract shoppers within the building should not be captured within this rule. Ms. Leith found that upon her observations shop window displays are usually around 1m in width adjoining the shop front. She concluded that Rule 31.7.5(b) be amended to only apply to interior signage within 1m of shopfront glazing.

- 2.10** Ms. Leith then goes on to address submission 2128 which queries the imposition of the rule upon merchandising within shopfronts based on the notified definition of ‘sign and signage’ which also includes ‘displays’. The notified definition where relevant to displays is as follows;

*“a. any external name, figure, character, outline, display, delineation, announcement, design, logo, mural or other artwork, poster, handbill, banner, captive balloon, flag, flashing sign, flatboard, free-standing sign, illuminated sign, moving signs, roof sign, sandwich board, streamer, hoarding or any other thing of a similar nature which is: i) intended to attract attention; and ii) visible from a road or any public place;”*

- 2.11** Ms. Leith correctly states that this portion of the definition remains unchanged from its definition in the Operative District Plan and to her knowledge has not been used to control shopfront displays. She goes on to state that she considers quality shopfront displays to be important within a streetscape environment and states in 12.7 of her report;

*“I do not consider that shopfront displays which present physical goods available within the store for sale should be captured by Chapter 31. However if the shopfront display incorporates visual presentation of*

*the businesses or products and services logos or name (within 1m of the shopfront glazing as recommended above), I consider these components should be captured by Chapter 31.'*

**2.12** Ms. Leith recommends that a change to the definition of 'sign and signage' based on submission received from Wanaka Flooring Xtra (2128) to which I support in part.

**2.13** I support Ms. Leith's findings in that shop front displays which present physical goods should not be captured by Chapter 31, however corresponding promotional posters of goods on display are not discussed and therefore this point is ambiguous (refer Attached photos). I recommended an amendment to the proposed amended definition to also exclude display posters in bold underline as follows;

*any external name, figure, character, outline, display **(excluding a display of posters of physical goods or physical products available for sale on the premises)**, delineation, announcement, design, logo, mural or other artwork, poster, handbill, banner, captive balloon, flag, flashing sign, flatboard, free-standing sign, illuminated sign, moving signs, roof sign, sandwich board, streamer, hoarding billboard or any other thing of a similar nature which is:*

*i) intended to attract attention; and*

*ii) visible from a road or any public place;*

**2.14** I recommend clarification in Rule 31.7.5(b) with respect to specifically excluding window product displays. Product displays which have corresponding promotional posters as part of the display are not excluded is not as part of her recommendation. I recommend the following;

Amend Rule 31.7.5(b) in bold underline as follows;

*"b. signs shall not exceed 50% coverage of glazing. This applies to individual or partitioned glazed areas located within the ground floor area. **Window product and temporary poster displays not attached to glazing and** signs not attached to glazing that are sited within the enclosed interior of a building and are not directly visible from a public place, are not subject to part (b) of this rule."*

**Erin Quin**

**6<sup>th</sup> August 2018**

**ATTACHMENT: EXAMPLE PHOTOS OF WINDOW AND NOTICE BOARD SIGNAGE**

