

## Attachment C – Bylaw Panel recommendations

This attachment contains the Bylaw Panel recommendations in response to public feedback and local board views on the proposal to make the new Signs Bylaw 2022. The table format shown is a condensed version of the table used by the Bylaw Panel to provide a structure for deliberations. A fuller version showing reasons contained in feedback can be viewed in [Attachment A](#) of the Bylaw Panel Deliberations Report.

The Bylaw Panel read all the public feedback and local board views in Attachments C to H of its deliberations agenda report to ensure that all matters raised received due consideration. Operational and non-bylaw related matters were summarised in Attachment E of that report and will be referred to other Auckland Council and Auckland Transport departments and other council-controlled organisations where relevant.

Public feedback topic (Proposal 1) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify current rules, including placement / conditions for display of banners</b></p> <p>41 feedback responses: <b>30 support (73 per cent)</b>, 9 oppose (22 per cent), 2 other (5 per cent) and 19 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (5) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Reject, and replace with new proposal or maintain status quo (1) (Hibiscus and Bays).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying current rules, including the placement and conditions for the display of banners in clause 14 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>. Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>seeks to balance rights and freedoms to display banner signs with rules that manage their potential negative impacts</li> <li>is part of a wider regulatory framework which limits third-party advertising on private property to achieve its objectives</li> <li>already regulates changeable message signs, prohibits animations and regulates colour where an approval is required</li> <li>already provides rules to address public safety and obstruction risks, for example prohibits signs that obstruct or create a hazard or obstruct the line of sight, and requires signs to be secure, structurally sound, not able to be displaced under poor or adverse weather conditions, and maintained in a condition that does not endanger public safety or cause a nuisance</li> <li>already clarifies the requirement to comply with other legislation</li> <li>already regulates duration, removal, number and location of banner signs, for example as a condition of approval or as part of a rule for banners that are also another sign type such as an event sign</li> <li>already requires cross-street banners on council-controlled public places to obtain an approval and provides for limited signs by sports clubs on Open Space Zones without an approval.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (content) (6):</b> Amend content rules, for example restrict or remove restrictions for sign content on private property, or regulate colours, animations and changeable messages on banners.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (safety / environmental protection) (4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce rules for safety.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (display period) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce removal rules in general.</li> <li>Require banners advertising events to be removed within one day of the event.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (location) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only allow banners on private property (for example wrong to use public land for personal gain).</li> <li>Apply rules to entire region, not just city centre.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (quantity) (2)</b></p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 1) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibit / reduce number of banners (too many).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (approvals) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require council approval for banners on council-controlled public places, excluding banners attached to buildings (for example sports clubs).</li> </ul>	<p>Note: Panel Member Glenn Wilcox dissented due to requirement for banner signs on private property to only advertise products, services, goods or events available or taking place on the site (unless an approval has been obtained).</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 2A – Election signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify that election signs may be displayed on some sites for nine weeks and are permitted on billboards and poster board sites</b></p> <p>47 feedback responses: 25 support (53 per cent), 17 oppose (36 per cent), 5 other (11 per cent) and 31 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Waitemata).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (election sign sites) (13)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow only on sites normally recognised as being suitable or that are on existing, permanent digital infrastructure.</li> <li>Allow election signs with no limits on placement if displayed with landowner permission.</li> <li>Prohibit election signs on all private properties (excluding MP's residential and office properties), council-controlled public places, posterboards, and at locations where not all parties may display.</li> <li>Prohibit election signs directed at primary and secondary schools, industrial / commercial parks and playgrounds typically well contained within four walls (for example McDonalds and Lollipops).</li> <li>Prohibit all election signs / all party election signs on all sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Devonport-Takapuna suggest that outside the 9-week election campaign period signs designed purely to promote government or local body elected members should be restricted to their official premises or residence.</p> <p><b>Key changes sought (display period) (9)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retain current rules - election signs displayed for long enough as it is.</li> <li>Allow display only for a limited time.</li> <li>Reduce display period, for example to one month or four weeks maximum as signs are damaged, not looked after, and display period too long for purpose of signs.</li> <li>Increase display period for candidates who aren't currently elected; do not increase for incumbent candidates.</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying that election signs may be displayed on some sites for nine weeks and are permitted on billboards and poster board sites in clause 17 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify that there are more opportunities to display election signs than would otherwise be allowed for signs not related to activities on the property</li> <li>align with the requirement for national election signs to comply with the nine-week pre-election period in the Electoral Act 1993 (s221B).</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal retains current limits on sites, including clarifying that third-party signs can display election advertisements at any time</li> <li>the proposal seeks to address negative impacts by requiring signs to comply with appropriate specific and</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 2A – Election signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna suggest that outside the 9-week election campaign period signs where a government or local body elected member is promoting a particular cause or event should be limited to no more than 3 weeks at any one site in any three-month period.</li> <li>Ōrākei suggests providing clear and unambiguous guidelines about whether the nine-week display period overrides the board's 2017 resolution to impose a four-week display period on election signs in local parks and reserves, and the relevant enforcement authority.</li> </ul>	<p>general rules while providing opportunities for display to support democracy. This includes for example prohibiting obstruction and use of changeable messages, but not differentiating by candidate status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal allows for more limited display durations on council-controlled public places as set in a Bylaw Control.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (removal / safety) (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require election signs to be removed after nine-week period / be removed or repaired immediately after damage (4).</li> <li>Require election signs to be clear of street intersections / not block traffic visibility, to avoid visual obstruction (2).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (appearance / quantity / application) (3):</b> Amend appearance / quantity / application rules.</p> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Howick suggests setting a maximum number of election signs per person for local board and councillor positions combined per electorate.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 2B – Election signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Prohibit election signs directed at a council-controlled park, reserve or Open Space Zone</b></p> <p>48 feedback responses: <b>30 support (63 per cent)</b>, 17 oppose (35 per cent), one 'I don't know' (2 per cent), 34 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (3) (Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Waitemata).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (1) (Puketapapa).</li> <li>Reject, and replace with new proposal or maintain status quo (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Franklin, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (permit in certain places) (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permit election signs on private property, for example to avoid private property right restrictions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna suggest prohibiting election signs on the shared boundary between private and council-controlled land.</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about prohibiting election signs directed at a council-controlled park, reserve or Open Space Zone in clause 17 be <b>amended</b> to clarify that election signs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>must be directed at the roadway</li> <li>must not be displayed on a boundary fence facing into any Open Space Zone (for example a council-controlled park or reserve)</li> <li>may be displayed on a front boundary fence on the opposite side of the roadway to an Open Space Zone.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>protect the amenity of Open Space Zones</li> <li>improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 2B – Election signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Franklin suggests only prohibiting election signs directed at a council-controlled park, reserve or Open Space Zone if on a common boundary fence between the public space and private property.</li> <li>Puketāpapa suggest restricting signs on reserve fences but not signs on private fences opposite reserves.</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal aligns with wider objectives contained in park management guidelines and plans for parks to provide places of respite from the pressures of everyday life</li> <li>the Bylaw must be made for the reasons stated in its purpose and cannot discriminate about current candidate status.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (restrict) (1):</b> Restrict display based on candidate status.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 2C – Election signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the current rules, including to remove Entrust from the types of permitted election signs</b></p> <p>48 feedback responses: <b>32 support (67 per cent)</b>, 10 oppose (21 per cent), 4 selected 'I don't know' (8 per cent), 2 other (4 per cent) and 21 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Waitemata).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (2) (Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei).</li> <li>Reject, and replace with new proposal or maintain status quo (2) (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (energy trust signs) (10)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow Entrust signs in general; allow on private land; prohibit on council-controlled public places (6).</li> <li>Allow Entrust signs but restrict content, to create awareness and avoid misinformation (1).</li> <li>Allow other energy trust signs (3).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (4):</b> Hibiscus and Bays, Maungakiekie-Tāmaki, Ōrākei and Puketāpapa all suggest allowing Entrust election signs.</p> <p><b>Key changes sought (central electoral process) (1):</b> Clarify / amend relationship with central electoral process to ensure that rules comply with / will not require changes to electoral requirements.</p> <p><b>Other local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hibiscus and Bays suggest requiring all election signs to comply with the special and general rules in Subparts 2 and 3 of Part 2 of the proposed new Bylaw, for fairness.</li> <li>Ōrākei suggest requiring a separation distance between election signs (for example 10 metres or another distance) as election billboards become cluttered and work on a first-in, first-served basis.</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the current rules, including to remove Entrust from the types of permitted election signs be <b>rejected and the proposal amended to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>allow any energy trust which owns shares in a public utility company for the benefit of its beneficiaries in Auckland to display election signs</li> <li>add a related information note about current energy trusts in Auckland.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recognise that energy trust beneficiaries are Aucklanders who vote to elect trustees to manage public utility assets (for example electricity supply) for their benefit</li> <li>treat all Auckland energy trusts consistently.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>already clarifies the relationship with electoral requirements and notes in the Bylaw Summary that the Bylaw does not seek to duplicate or be inconsistent with legislation</li> <li>already requires election signs to comply with all special and general rules</li> <li>focuses on impacts to the public (for example safety risks)</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 2C – Election signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>can, if appropriate, regulate the number and placement of signs on council-controlled public places as set in a Bylaw Control.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 3A – Event signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Allow people to advertise temporary sales (like garage sales) on the day of the event</b></p> <p>41 feedback responses: <b>22 support (54 per cent)</b>, 14 oppose (34 per cent), 4 other (10 per cent), one selected 'I don't know' (2 per cent) and 26 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (1) (Papakura).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Ōrākei, Waitemata).</li> <li>Reject, and replace with new proposal or maintain status quo (1) (Puketāpapa).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (display period / removal) (14)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require sign removal, for example the day after the sale.</li> <li>Increase display period before the sale, for example one, two, three, five or up to seven days to allow sufficient time to generate awareness amongst more people, ensure signs are effective, and assist disposal of goods and potential reduction of waste to landfill.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Henderson-Massey suggest requiring removal of the sign the day after the event.</li> <li>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggest setting a “permitted duration of temporary sales signage”.</li> <li>Six boards suggest increasing the display period before the sale, for example to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>two or three days (Hibiscus and Bays)</b></li> <li><b>three days (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey)</b></li> <li><b>between three and seven days (Kaipātiki)</b></li> <li><b>seven days / one week (Ōrākei, Puketāpapa).</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (conditions) (2):</b> Apply further conditions, for example align rules with existing event restrictions for residential zones or require temporary sale signs to be made of paper.</p> <p><b>Key changes sought (placement) (1)</b></p>	<p>That the proposal about allowing people to advertise temporary sales (like garage sales) on the day of the event in clause 16 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to provide certainty about opportunities to advertise temporary sale events on residential properties, while reducing potential for nuisance and clutter.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed display and removal periods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>align with rules for directional real estate signs</li> <li>seek to reduce risk of visual amenity issues</li> <li>recognise that social media can also be used to promote temporary sale events.</li> </ul> </li> <li>temporary sales on residential properties are minor events not of a scale requiring formal event management, however compliance with any relevant regulation is still required</li> <li>allowing display in public places near the property is considered appropriate as the signs have similar impact to sole-agent real estate signs which are accepted by the community.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 3A – Event signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend placement rules / conditions to require display only on the property where the sale occurs, or add rules for sign mountings to ensure signs are secured and do not blow into pedestrians, cars, cyclists and house windows.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Local board views on how to address feedback (1)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waitematā suggest allowing display only on the property where the sale occurs.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 3B – Event signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><a href="#">Allow event signs to use election sign sites and clarify that community events must be provided by not-for-profit groups</a></p> <p>41 feedback responses: <b>24 support (59 per cent)</b>, 11 oppose (27 per cent), 5 other (12 per cent), one selected 'I don't know' (2 per cent) and 23 comments.</p>	<p>That the proposal about allowing event signs to use election sign sites and clarifying that community events must be provided by not-for-profit groups in clause 16 be <b>rejected and the proposal amended</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>remove provision for the display of an event sign on a council-controlled election sign site</li> <li>remove differentiation for community events provided by a not-for-profit group</li> <li>clarify that a community event sign on private property must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>relate solely to the event rather than any sponsors</li> <li>be located within the area local to the event.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Panel notes that this means the display of event signs are limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the site of the event</li> <li>a location specified in a future Bylaw Control or approval</li> <li>a community event sign on a community noticeboard specified in the proposed Bylaw Control</li> <li>a community event sign on a site associated with that community that is not a council-controlled public place.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance</li> <li>allow event signs in a way that:</li> </ul>
<p><a href="#">Local board views (7)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (4) (Henderson-Massey, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (3) (Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Waitematā).</li> </ul>	
<p><a href="#">Key changes sought (community event signs) (11)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow display of community event signs by groups other than not-for-profit groups in general / on sites associated with the community.</li> <li>Clarify whether schools (both public and private) may display community event signs.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Local board views (1)</a>: Hibiscus and Bays suggest recognising that events for community groups may be provided by groups other than not-for-profit groups.</p>	
<p><a href="#">Key changes sought (display duration / removal) (4)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit display period pre- and post-event (for example, require removal the next day).</li> <li>Require signs to be removed or repaired immediately after damage.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Local board views (2)</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Albert-Eden suggest limiting display of community event signs to two weeks before until one day after event.</li> <li>Waitematā suggest limiting display of 'event signs' to one week before until one day after event.</li> </ul>	
<p><a href="#">Key changes sought (election sign sites) (4)</a></p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 3B – Event signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not allow event signs to be displayed on election sign sites / on public land (for example, to avoid clutter)</li> <li>Instead of using election sign sites, establish dedicated event sign sites that are appropriately operated and curated (for example, tender for operators responsible for managing locations).</li> <li>Ensure that restrictions for election signs do not apply to event signs on election sign sites (for example, as same restrictions not applicable).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna seek clarification around signs for events benefitting not-for-profits which are sponsored or provided by a commercial third party, and suggest that election sign sites be limited to election candidates and not-for-profit organisations and events in the local board / ward area.</li> <li>Waitematā suggest prohibiting display of event signs on election sign sites, for example due to clutter, public safety risks and reduced visual amenity / access from display of signs year-round.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>supports and informs communities while reducing potential for proliferation, clutter and distraction risks that may impact use and enjoyment of public places</li> <li>aligns with the wider regulatory framework which limits third-party advertising</li> <li>recognises that community events may be provided by commercial groups or supported by sponsorship</li> <li>ensures relevance of community event signs on private property to the local area.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed duration and removal rules support event awareness and ensure sign removal post-event</li> <li>proposal requires all signs to be maintained in a condition that does not endanger public safety or cause a nuisance</li> <li>'political' signs must comply with rules for the relevant sign type</li> <li>the Bylaw can only address matters contained in its purpose</li> <li>proposal already notes that a person must also comply with any other relevant legislation and industry standards</li> <li>limiting event signs to events within a local board area and within a specified distance may increase clutter and limit event awareness and display options.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarifications) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify how proposal impacts display of 'political signs'.</li> <li>Clarify proposal to prevent association of events with political parties that the parties are not affiliated with (concern about taking credit for initiatives like festivals).</li> <li>Clarify how proposal will interact with existing advertising legislation and communications industry standards.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (display locations) (1):</b> Allow additional or alternative display locations.</p> <p><b>Local board views (2):</b> Waitematā (for all event signs) and Albert-Eden (for community event signs) suggest allowing signs only 'for an event within the local board area and within two kilometres of the sign's location'.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 3C – Event signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the current event sign rules, including their definition and placement</b></p> <p>41 feedback responses: <b>32 support (78 per cent)</b>, 3 oppose (7 per cent), 4 other (10 per cent), 2 selected 'I don't know' (5 per cent) and 15 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (6) (Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the current event sign rules, including their definition and placement in clause 16 be <b>amended</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>align with the Bylaw Panel directions for Proposal 3B</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 3C – Event signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt with amendments (1) (Devonport-Takapuna).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarify in an information note where people can display event signs (for example community notice boards).</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal already regulates temporary sale signs and real estate signs as separate sign types</li> <li>the recommended Bylaw does not differentiate between community and commercial events</li> <li>clarification of Auckland Transport-owned land or sites is an operational matter</li> <li>the proposal already provides rules to manage public safety and damage risks</li> <li>the proposal already limits the size of event signs on private property to 1.5m<sup>2</sup> and provides appropriate display duration and removal rules</li> <li>the recommended Bylaw only prohibits information about the event sponsor on a community event sign on private property.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (event definition) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Broaden ‘event’ definition to include real estate signs and garage sales (as these activities cause issues).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Albert-Eden suggest restricting ‘community signs’ to community events and community non-profit-making events.</li> <li>Hibiscus and Bays suggest ensuring rules differentiate between community and commercial events.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (conditions) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify Auckland Transport owned land / sites.</li> <li>Clarify rules about permanent event noticeboards that can be used for different community events.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (public safety) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require signs to be secured to reduce public safety risks and damage, for example from being blown away and into pedestrians or property. Refer feedback number 19 for examples of the above.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (placement / appearance) (1):</b> Allow a sponsor’s name on a not-for-profit event sign.</p> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Devonport-Takapuna support temporary signs up to 3m<sup>2</sup> on private property supporting trade exhibitions, shows, and commercial events which may be displayed up to four weeks prior, and moved immediately after the event.</p>	
<p><b>Staff clarification (events include sponsorship):</b> Amend ‘event sign’ definition to allow sponsorship as the secondary message, as already occurs in practice (cl 16(1)).</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 4 – Free-standing signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify current rules, including the definition and separation distances for free-standing signs</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;"> <p>50 feedback responses: <b>33 support (66 per cent)</b>, 7 oppose (14 per cent), 6 other (12 per cent), 4 selected ‘I don’t know’ (8 per cent) and 29 comments.</p> </div> <p><b>Local board views (6):</b> Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying current rules, including the definition and separation distances for free-standing signs in clause 7 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</p>



Public feedback topic (Proposal 4 – Free-standing signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (safety) (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure freestanding signs (including any permanent, fixed signage such as signage on monuments, poles and pylons) are placed in a way that does not obstruct / impede pedestrians and ensures safety of all members of the public.</li> <li>• Ensure signs are safely displayed and constructed, for example in windy conditions.</li> <li>• Prohibit large 'A' Frame signs (area: 4m<sup>2</sup>, width: 2m, height: 6m) / Remove 'or placed on the ground' from the definition of freestanding sign (clause 7(1)(b)).</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that the proposal already contains rules to protect public safety and reduce nuisance risks, and that any non-compliance can be reported to council for enforcement. For example, the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• prohibits signs that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ affect the safe and efficient movement of traffic on council-controlled public places</li> <li>○ obstruct the line of sight of any corner, bend, intersection, vehicle crossing, pedestrian crossing or private entrance</li> <li>○ obstruct or create a hazard to a person on foot or in a vehicle</li> </ul> </li> <li>• requires signs to be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ secure, structurally sound, not easily broken, and not able to be displaced under poor or adverse weather conditions</li> <li>○ maintained in a condition that does not endanger public safety or cause a nuisance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• sets sign size, number, placement and separation distance rules which enable display while managing potential negative impacts</li> <li>• identifies that the key difference between freestanding and portable signs is the ability to be moved easily by hand.</li> </ul> <p>Note: The Panel's decision to amend the sizes of some types of signs to minimise waste affects freestanding signs (refer 'Other matters - Amend sign sizes to prevent waste').</p>
<p><b>Key changes sought (separation distance) (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend separation distances between principal freestanding signs to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ensure the distances accurately reflect best practice</li> <li>○ reduce the 10m distance for signs on same site, for example to 2m</li> <li>○ introduce limit of one sign per 10m property front</li> <li>○ extend the 2m distance for signs on another site to 10m between signs on any site.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Note: feedback about trailer signs has been moved to Proposal 9 about vehicle signs.</p> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggest setting a “permitted distance from property for freestanding signs”.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (sign size) (2):</b> Add maximum sign size, for example to protect public safety.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify difference between freestanding and portable signs further, including their ability to be moved, and provide description to inform how freestanding signs are to be moved.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 5A – Portable signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Increase the area where portable signs are prohibited to cover the entire City Centre Zone</b></p> <p>50 feedback responses: <b>33 support (66 per cent)</b>, 10 oppose (20 per cent), 4 other (8 per cent), 3 selected 'I don't know' (6 per cent) and 35 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Waitemata).</li> <li>• Adopt with amendments (3) (Albert-Eden, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about increasing the area where portable signs are prohibited to cover the entire City Centre Zone in Appendix C of the associated Bylaw Control be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to:</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 5A – Portable signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (remove prohibition / solely regulate) (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove / do not increase prohibited area (3).</li> <li>Regulate rather than prohibit portable signs (5).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (consider local context) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delay commencement of new prohibited area, for example for 12 months or until at least 2026 to support small businesses (due to concern about enforcement in current construction and Covid-19 environment).</li> <li>Ensure other options available for small businesses (such as cost-effective or free sign alternatives)</li> <li>Take more nuanced approach by developing criteria to determine prohibited areas, more aligned with local context (for example, consider footpath width, pedestrian numbers, street amenity, micro-mobility device usage, business use of the area and traffic counts).</li> <li>Clarify that portable signs are allowed on publicly accessible private property within the ban area (as difference between portable signs on private property and public spaces is unclear).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Ōrākei suggests support to small businesses through portable sign advertising may help mitigate impacts of lower foot traffic from lockdown and City Rail Link disruption.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prioritise the area for pedestrians and place-making activities, for example the proposal would support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accessibility for the mobility and vision-impaired, and use of micro-mobility devices</li> <li>implementation of the <a href="#">City Centre Masterplan</a></li> <li>Wynyard Quarter as a pedestrian-friendly area.</li> </ul> </li> <li>help to reduce potential safety, nuisance, and clutter risks</li> <li>recognise that portable signs may not always be the primary marketing medium.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a definitive, prompt commencement date is considered more appropriate than a delayed commencement date, to increase certainty and voluntary compliance</li> <li>additional portable sign bans in other areas may be adopted in a Bylaw control or considered as part of a future Bylaw review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> Panel Member Glenn Wilcox expressed a preference to retain the current ban area until the next Bylaw review to support business recovery from COVID-19 impacts and recognise that portable signs may help to support vibrancy of the City Centre Zone.</p>
<p><b>Key changes sought (extend prohibited area) (15) Note:</b> Includes similar feedback from Proposal 5B. Feedback about bollard sleeve signage may be found in Proposal 5B.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend prohibited area (for example to town centres, shopping centres, public footpaths, Neighbourhood Centre Zones, other areas with high pedestrian traffic volumes).</li> <li>Prohibit portable signs on footpaths but allow for events, temporary activities, and public interest and community purposes, for example protests, sports and markets.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Albert-Eden suggest banning portable signs in the City Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Zones.</li> <li>Hibiscus and Bays suggest prohibiting portable signs in all town centres (as obstruction and hindered visibility occur in any commercial area).</li> <li>Puketapapa suggest investigating banning or further regulating portable signs in the City Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Zones (for example to address issues relating to accessibility, amenity, and proliferation of advertising in the public realm).</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 5B – Portable signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
Clarify current rules, including the definition and placement of portable signs	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 5B – Portable signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p>50 feedback responses: <b>37 support (74 per cent)</b>, 4 oppose (8 per cent), 5 other (10 per cent), 4 selected 'I don't know' (8 per cent) and 28 comments.</p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying current rules, including the definition and placement of portable signs in clause 11 be <b>amended</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• correct drafting errors</li> <li>• improve certainty</li> <li>• clarify the rules for signs on bollards in the Bylaw Summary and clause 6(3)(a).</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better reflect the intent of current rules for portable signs on private property in a way that is up to date, more certain and reflective of current practice</li> <li>• clarify that the proposal already manages signs on bollards.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal already sets number, placement, separation distance, detection and responsibility rules for portable signs on council-controlled public places</li> <li>• the proposal already prohibits signs that endanger public safety, cause a nuisance, obstruct, or create a hazard</li> <li>• approvals for signs that do not comply with the Bylaw may still be granted in exceptional circumstances.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura).</li> <li>• Adopt with amendments (3) (Albert-Eden, Devonport-Takapuna, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (placement / duration) (7):</b> Amend or clarify placement / duration rules.</p> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Devonport-Takapuna suggest allowing flexibility or a consenting process to allow additional portable ladder boards for multi-business buildings and arcades, and/or to allow reasonable signage at street corners to enable customers to find businesses and local attractions located down side-streets (for example, to support business recovery, and the vibrancy and viability of our shopping centres).</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (safety) (2):</b> Add rules to better protect public safety.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (bollard sleeve signs) (4):</b> Include bollard sleeves as a type of portable sign and prohibit bollard sleeve signs; prohibit on footpaths and surrounding areas.</p> <p><b>Local board views (4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit bollard sleeve signage throughout Auckland (Albert-Eden).</li> <li>• Address bollard advertising, to avoid unnecessary clutter and harmful advertising at shop entrances and other public spaces (Maungakiekie-Tāmaki).</li> <li>• Prohibit bollard sleeve signage (concern about prevalence in Neighbourhood Centre Zones) (Waitematā).</li> <li>• Investigate banning or further regulating bollard sleeves in the City Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Zones (for example to address issues relating to accessibility, amenity, and proliferation of advertising in the public realm) (Puketapapa).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Other local board views (1):</b> Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggests setting a “permitted distance from property for portable signs”.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 6 – Posters) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify current rules, including that poster board sites require approval</b></p> <p>37 feedback responses: <b>28 support (76 per cent)</b>, 6 oppose (16 per cent), 2 other (5 per cent), 1 selected 'I don't know' (3 per cent) and 18 comments.</p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the current rules, including that poster board sites require approval in clause 13 be <b>amended</b> to:</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 6 – Posters) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Ōrākei, Papakura).</li> <li>• Adopt with amendments (3) (Albert-Eden, Hibiscus and Bays, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• move clause 13(3)(a) to ‘Conditions for ... poster boards in (2)(a)’</li> <li>• amend the first table header in clause 13(3) to ‘Conditions for display of all poster signs in (2)’.</li> <li>• refer to posters and banners used as a ‘sign’ in the title of clauses 13 and 14</li> <li>• include a definition of ‘poster board’ in clause 5(1) and 13(2)(a) instead of clause 13(4).</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal already regulates façade signs, for example as either a window sign, poster sign or wall-mounted sign.</li> <li>• permitted distances from property are unnecessary due to nature of a poster sign which is displayed on a building or other approved structure.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (façade posters) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit poster signs on the façades of premises (for example on a board covering a window) in Neighbourhood Centre Zones.</li> <li>• Amend clause 13(1) to add definition of façade poster sign (for example ‘, and to a façade poster sign, which in this Bylaw means a temporary sign fixed to a structure or building (or within a frame fixed to a structure or building)’).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local board views (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three local boards in relation to façade signs on premises in Neighbourhood Centre Zones suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ including façade signs in the Bylaw due to concerns about prevalence, particularly in Neighbourhood Centre Zones (Waitemata)</li> <li>○ prohibiting façade signs (or regulating prevalence, size / coverage and content) (Albert-Eden)</li> <li>○ investigating banning or further regulating façade signs (Puketāpapa).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify requirements for event posters) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify that some posters related to an event are permitted without an approval.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify definitions and phrasing) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify whether “poster” and “poster sign” can be used interchangeably (only “poster sign” is defined).</li> <li>• Define ‘poster board’ in clause 5 or clause 13(1) to align with the definition in 13(4).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggests setting a “permitted distance from property for posters”.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 7A – Real estate signs in Heavy Industry Zones) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Increase maximum area of certain flat wall-mounted real estate signs in Heavy Industry Zones to 6m<sup>2</sup></b></p> <p>34 feedback responses: <b>19 support (56 per cent)</b>, 11 oppose (32 per cent), 1 other (3 per cent), 3 selected ‘I don’t know’ (9 per cent) and 14 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>• Reject, and replace with new proposal or maintain status quo (3) (Henderson-Massey, Ōrākei, Waitematā).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about increasing the maximum area of certain flat wall-mounted real estate signs in Heavy Industry Zones to 6m<sup>2</sup> in clause 15(3) be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 7A – Real estate signs in Heavy Industry Zones) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mangere-Otahuhu Local Board: does not indicate support/opposition but notes that real estate signs if not regulated cause safety issues with signs obscuring views, properties having too many signs and signs obstructing footpaths and driveways.</li> </ul>	<p>Reasons include to allow more visible display of information in an area which has a larger built form and a lower priority on amenity.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clauses 24(2)(e)(f) of the proposed Bylaw already require signs not to distract drivers.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (do not distract drivers) (1):</b> Prohibit real estate signs from distracting drivers.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (retain current sign size) (4):</b> Do not increase the size to 6m<sup>2</sup> / Retain current sign size.</p> <p><b>Local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Henderson-Massey suggests (based on a review of public feedback) that increasing size of wall mounted signs is unnecessary.</li> <li>Waitemata suggests maintaining the status quo as larger signs could reduce visual amenity and are unnecessary as these signs are already visible.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 7B – Real estate signs) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the rules for real estate signs, including the maximum number and placement of real estate signs</b></p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for real estate signs, including the maximum number and placement of real estate signs in clause 15 be <b>amended</b> to clarify in clause 15(3)(d) that the earlier of the two dates provided for the removal of principal real estate signs applies.</p> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal retains the intent of the current Bylaw in a way that is easier to understand, including limits on sign number and size</li> <li>the proposal already requires real estate signs to comply with rules to reduce safety and obstruction risks</li> </ul>
<p>34 feedback responses: <b>21 support (62 per cent)</b>, 8 oppose (24 per cent), 1 other (3 per cent), 4 selected 'I don't know' (12 per cent) and 16 comments.</p>	
<p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (5) (Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (1) (Devonport-Takapuna).</li> <li>Mangere-Otahuhu does not indicate support/opposition but notes that real estate signs cause safety issues if not regulated, for example obscure views, properties with too many signs, obstructing footpaths and driveways.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> Feedback and views about illuminated and changeable message real estate signs are addressed in Proposal 14C.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (increase restrictions) (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit real estate signs to one small 'For Sale' sign/house or within property boundary (2).</li> <li>Prohibit real estate advertising in any public space (1).</li> <li>Prohibit directional signs/flags (1)</li> <li>Restrict directional signs to display on one day only (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Local Board views (1):</b> Devonport-Takapuna suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>clarifying how long a principal sign can remain after sale</li> <li>limiting directional signs to one per intersection per real estate brand to reduce proliferation</li> <li>permitting signs whose primary purpose is to advertise an agent and not a property only at the agent's business premises or private residence.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 7B – Real estate signs) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (amend number of signs for sub-divisions) (1):</b> Amend rules for signs in sub-divisions / housing developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal provides for signs on ‘the site of the premises’ (for example any area of land that could have a certificate of title) without any needing further approval.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (prohibit on footpaths) (1):</b> Require footpaths to be kept clear.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 8 – Stencil signs) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the rules for stencil signs, including the definition and placement of stencil signs</b></p> <p>24 feedback responses: <b>17 support (71 per cent)</b>, 3 oppose (13 per cent), 4 selected ‘I don’t know’ (17 per cent) and 6 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (regulate port and industrial areas differently) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Differentiate the rules for ‘industrial and port areas’ from other areas (for example residential, commercial etc).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for stencil signs, including the definition and placement of stencil signs be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that the proposal seeks to retain and clarify the intent of the current Bylaw, for example the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>seeks to address safety and nuisance risks (noting that stencil signs in port and industrial areas create the same safety issues as other zones)</li> <li>requires an approval for display on council-controlled public places</li> <li>does not apply to stencils on private property not visible to the public</li> <li>allows instructional or information signs required by statute or for public safety or security.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 9 – Vehicle signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the current rules, including when a person may display a sign on a vehicle and what rules regulate signs advertising a vehicle for sale</b></p> <p>24 feedback responses: <b>12 support (40 per cent)</b>, 13 oppose (43 per cent), 2 other (7 per cent), 3 selected ‘I don’t know’ (10 per cent) and 15 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (4) (Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Reject, and replace with a new proposal or maintain status quo (1) (Devonport-Takapuna).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (increase restrictions) (6)</b></p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the current rules, including when a person may display a sign on a vehicle and what rules regulate signs advertising a vehicle for sale in clause 18 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that the proposal either already provides rules that seek to manage matters raised, or further changes are not considered appropriate, for example:</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 9 – Vehicle signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibit certain signs / practices, for example prohibit all vehicle signs / billboard trailer signs, prohibit bus destination signage from being an unreadable size and prohibit the sale of vehicles on streets and instead require vehicles for sale to be parked on the owner’s property.</li> <li>Remove exceptions allowing election signs on vehicles outside of ordinary day-to-day travel and for the main purpose of displaying the sign</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna expressed concern about potential inequalities, for example that a prohibition intended to prevent commercial car yards using on-street parking to sell cars would mean private vehicle owners would also breach the Bylaw if they park their car on the road with a for sale sign.</li> <li>Ōrākei suggests vehicle owners should have the right to advertise and sell their vehicle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal seeks to balance rights and freedoms to display vehicle signs with rules that manage potential negative impacts</li> <li>the proposal already prohibits vehicle signs if the main purpose is to display advertising material (with exemptions for real estate and election signs and approvals)</li> <li>Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency <a href="#">urban bus standards</a> already specify that the external destination display sign must be easily readable as the bus approaches or departs</li> <li>the <a href="#">Auckland Transport Traffic Bylaw 2012</a> already prohibits the use of a vehicle on any road or parking place for the purpose of advertising the vehicle for sale, unless it is being used for day-to-day travel, being taken for a test drive or to a garage or testing facility.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (remove rules) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove all rules for signs on vehicles (regulation of signs on private vehicles restricts private property rights / should not regulate signs legal under road code).</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 10 – Verandah signs) (Number of comments in brackets) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the current rules, including the definition of verandah</b></p> <p>28 feedback responses: <b>15 support (54 per cent)</b>, 5 oppose (18 per cent), 2 other (7 per cent), 6 selected ‘I don’t know’ (21 per cent) and 13 comments.</p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the current rules, including the definition of verandah in clause 8 be <b>amended</b> to clarify that the 30mm projection in clause 8(3) applies when the veranda is over the road and that there is no maximum projection when veranda is on private property.</p> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance</li> <li>better protect public safety on council-controlled public places (for</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (advertising conditions) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend advertising conditions, in ‘other’ column under clause 8(3), to reduce percentage of a verandah fascia sign that may display advertising, from a maximum of 50 per cent to maximum of 10 per cent of the sign (as 50 per cent too generous).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (completely prohibit / allow) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibit verandah signs because they are unsightly.</li> <li>Allow verandah signs with no restrictions.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (above verandah signs) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restriction on above veranda signs is against the urban design expert approach of signage being acceptable if within a building envelope (which an above veranda sign would be).</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 10 – Verandah signs) (Number of comments in brackets) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify projection distance and other measurements) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend verandah fascia signs measurements [cl 8(3)] (2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ amend maximum projection of signs displayed on the fascia of a verandah to 0.3m (currently incorrectly listed as 30mm)</li> <li>○ amend diagram to show adjusted area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ would only allow ACM (a thin signage substrate).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Under verandah signs [cl 8(4)] (1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ change wording from “separation” to “set back” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ change maximum depth from 0.25m to 250mm</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ change minimum set back from 0.5m to 500mm <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ amend diagram to show adjusted area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>example to prevent buses or trucks from hitting signs).</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal retains the intent of current rules and continues to balance display of signs with rules that manage potential negative impacts</li> <li>• the proposal already prohibits signs mounted on top of a verandah.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Staff clarification (verandah definition)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definition of verandah in clause 8(1) should be clarified to refer to a sign ‘attached to’ rather than ‘on’ a verandah, to reflect that a sign may include swinging signage under a verandah.</li> <li>• The Panel if it wishes could amend subclause (a)(iii) of the definition of sign in Clause 5 to clarify whether it also includes signs affixed or painted on to a verandah.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 11A – Wall-mounted signs in Heavy Industry Zones) (Number of comments in brackets) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Increase maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in Heavy Industry Zones to 6m<sup>2</sup></b></p>	<p>That the proposal about increasing maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in Heavy Industry Zones to 6m<sup>2</sup> in clause 9 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to allow more visible display of information in an area which has a larger built form and a lower priority on amenity.</p>
<p>42 feedback responses: <b>25 support (60 per cent)</b>, 10 oppose (24 per cent), 7 selected ‘I don’t know’ (17 per cent) and 17 comments.</p>	
<p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>• Reject, and either replace with a new proposal or maintain status quo (3) (Henderson-Massey, Ōrākei, Rodney).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (reduce / remove restrictions) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce/remove restrictions (for signs on private property or flat wall-mounted signs in Heavy Industry Zones).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (limit size and number) (1):</b> Limit size and number of signs to “keep all signs to a minimum size and number”.</p> <p><b>Key changes sought (retain current sign size) (2):</b> Do not increase the size to 6m<sup>2</sup> / Retain current sign size.</p> <p><b>Local board views (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henderson-Massey suggests (based on a review of the public feedback) that increasing the size of wall-mounted signs is unnecessary.</li> <li>• Ōrākei suggests the proposed changes are unnecessary and do not add value.</li> <li>• Rodney does not support the increased size of wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industrial Zone.</li> </ul>	



Public feedback topic (Proposal 11B – Wall-mounted signs) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the current rules for wall-mounted signs, including locations, separation distances and dimensions</b></p> <p>40 feedback responses: <b>23 support (58 per cent)</b>, 10 oppose (25 per cent), 4 other (10 per cent), 3 selected 'I don't know' (8 per cent) and 19 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt with amendments (1) (Albert-Eden).</li> <li>• Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the current rules for wall-mounted signs, including locations, separation distances and dimensions in clause 9 be <b>amended</b> to clarify that the 30mm projection only applies where a sign impacts a council footpath or road and that a wall wrap is a wall-mounted sign. Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to continue to provide for signs advertising businesses</li> <li>• support certainty and ease of understanding and compliance</li> <li>• reduce safety risks to pedestrians.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (address regulatory gaps to protect visual amenity of Neighbourhood Centre Zones) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend the Bylaw to address regulatory gaps for businesses in Neighbourhood Centre Zones that use vivid colours and exterior wall-wraps as advertising signs, to protect the visual amenity of these zones as detailed in following specific relief sought. <b>Refer also to Other Matters (Bylaw purpose).</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Key change sought (restrict vivid colours) (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit or regulate buildings being painted in a single colour associated with a particular brand or franchise of the premises, in Neighbourhood Centre Zones (3).</li> <li>• Amend the definition of sign in clause 5(1) to add the underlined text (3): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ to exclude the colour of buildings or other structures in neighbourhood centre zones in subclause (b)(iii) (for example “a sign does not include the colour of a building, other structure or vehicle <u>(except for the colour of buildings or other structures in neighbourhood centre zones)</u>”</li> <li>○ to add that a sign includes advertisements, messages or notices placed (or similar) onto a <u>‘bollard’</u> in subclause (a)(iii) (<b>see relief sought in Proposal 5B</b>)</li> <li>○ to specify that a sign also includes advertising a franchise (for example “sign means an advertisement ... using any visual medium, which advertises a product, business, service, <u>franchise</u>, or event... ”.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views on vivid colours (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Albert-Eden suggests prohibiting or regulating buildings painted in vivid colours in Neighbourhood Centre Zones (for example requiring buildings in Neighbourhood Centre Zones to be painted in muted colours not associated with a business, franchise or advertiser).</li> <li>• Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggests that the proposed Bylaw does not address changes over the last five years such as the addition of block colouring of buildings (for example, intention to reduce crime and increase safety by actively discouraging window shop window signage has led to more street and building signage).</li> <li>• Puketāpapa suggests prohibiting or regulating use of vivid building colours for advertising purposes or for brand extension, in Neighbourhood Centre Zones.</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Auckland Unitary Plan generally regulates amenity through bulk and location rules with colour controls limited to areas with high natural amenity values</li> <li>• restricting base colours of buildings could create unintended consequences,</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 11B – Wall-mounted signs) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key change sought (restrict wall-wraps) (3):</b> Prohibit or regulate exterior wall wraps.</p> <p><b>Local board views on wall wraps (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggests that the proposed Bylaw does not address changes over the last five years to the addition of commercial advertising.</li> <li>Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa suggest prohibiting or regulating exterior building wraps (for example for advertising purposes or for brand extension) in Neighbourhood Centre Zones.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rationale: Protect visual amenity of Neighbourhood Centre Zones (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Signs Bylaw 2022 should give special protection to the visual amenity of Neighbourhood Centre Zones.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views on visual amenity (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu suggest providing special protection for the visual amenity of Neighbourhood Centre Zones (for example single corner stores or small shopping strips in residential neighbourhoods, especially those in vulnerable communities), to ensure these zones are attractive environments, create a sense of place and where the adverse visual effects of advertising (particularly from alcohol and fast-food) are minimised or avoided.</li> <li>Puketāpapa suggests investigating regulating signage more strictly in Neighbourhood Centre Zones in particular to allow for consideration of the visual amenity of these spaces.</li> </ul>	<p>be overly-restrictive, and subjective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it seeks to retain intent of current Bylaw (for example to not restrict signs further or regulate by industry further, and to rely on wider regulatory framework to regulate content)</li> <li>the Bylaw is part of a wider regulatory framework that already generally regulates objectionable content</li> <li>council is investigating further regulation of signs associated with off-licence premises separate from this proposal.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify / increase projection distance) (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify 30mm projection or amend wall-mounted sign maximum depth to 300mm (3).</li> <li>Increase projection distance of flat wall mounted signs to at least 100mm (2).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (prohibit in specific areas) (3):</b> Prohibit wall-mounted signs in specific areas (3).</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (regulate all businesses the same) (1):</b> Treat all businesses and industries the same.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (content of signs) (1):</b> Regulate the content of wall-mounted signs (for example to prevent objectionable content).</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 12 – Window signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify current rules, including that there are no restrictions on window signs in the City Centre Zone</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 5px 0;"> <p>29 feedback responses: <b>20 support (69 per cent)</b>, 8 oppose (28 per cent), 1 selected 'I don't know' (3 per cent) and 17 comments.</p> </div> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying current rules, including that there are no restrictions on window signs in the City Centre Zone in clause 12 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to:</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 12 – Window signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Reject, and either replace with a new proposal, or maintain status quo (1) (Waitematā).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (increase / decrease restrictions) (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exempt window signs in Metropolitan Centre Zones from all restrictions (to avoid disadvantaging Newmarket and Parnell businesses) (4).</li> <li>Increase restrictions for window signs in the City Centre in general or apply the same rules as for town centres as these are equivalent zones (3).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waitematā suggests applying: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to the city centre the current restrictions on window signs (particularly the restriction on more than half of a window being covered by a sign), to avoid impersonal street fronts</li> <li>current restrictions as far as practicable to signs / screens intended for viewing outside the premises, for safety and amenity reasons (noting that an internal window display could occupy an entire window space).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (decals / vinyl stickers) (2):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide for use of decals or vinyl stickers on vacant premises.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recognise the special character of the City Centre Zone compared to other commercial areas</li> <li>recognise the importance of window signs in the City Centre Zone given the portable sign ban</li> <li>improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal aligns with zone characteristics in the Auckland Unitary Plan, which identifies retail and commercial frontage controls that apply to commercial areas such as Metropolitan Centre Zones but not to the City Centre Zone</li> <li>the proposal applies to signs on or within 15mm of the inside face of a window of a building and does not regulate ‘window displays’</li> <li>the proposal limits display of ‘third-party’ signs, including on premises that may be vacant over a long period</li> <li>the Bylaw does not regulate decal or vinyl stickers that do not meet the definition of ‘sign’ (for example, which do not advertise a product and seek to increase amenity of an area).</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 13A – Major Recreational Facility Zones) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the rules for signs in Major Recreational Facility zones and the conditions for their display</b></p> <p>29 feedback responses: <b>14 support (48 per cent)</b>, 3 oppose (10 per cent), 2 other (7 per cent), 10 selected ‘I don’t know’ (34 per cent) and 8 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (5) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (allow facing signs) (1):</b> Amend clause 20(1)(c) to allow signs on buildings that face carparks which directly serve playing fields, and clubs that occupy the building.</p> <p><b>Key changes sought (remove rule) (1):</b> Remove all rules for signs in Major Recreational Facility Zones, as these facilities can regulate themselves.</p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for signs in Major Recreational Facility zones and the conditions for their display in clause 20 be <b>amended</b> to clarify that the display limits in clause 20(2) apply to signs primarily directed off-site.</p> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance</li> <li>allow display of signs while managing potential negative effects.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 13B – Open Space Zones) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the rules for signs in Open Space Zones, including which signs do not require an approval</b></p> <p>29 feedback responses: <b>17 support (59 per cent)</b>, 6 oppose (21 per cent), 2 other (7 per cent), 4 selected 'I don't know' (14 per cent) and 10 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (3) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Papakura).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (3) (Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Puketāpapa) (refer to Attachment E for Hibiscus and Bays and Puketāpapa relief sought).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (boundary fences) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow signs on boundary fences with an Open Space Zone to be displayed without approval from the relevant authority.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (enable clubs to advertise themselves and sponsors) (4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Permit community clubs to advertise themselves on public land (2).</li> <li>Enable clubs on council-controlled public places whose buildings are not visible from the Auckland transport system to advertise the club with signs on boundaries (1).</li> <li>Enable clubs to promote club sponsors reasonably (1).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (require approvals for all signs) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require all signs in Open Space Zones to obtain approval from the relevant authority.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Ōrākei suggests signs on boundary fences within Open Space Zones should not require council approval if on private property.</p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for signs in Open Space Zones, including which signs do not require an approval in clause 21 be <b>amended</b> to add a related information note about how officers determine the 'primary message' and 'secondary message' of a sign. Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support certainty and ease of understanding and compliance</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal appropriately retains the current approach to limit signs in Open Space Zones</li> <li>retains an approval process for boundary fence and infield signs and for signs that are unable to comply with the Bylaw.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 13C – Signs advertising commercial sexual services) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify a limit of one sign per commercial sexual service premises</b></p> <p>30 feedback responses: <b>22 support (73 per cent)</b>, 6 oppose (20 per cent), 1 other (3 per cent), 1 selected 'I don't know' (3 per cent) and 12 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (5) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Waitemātā).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (1) (Ōrākei).</li> <li>Reject, and either replace with a new proposal or maintain the status quo (1) (Hibiscus and Bays).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying a limit of one sign per commercial sexual service premises in clause 22 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>. Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 13C – Signs advertising commercial sexual services) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (remove clause) (4):</b> Remove Commercial Sexual Services clause and require these businesses to comply with the Bylaw's other rules.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 enables commercial sexual services to be regulated differently from other activities, including content of signs</li> <li>current sign rules are considered appropriate</li> <li>the Auckland Unitary Plan regulates the location of commercial sexual services.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (sign appearance) (1):</b> Reduce the permitted display area, in Residential Zones to 0.25m<sup>2</sup> and in all other (non-residential) Zones to 0.75m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	
<p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Ōrākei suggests allowing discretion in design of the sign.</p> <p><b>Key changes sought (clarify any banned areas) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify whether sexual services are banned in most residential areas.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 14A – Movement of traffic and vessels) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the rules that ensure signs do not endanger public safety, cause a nuisance or affect the safe, efficient movement of traffic or vessels</b></p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules that ensure signs do not endanger public safety, cause a nuisance or affect the safe, efficient movement of traffic or vessels in clauses 24 and 25 be <b>amended</b> to refer to luminescence.</p> <p>Reasons include to minimise risks to public safety by ensuring luminescence from signs do not distract vehicles.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that the Bylaw already adequately regulates risks to obstruction and public safety from signs on footpaths, and noise from signs.</p> <p>The Panel also notes that the Auckland Council Navigation Bylaw 2021 requires objects on the water (including signs) to not resemble a navigation safety symbol.</p>
<p>39 feedback responses: <b>26 support (67 per cent)</b>, 5 oppose (13 per cent), 7 other (18 per cent), 1 selected 'I don't know' (3 per cent) and 17 comments.</p>	
<p><b>Local board views (6):</b> Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (footpaths) (4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better protect public safety by introducing rules to address safety of pedestrians and vehicles.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (amend rules for traffic safety) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend 24(2)(e) to add 'luminescence' to the list of things a sign must not use (1).</li> <li>Add Related Information note explaining the key determinants of rapid sign comprehension (1).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (noise)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waitematā Local Board suggests expanding clause 23(2)(d) (which prohibits signs from emitting noise and similar) to include outdoor signs where the sounds or effects are audible or intrude into public space or other private spaces.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 14B – Altering the top of a building) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the rules for signs on rooftops by creating a new separate clause</b></p> <p>39 feedback responses: <b>31 support (79 per cent)</b>, 7 oppose (18 per cent), 1 other (3 per cent) and 18 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (6) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Ōrākei, Papakura, Puketāpapa, Waitematā).</li> <li>• Reject, and replace with a new proposal, or maintain status quo (1) (Hibiscus and Bays).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (remove rules about above roof signs) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove rules about above roof signs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (clarify scope of above roof rules) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify whether rules will apply retro-actively / to existing non-compliant signs (1).</li> <li>• Clarify that people should not illegally adjust their building to make their signs compliant (1).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for signs on rooftops by creating a new separate clause be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to retain the intent of current rules, which require an approval to display signs on or above the roofline and help to achieve the Bylaw purpose in relation to public safety, nuisance, the Auckland transport system and the environment</li> <li>• to ensure consistency with the Auckland Unitary Plan.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the proposal already clarifies when existing signs may continue to be displayed in clause 44</li> <li>• illegal alterations to a building are more appropriately addressed using relevant legislation such as the Building Act 2004 and Resource Management Act 1991.</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 14C – Illuminated and changeable message signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	
<p><b>Clarify the rules for illuminated signs, including that signs must use static images and lighting, and that the person displaying the sign must demonstrate it is compliant</b></p> <p>39 feedback responses: <b>29 support (74 per cent)</b>, 3 oppose (8 per cent), 6 other (15 per cent), 1 selected 'I don't know' (3 per cent) and 18 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (8)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei, Papakura).</li> <li>• Adopt with amendments (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Kaipātiki, Puketāpapa, Waitematā).</li> </ul>	
Public feedback topic (Proposal 14C – Changeable message signs)	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (animation / movement) (7)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restrict rapid changes between illumination levels (for example from dark to bright, to prevent strobing or flashing).</li> <li>• Restrict high colour contrasts between displays (for smoother transitions which do not distract or increase negative impacts).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for changeable message signs in clause 27 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty, ease of understanding and compliance with the intent of current rules.</p>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 14C – Illuminated and changeable message signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibit animation and movement on all signs visible to vehicle operators (boats, cars, bicycles) or digital video signs at intersections.</li> <li>Regulate colours, animations and changeable messages of certain sign types, for example election signs and event signs.</li> <li>Allow signs to use full-motion video / animation.</li> </ul>	<p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal already prohibits signs from using movement and animation, and illumination, movement or materials that may cause a distraction</li> <li>signs that use animation, movement or video are considered to pose higher nuisance and safety risks and may be inconsistent with the Auckland Transport <a href="#">Vision Zero for Tāmaki Makaurau</a> Programme</li> <li>proposal retains the same standard transition and dwell times as in the current Bylaw, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>allow for ease of understanding and compliance</li> <li>protect public safety by preventing longer transitions and short dwell times that could distract (noting that the Waka Kotahi / NZ Transport Agency <a href="#">Traffic Control Devices Manual, Part 3 Advertising Signs</a> does not set times).</li> </ul> </li> <li>proposal already requires a sign directed at drivers to be able to be read by a driver moving at the legal speed limit</li> <li>proposal retains the same luminance standards as in the current Bylaw which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>align with Auckland Unitary Plan limits for digital billboards</li> <li>allow for ease of understanding and compliance</li> </ul> </li> <li>proposal already requires changeable message signs that use artificial light sources to automatically adjust brightness in response to ambient light conditions</li> <li>proposal balances rights and freedoms to display signs with rules to address potential negative impacts, and requires signs that do not comply with the rules to obtain an approval.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (transition and dwell times) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce number of message changes per minute (to reduce distraction of traffic and visual disturbance).</li> <li>Replace minimum eight second dwell time (27(1)(c)) with a time that ensures that driver at legal speed limit 'will have the potential to be distracted by no more than one change of each image or display' (as while road user reaction times to signs are reasonably constant, vehicle speed rather than standard dwell time defines length of time a road user is exposed to a sign and the number of images viewed).</li> <li>Amend transition and dwell times (for example too short, impractical).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (luminance) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Replace daytime luminance limit with requirement "not to dazzle or distract".</li> <li>Reduce luminance limits (for both day-time and night-time).</li> <li>Require luminance levels to be relative to current ambient lighting levels (for example 75 per cent of surrounding light levels at all times except for day-time) to reduce distraction and night-time visual pollution to residents.</li> <li>Concern that council has not considered recommendations of Hearings Commissioners in LUC60347826 and notes other councils have higher daytime brightness limits.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Waitemātā suggest halving maximum brightness of signs between 9pm – 7am.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (increase prohibitions) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibit all changeable message signs.</li> <li>Prohibit display of changeable message signs visible to drivers (for example, to reduce distraction).</li> <li>Limit size of changeable message signs.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (approvals) (1):</b> Waitemātā Local Board suggests requiring approval for illuminated signs that use changeable messages or videos, through an individual application process that enables council to alter or decline signs if they create a nuisance or reduce visual amenity / safety.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 14C – Illuminated and changeable message signs) (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	
Public feedback topic (Proposal 14C – Illuminated signs)	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (restrictions / prohibitions) (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibit all illuminated signs (distracting, eyesore, not eco-friendly).</li> <li>Prohibit display of illuminated signs visible to drivers (to reduce distraction).</li> <li>Restrict illuminated signs at intersections to displaying during red lights only.</li> <li>Increase restrictions on illuminated signs in general (for example they are unnecessary as they waste energy, they are too bright, glaring or confusing).</li> <li>Add a strict limit on the number of illuminated signs in an area (to limit overall light pollution).</li> <li>Limit size of illuminated signs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna suggest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>restricting illuminated signs to commercial and industrial zones, or limit the size in residential areas to 0.3m<sup>2</sup> with low luminance levels</li> <li>restricting size of illuminated commercial billboards and prohibit from primarily facing a motorway or road (as they create visual distractions and safety hazards)</li> <li>prohibiting illuminated real estate signs in residential areas due to light disturbance to neighbours and ability to enforce rules.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Kaipātiki suggests tightening the rules on illuminated real estate signs, particularly where they are near road intersections or busy roads, and where they are attached to mobile frames (for example because they distract drivers with brightness, movement and appearance in unexpected places).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for illuminated signs in clause 28 be <b>amended</b> to reference the <a href="#">‘Digital Billboard Guidance-Addendum to Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 3’</a> in a related information note.</p> <p>Reasons include to support certainty and ease of understanding and compliance with the intent of current rules.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposal seeks to balance rights and freedoms to display illuminated signs with rules to address their potential negative impacts such as distraction</li> <li>proposal already prohibits signs that affect the safe and efficient movement of traffic on a council-controlled public place</li> <li>illuminated signs must still comply with rules for the sign type, such as size and number limits</li> <li>illumination standard AS/NZS 4282 2019 ‘Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting’ is an industry standard that is part of the wider regulatory framework.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (luminance) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add new illumination rule in a new clause 28(1)(e): ‘Must comply with the sign illumination standard AS/NZS 4282 2019’ as this is a national sign illumination standard.</li> <li>Note in related information note about illumination and glare requirements in Clause 28 the “Digital Billboard Guidance-Addendum to Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 3”, as is a new addition which sets requirements for digital billboards particularly in high-speed environments.</li> </ul>	
Public feedback topic (Proposal 14C – Illuminated and changeable message signs)	Panel recommendation
<b>Key changes sought (compliance) (2)</b>	That the proposal about clarifying the rules for illuminated and changeable message signs in clauses 27 and 28 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b> .



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require illuminated signs used by schools and other facilities to comply with the Bylaw.</li> <li>Require all signs to demonstrate compliance with changeable message sign rules; remove 'if required' from clause 27(2) to reduce risk of council bias.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Puketāpapa suggest ensuring an expectation that any malfunctions are fixed quickly (for example to prevent public safety risks from flashing signs).</li> </ul>	<p>Reasons include to support certainty and ease of understanding and compliance with the intent of current rules.</p> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all signs must comply with the Bylaw (including schools)</li> <li>requiring a compliance demonstration for changeable message signs may only be necessary during the investigation of complaints or proactive monitoring</li> <li>any malfunctions that make a sign non-compliant must be corrected to avoid compliance action.</li> </ul>
---	--

<b>Public feedback topic (Proposal 14D – Businesses that have ceased to trade)</b> (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	<b>Panel recommendation</b>
<p><b>Clarify the rules for businesses that have ceased to trade, including when and where signs must be removed</b></p> <p>38 feedback responses: <b>22 support (58 per cent)</b>, 14 oppose (37 per cent), 2 other (5 per cent), 1 selected 'I don't know' (3 per cent) and 18 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (4) (Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (1) (Devonport-Takapuna).</li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying the rules for businesses that have ceased to trade, including when and where signs must be removed in clause 29 be <b>amended</b> to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>add the owner, occupier or manager of the premises as the person responsible for the removal of a sign in clauses 5(1) under 'person' and 29(1) (same as in the current Bylaw)</li> <li>add a reference to the Unitary Plan in clause 29 in relation to signs that have historic heritage value.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons include to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>increase certainty, improve compliance and make it easier to understand who is responsible for removing a sign</li> <li>increase certainty about how signs with historic heritage value are regulated.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal seeks to apply to new signs on historic heritage features associated with a place's current use (rather than an historic sign that forms part of a place's heritage)</li> <li>using calendar months for the time period for sign removal could be considered unfair because calendar months do not account for public holidays or for how some months are shorter than others.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (time period) (8):</b> Amend the time period for removal of signs</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (heritage value) (1):</b> Allow some signs with historic heritage value to remain displayed (for example if they do not cause confusion).</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (responsibility for removal) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify who is responsible for removing business signs from premises where the business has moved or closed down.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (1):</b> Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggests the Bylaw address removal of signs after a business or similar vacates a property.</p>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 15 – Controls and approvals) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify ability for council to make additional rules and to approve signs that do not comply with the Bylaw</b></p>	<p>That the proposal about clarifying ability for council to make additional rules and to approve signs that do not comply in Part 3 be <b>amended</b> to:</p>
<p>29 feedback responses: <b>15 support (52 per cent)</b>, 7 oppose (24 per cent), 3 other (10 per cent), 4 selected 'I don't know' (14 per cent) and 13 comments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• exclude frames from the calculation of the area of a poster board in clause 34(2)</li> <li>• add the current area of a poster bollard in clause 34(2)</li> <li>• allow the transfer of approvals in clause 37</li> <li>• add 'all relevant traffic modes' in clause 33(2)(c)(i).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopt as notified (4) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>• Adopt with amendments (2) (Hibiscus and Bays, Ōrākei).</li> </ul>	<p>Reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to reflect current practice in relation to the calculation of the area of a poster board</li> <li>• to better provide for the intent of current rules in relation to the anticipated maximum area of poster bollards</li> <li>• to make the approval transfer process clearer, simpler and reflect current practice</li> <li>• to increase certainty by accounting for a broad range of traffic (for example scooters, cyclists, pedestrians and buses).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (poster board approvals) (3):</b> Amend or clarify poster board approval process.</p>	<p>In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p>
<p><b>Key changes sought (remove prohibition on poster boards facing Residential Zones) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove the requirement in clause 34(2)(a) for posters boards to not directly face a Residential Zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• poster board sites on private property can have negative effects on council-controlled public places</li> <li>• cumulative impacts are already considered as part of approval process</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (increase poster board size) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend clause 13(3) to increase the maximum size of poster boards, for example to 7.2m<sup>2</sup> (six A0 posters) or to enable eight A0 posters on an approved poster board.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the exclusion in clause 34(2)(b) on signs directly facing residential zones as part of an anticipated approval reflects current practice</li> <li>• a specific arts sector-related approval process would be difficult to enforce and would create unnecessary inconsistencies</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (arts sector posters) (1):</b> Provide specific process to enable arts and entertainment poster signs, in proximity to key arts / entertainment areas.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (include frame in maximum area) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend 13(3)(c) so that the maximum size excludes frames (1).</li> <li>• Remove the requirement in clause 34(2)(a) for posters boards to comply with the size rules for wall-mounted signs in clause 9 to gain an approval (2).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (digital poster boards) (1):</b> Amend 13(1) and 13(4) to define a poster sign as also being 'displayed on a sign that uses changeable messages.'</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (increase certainty of approval considerations) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend to clause 33(1)(a) to only consider matters in 33(2) (1).</li> <li>• Amend 33(2) to increase certainty by (2), for example by changing 'may' to 'will' and adding 'the positive effects of the sign on the economic and social well-being of the community' or 'the positive effects of the activity' as a criteria.</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 15 – Controls and approvals) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (attach transfer of poster boards to land) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend clause 37 to enable the transfer of poster boards (for example by clarifying that cl 37 does not apply to poster boards, or by replacing cl 37 with a process for transferring approvals).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the requirement in clause 34(2)(a) to align with wall-mounted sign size rules and the maximum size of poster boards clause in clause 13(3)(c) provides certainty about which sign sizes are anticipated as being generally acceptable subject to other assessment criteria</li> <li>the Auckland Unitary Plan provides for digital poster boards through the resource consents process</li> <li>retaining the 'may' phrasing of clause 33 allows the approval to adapt to change provided it relates to the Bylaw's purpose</li> <li>the Bylaw regulates negative effects of signs, while the Bylaw summary and wider framework (for example the Unitary Plan) acknowledge the benefits of signs</li> <li>the approvals process in clause 34(7) allows for additional opportunities to display signs</li> <li>the current clauses 35(2)(f) and (i) are broad enough to cover aspects relating to construction, maintenance and protecting the environment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (remove approvals) (4)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove approvals process, for example do not allow signs that do not comply with the Bylaw.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (add new approval conditions) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add new approval conditions to address protecting safety and the environment: amend 33(2)(c)(i) to add the underlined text: "obstructions or hazards to pedestrian or vehicular visibility, access or flow across all relevant Traffic Modes".</li> <li>Amend 35(2)(f) to add the underlined text: "The construction and maintenance requirements for the sign (including but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>(i) The structural integrity and durability of the sign, its supports and fixtures</u></li> <li><u>(ii) Access and maintenance arrangements for the sign...</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In high-speed limited access road corridors these considerations can generate as many safety and traffic network efficiency issues as the sign itself.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>Amend 35(2)(i) to add the underlined text: "Protecting the environment, (including but not limited to) physical and visual amenity (especially in relation to streetscape, <u>existing and subsequent landscape planting and maturation</u>, residential areas and heritage) and damage"</li> </ul>	

Public feedback topic (Proposal 16 – Enforcement and savings) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Clarify the bylaw's enforcement powers and penalties and how we transition to the new rules</b></p> <p>29 feedback responses: <b>18 support (62 per cent)</b>, 2 oppose (7 per cent), 6 other (21 per cent), 3 'I don't know' (10 per cent) and 7 comments.</p> <p><b>Local board views (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopt as notified (5) (Devonport-Takapuna, Henderson-Massey, Hibiscus and Bays, Papakura, Puketāpapa).</li> <li>Adopt with amendments (1) (Ōrākei).</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (clarify savings) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify clauses 44 and 45 (existing signs and approvals may continue): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to confirm that existing poster (and poster board) approvals are 'saved' / remain lawful</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal about enforcement and savings in Part 4 and Part 5 be <b>adopted as publicly notified</b>. Reasons include to increase certainty, for example by making the bylaw enforcement powers and savings easier to read and understand. In relation to other changes sought, the Panel notes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal already clarifies that existing poster and poster board approvals remain</li> </ul>

Public feedback topic (Proposal 16 – Enforcement and savings) (Number of comments) [Reference feedback number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ to either define 'poster' in 44(2)(g) or use an equivalent defined term.</li> <li>● Amend clause 45 to include the underlined text: 'For the purposes of Part 4 of this Bylaw, every approval, exemption or dispensation granted or saved under the 2015 Bylaw continues to apply as if it were an approval granted under this Bylaw. <u>For the avoidance of doubt, this clause applies to poster boards granted or saved under the 2015 Bylaw (and its predecessors).</u>'</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (clarify enforcement) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Clarify the rules and process for handling bylaw breaches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ change 'may be prosecuted' to 'will be prosecuted' (for example to prevent inconsistent or biased enforcement)</li> <li>○ clarify council can remove a misplaced hoarding and charge offending person for the cost of removal and storage.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views (clarify transition) (1):</b> Ōrākei Local Board suggests the Bylaw clarify the timeframe for transition and who will monitor, manage and enforce the bylaws and any (ad hoc) additional rules (for example Auckland Council or Auckland Transport).</p>	<p>lawful and correctly refers to 'poster' in a list of different sign types in clause 44(2)(g)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● council's approach to compliance and enforcement means prosecution is only used for significant bylaw breaches</li> <li>● the Bylaw already provides powers to remove signs and recover costs in clause 41</li> <li>● the Bylaw already clarifies the timeframe for transition in clause 44, noting that impacts should be minimal because the proposal mostly retains the intent of the current Bylaws.</li> </ul>

Other matters - Amend sign sizes to prevent waste (Number of comments) [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (amend sign sizes to prevent waste) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amend the maximum areas of signs throughout the bylaw to match the standard sizes of sheet material used to make signs, to minimise or eliminate wastage, creating economic and environmental benefits.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amend the following sign sizes and amend associated diagrams</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Free-standing menu board signs [cl 7(4)] increase area to 4.5m<sup>2</sup> (currently 4.2m<sup>2</sup>).</li> <li>● Free-standing wayfinding signs [cl 7(5)] increase area to 2.2m<sup>2</sup> (currently 2.0m<sup>2</sup>).</li> <li>● Horizontal wall-mounted signs [cl 9(3)] increase area to 2.2m<sup>2</sup> (currently 2.0m<sup>2</sup>).</li> <li>● Flat wall-mounted signs (signs displayed flat or painted) [cl 9(4)]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ increase area in Coastal Zones to 2.2m<sup>2</sup> (currently 2.0m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>○ reduce area in Residential Zones to 0.3m<sup>2</sup> (currently 0.33m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>○ increase area in General Business, Business Park, Light Industry Zones to 6m<sup>2</sup> (currently 5m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>○ increase area in Future Urban, Rural, Other Special Purpose Zones to 2.2m<sup>2</sup> (currently 2.0m<sup>2</sup>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Portable ladder board signs [cl 11(6)] increase width on a council-controlled public place to 0.8m (currently 0.715m).</li> <li>● Principal 'for sale' real estate signs [cl 15 (3)(d)]:</li> </ul>	<p>That the request to amend sign sizes to prevent waste be <b>accepted in part</b> to adjust the sign areas to align with standard sheet sizes where not significant.</p> <p>Reasons include to support council's waste minimisation plan where the provision of standard signage industry sheet sizes would avoid wastage without any significant change in possible negative impacts or requirement for further public consultation.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ increase area in Future Urban, Rural, and locations in Other Zones, and for signs that are not flat wall-mounted to a wall of a building in Heavy Industry Zones to 3m<sup>2</sup> (currently 2.88m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>○ increase area in Residential Zones if being sold by a sole agency to 2.2m<sup>2</sup> (currently 1.80m<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>○ increase area in Residential zones if being sold by multiple agencies to 0.75m<sup>2</sup> (currently 0.6m<sup>2</sup>).</li> <li>● Directional real estate signs [cl 15(4)(c)] increase area to 0.3m<sup>2</sup> (currently 0.28m<sup>2</sup>)</li> </ul>	<p>For example, changes of up to 300mm<sup>2</sup> were accepted while changes of up to 1000m<sup>2</sup> (1m<sup>2</sup>) were rejected.</p>
--	---

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Other matters - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency</b> [Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Panel recommendation</b></p>
<p><b>Key changes sought (address Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency concerns) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency suggests a number of changes to ensure the Bylaw regulates signs visible from national state highways and motorways in Auckland.</li> <li>● Amend the summary to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ clarify that the Auckland transport system includes ‘the sections of the national state highway and motorway network located within the Auckland Region.’</li> <li>○ explain that ‘The Bylaw aims for better signage outcomes for the region by encouraging early consultation with the relevant authority and with all stakeholders with interests within the visual field of potential signage.’</li> <li>○ clarify the explanation of jurisdictions by add ‘Signs adversely affecting State Highways and motorways are an exception to this principle as they are not within the jurisdiction of Auckland Transport and fall to Auckland Council to administer.’</li> <li>○ add a note under the quick reference guide to sign rules to specify that ‘All sign types directed towards and or visible from the State Highway and Motorway Network require the prior approval of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency’.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Amend the purpose in clause 4(1)(b) to add the underlined text: “manage impacts on the effectiveness, efficiency and safety of the <del>Auckland transport system</del> <u>Regional Transport Network across all relevant traffic modes</u>”.</li> <li>● Add the following terms to clause 5 (Interpretation): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>multi modal</b> includes but is not limited to Truck, Car, Motorcycle, Rail, Light Rail, Pedestrians, Cyclists, E-scooters / bikes / wheelchairs /skateboards and other assisted mobility devices</li> <li>○ <b>Regional Transport Network</b> means the combined transport networks under the jurisdiction of Waka Kotahi / The NZ Transport Agency and the Auckland Transport System under the jurisdiction of Auckland Transport</li> <li>○ <b>State Highway or Motorway</b> has the same meaning as in the Government Roding Powers Act 1989 and refers to transportation networks under the jurisdiction of Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency. (Clarity on jurisdiction of Waka Kotahi).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Amend cl 6(2) to “However, <u>a sign application under section (1) above</u> does not apply to <u>would not be required for–</u></li> </ul>	<p>That the request to provide for the further regulation of signs visible from national state highways and motorways in Auckland be <b>rejected</b></p> <p>Reasons include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● some changes sought are significant and would require further public consultation</li> <li>● further discussion is necessary by Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency with Auckland Council and Auckland Transport about shared</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Other matters - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency</b>  [Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Panel recommendation</b></p>
<p>(a) signs not visible from a council-controlled public place <b>and signs not visible from a motorway and / or a state highway</b> (for example this Bylaw would not apply to signs on a shop only visible within a privately owned shopping centre);”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend the example in cl 6(2) because it is difficult to follow, too narrow in scope and potentially confusing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key changes sought (require approvals for some sign types larger than 4m<sup>2</sup>) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require free-standing, wall mounted, event, election and real estate signs that are larger than 4m<sup>2</sup> and that are directed towards and or visible from the state highway and motorway network ('specific signs over 4m<sup>2</sup>') to gain an approval [FRN 97]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ signs smaller than 4m<sup>2</sup> are relatively unobtrusive in the high-speed context of the Highways and Motorways</li> <li>○ change intended to manage the adverse effects of signs located on private or public property that is not part of the State Highway and Motorway network, including to the visual amenity or the effectiveness, efficiency and safety of the state highways and motorways within the Auckland region across all relevant traffic modes</li> <li>○ Waka Kotahi is primarily concerned about the effect on traffic safety of complex signs (for example signs that use smaller fonts, complex graphics and text, and which can't be understood at a glance)</li> <li>○ at an operational level, Auckland Transport and Auckland Council would process approvals for these signs and enforce non-compliance</li> <li>○ Waka Kotahi estimates this would apply to approximately 1-2 signs per month. While this is a low number, Waka Kotahi is concerned about the cumulative effect over a period of years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amend the following sections of the bylaw to list the types of signs that are permitted if they are smaller than 4m<sup>2</sup> in area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ note in quick reference table of Summary (page 3 of proposed Bylaw)</li> <li>○ a new sub-clause after 6(3)(d).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Add a new clause to Subpart 2 detailing the approval process for specific signs over 4m<sup>2</sup> that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ lists the types of specific signs over 4m<sup>2</sup></li> <li>○ restricts these signs to only identifying the business and / or the products, services, goods and events available or taking place on the site</li> <li>○ requires compliance with clauses in the proposed Bylaw public safety and nuisance [cl 23], traffic safety [cl 24], changeable message signs [cl 27] and illuminated signs [cl 28]</li> <li>○ requires compliance with approvals criteria and conditions in the proposed Bylaw [cl 32, 33, 35]</li> <li>○ adds new approval criteria specific to state highways / motorways, with signs that do not meet the following criteria requiring approval: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ placement, clutter, distraction, amenity values</li> <li>▪ provision for maintenance access from within the site</li> <li>▪ separation of 250 metres between signs whether on the same or adjoining sites (250 metres = 8-10 seconds viewing time at 100km/hr). This does not preclude the possibility of at least one sign per site</li> <li>▪ separation of 250 metres from Traffic Control Devices; traffic lights, warning signs, speed change indicators, variable message displays, direction control signs and the like, and other key complex decision points formally identified by the road controlling authority</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ must reconcile the sign location with any crash record within a 500 metre radius of the proposed site for the sign.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>objectives, and appropriate opportunities for collaboration (for example delegations for bylaw-making and enforcement).</p>

<b>Other matters - Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency</b> [Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	<b>Panel recommendation</b>
<p><b>Key changes sought (prohibit signs near state highways) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend 24(1) to prohibit display of a sign that affects the safe and efficient movement of traffic 'on a state highway or motorway' in addition to a council-controlled public place.</li> <li>Add new subclause 24(2)(i) that specifies areas near State Highways, Motorways and similar environments where signs must not be displayed because these high-speed limited access corridors are critical elements of the regional road network and their high-speed, high traffic volume environment makes them particularly sensitive to adverse effects from signage.</li> </ul>	

<b>Other matters</b> [Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	<b>Panel recommendation</b>
<p><b>Key changes sought (consideration of businesses) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider needs of businesses in approach to new Bylaw, as businesses face an uncertain year ahead.</li> </ul>	<p>That the changes requested in this table be <b>rejected</b>. Reasons include to recognise that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal seeks to balance rights and freedoms to display signs with rules that manage potential negative impacts, and clarify current rules for ease of understanding and compliance</li> <li>the Bylaw can only regulate matters within its legislative scope where justified and proportionate</li> <li>the council is separately investigating further regulation of signs at off-licence premises</li> <li>the Auckland Transport <a href="#">advertising policy</a> sets out high-level principles and decision-making framework for the approval of advertisements which appear on Auckland Transport infrastructure and services</li> <li>the review of current Bylaw did not identify any issues with the advertising of gas stations, new petrol and diesel vehicles and signs outside schools or day-cares that justified greater regulation.</li> <li>the Auckland Unitary Plan rather than the Bylaw regulates billboards and any amendment to billboard rules would require a Plan change</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (regulate other signs) (1):</b> Ban most public advertising (causes visual pollution and supports consumption which contributes to climate change).</p> <p><b>Local board views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waitematā Local Board suggests:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>allowing only one descriptive sign per alcohol and gambling outlets where client's problematic / addictive behaviour can be readily triggered by advertising or promotional signs</li> <li>restricting advertising of gas stations and new petrol and diesel vehicles if Auckland Council were to adopt Auckland Transport's advertising policy or develop their own policy around content.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Howick Local Board suggests prohibiting signs outside schools or day-cares, except for community-focused billboards not of a sexual, medical, religious or political nature.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key comment / changes sought (billboards) (6)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce the number of freestanding billboards (billboards reduce visual amenity and create light pollution, especially bright LED / electric billboards) (1).</li> <li>Prevent Bylaw and Auckland Unitary Plan from influencing the other's digital sign and billboard rules / conditions. For example, concern Bylaw enables permissive approach for digital billboards through use as a guide for resource consent conditions, and vice versa (considers Bylaw should anticipate issues from more digital signs, not just billboards) (1).</li> <li>Ensure that sign conversion from a static sign to digital billboard does not become common (concern about proliferation of digital billboards which are more intrusive than static signs, potential regulatory gap, and conversion precedents set) (1).</li> </ul>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Other matters</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">[Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Panel recommendation</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevent conflicts of interest in relation to billboards (for example, concern about Auckland Transport regulation role given bus stop advertising revenue; risk of council-controlled organisations granting more permissive consent conditions as part of landowner approval; and that landowners may justify signs / billboards as an environmental design feature) (1).</li> <li>• Out of Home Media Association Aotearoa and oOh!media New Zealand support exclusion of billboards and signs integrated with street furniture from Bylaw scope (for example, as Resource Management Act 1991 enables more appropriate, fair and transparent process than a Bylaw) (2).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views:</b> Waitemata Local Board suggest regulating the content of billboards and regulating signs and billboards in the same regulation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conflicts of interest are avoided through the different parts of the relevant authority that apply for and process an approval.</li> <li>• the Regulatory Committee previously recommended that consideration be given to a redistribution of sign rules between the Bylaw and Unitary Plan as part of a future Bylaw and Plan review (<a href="#">REG/2020/66</a>)</li> <li>• council legislative powers to make a bylaw are limited to those matters summarised in clause 4 of the proposal, and the proposal uses these powers to regulate signs on or visible from a council-controlled public place</li> <li>• both current and proposed Bylaws do not allow for 'temporary community signs' and the current compliance approach focuses on commercial advertising and uses officer discretion in other instances</li> <li>• proposal in clause 6(2)(i) does not regulate instructional or information signs required by statute or for public safety or security, which allows those signs to be displayed in a manner considered appropriate to achieve their purpose and means.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (road controlling authority) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require Auckland Council and Auckland Transport to not shirk their responsibilities as regulators by misusing Part 3 of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency <a href="#">Traffic control devices manual</a>, Part 3 Advertising Signs and asserting that "private landowners managing roads used by the public, including car parks, shopping centres, hospitals, universities and airports and other private landowners" are the Road Controlling Authority.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought ('temporary community signs')</b>: Puketāpapa Local Board suggests clarifying that 'temporary community signs' (for example about a lost cat) should not be regulated.</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify rules) (1)</b>: Make sign rules easier for both businesses and public to understand and recognise (for example, lack of clarity hinders enforcement and compliance, gaps allow businesses to stretch rules to fit their interests and display advertising that may not be amenable to the community or neighbourhood).</p>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (water safety signs and beach flags) (2)</b>: Use AS/NZS 2416.3:2010 'Water safety signs and beach safety flags - Guidance for use' for free standing signs in open spaces and around aquatic environments (for example, relating to clauses 21, 24(2)(a), (b) and 25(2)(a), (b) and (c).</p>	



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Other matters</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">[Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Panel recommendation</b></p>
<p><b>Key changes sought (permanent signs) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify rules in relation to permanent signs: their definition, process for installation, and relevant regulation / legislation additional to the Bylaw (for example best practice, and industry codes or standards including for advertising and design).</li> </ul>	<p>That the changes requested in this table (unless otherwise stated) be <b>rejected</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the proposal already appropriately describes permanent signs and references relevant legislation that is part of the wider regulatory framework for signs in the Bylaw Summary</li> <li>council lacks sufficient bylaw-making powers to regulate signage for sustainability purposes</li> <li>Auckland Transport considered making a requirement to display street numbers as part of a proposed new Auckland Transport <a href="#">Activities in the Road Corridor Bylaw 2022</a> but decided not to proceed with this option.</li> <li>the proposal has no impact on Te Kete Rukuruku programme (which adds names significant to Māori to local parks and community places)</li> <li>signs on marae have the same potential for negative impacts on the external environment as any other sign</li> </ul> <p><b>Note:</b> The Panel requested the decision letter to Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Whātua include advice on what signs can be displayed on marae.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>council and Auckland Transport are integrating te reo Māori into their signs but are not empowered to use a bylaw to regulate the content of most signs (including</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (sustainability)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Howick Local Board suggests requiring all signs to be recyclable. If this is not possible then a proven method for disposal of signs should be provided (for example taking a sustainable approach to the thousands of short-term plastic / corflute signs displayed that are difficult to dispose of).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (property numbering standards) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require display of the street number on any commercial sign (for example, because street numbers are a fundamental aspect of civilised life, street numbering rules are not enforced, and to improve road safety).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna suggest encouraging businesses to clearly display their street number.</li> <li>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board suggests incorporating property numbering standards into the Bylaw, instead of referencing them as a guidance standard.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (Māori signs / te reo Māori) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify impact on Māori signage in public and private places and Te Kete Rukuruku programme (1).</li> <li>Exempt signs on marae to support marae rangatiratanga (1).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board suggests requiring signage design rules to suggest that all signs use English and/or te reo Māori.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (regulating signs in Unitary Plan / regulatory gaps) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Auckland Unitary Plan should control most matters relating to signs.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Albert-Eden Local Board supports a review of the lighting rules in the Auckland Unitary Plan, as considers that even when sign lighting standards are met illumination can cause light distress and disturbance to residents, especially in areas experiencing intensification.</li> <li>Waitematā Local Board suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>in a future review that signs and billboards be covered by the same regulations</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Other matters</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">[Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Panel recommendation</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ as part of the proposal or the next Auckland Unitary Plan review to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ consider areas of high amenity (for example through public art, urban design, heritage, or natural space) to avoid signs that reduce quality of space where council has invested heavily in improvements</li> <li>▪ strengthen amenity rules in mixed-use areas</li> <li>▪ put residents' needs and preferences first in considering applications for signs in mixed-use areas (for example residents consider signs do not improve amenity, and illuminated signs that intrude on living spaces significantly reduce wellbeing as contributes to feeling of intrusion and lights make it harder to sleep)</li> <li>▪ addressing signs / billboards with bluetooth data-collecting capabilities of passer-bys, including legal and moral ramifications (privacy and resident well-being) and need to only allow after public consultation (including with youth, educators, health providers, CAB and Seniors Advisory Panel).</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Maungakiekie-Tāmaki suggests the proposed Bylaw does not address changes over the last five years that have increased the amount of street and building signage.</li> </ul>	<p>use of te reo) and no government legislation requires te reo Māori on signs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the Regulatory Committee has endorsed considering the redistribution of signage rules between a bylaw and the Unitary Plan as part of future signage bylaw and Unitary Plan reviews <a href="#">[REG/2020/66]</a></li> <li>● any significant changes to the proposal would require further investigation and public consultation</li> <li>● the proposal continues to address visual amenity impacts of signs within the context of council's bylaw making powers</li> <li>● positive economic and social effects of signs are addressed in the Bylaw Summary (rather than in the Purpose) to recognise the wider regulatory framework which considers the benefits of signs, and the Bylaw's role to address potential negative impacts</li> <li>● the proposal already makes it clear that all applicable signs (including posters) are required to comply with the approvals process.</li> </ul> <p>Note: the Panel recommended that drafting errors be corrected as part of the 'Staff recommended amendments' section in a table below.</p>
<p><b>Key changes sought (amend Bylaw purpose to include visual amenity) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amend clause 4 to retain a purpose of the current Bylaw: to assist in enhancing, maintaining, and promoting the visual amenity value of Auckland's built environments.</li> <li>● Prohibit advertising on verandah fascia signs in Neighbourhood Centre Zones (as detracts from amenity values in Neighbourhood Centre Zones).</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Albert-Eden, Ōtara-Papatoetoe and Māngere-Ōtāhuhu suggest retaining the visual amenity purpose.</li> <li>● Albert-Eden and Puketāpapa suggest more strict rules in Neighbourhood Centre Zones in particular to allow for consideration of the visual amenity of these spaces.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (amend Bylaw purpose to include other benefits) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Add 'enable the benefits of signs to the economic and social well-being of the community' to clause 4 (Purpose) (2).</li> <li>● Amend clause 4(2)(a) to add that the Bylaw seeks to achieve its purpose by providing for 'poster signs, subject to conditions and the approvals process' (in addition to signs that directly relate to the primary use or activities on the sign site) (1).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify measurement units / drafting errors) (3)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Correct drafting errors in the proposed Bylaw: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ review bylaw and amend all units of measurement so they are expressed in either millimetres (mm) or metres (m) (2).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

Other matters [Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ in contents page, change Part 2, Subpart 1 heading to correct numbering error (1).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (clarify free-standing billboards on road reserve) (1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Amend clause 6(2)(b) to clarify the status quo that free-standing billboard signs in the road reserve are excluded from the proposed Bylaw and are regulated by the Unitary Plan (considers billboard regulation in Plan appropriate and efficient, as avoids duplication of regulation and costs) (1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “billboards (a sign not directly related to the primary use or activities occurring on the site of the sign, <u>or a sign in the road reserve which displays ‘third party’ advertising which is not directly related to the function of the road reserve</u>) regulated in the Auckland Unitary Plan ...”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>That the request to clarify free-standing billboards on road reserve be <b>accepted in part</b> and the proposal be <b>amended</b> to clarify the intention that ‘third-party’ advertising, except for any specifically provided for in the Bylaw (for example, election signs) are regulated in the Unitary Plan, including billboards on road reserves.</p> <p>Reasons include to improve certainty.</p>

Other matters [Number of comments] [Feedback reference number(s) FRN]	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key changes sought (increase restrictions on number and location generally) (5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increase restrictions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ limit the number of signs (for example, reduce visual amenity and increase public safety risks)</li> <li>○ limit the square metre area of signs per kilometre / limit the size of signs in general</li> <li>○ increase the minimum distance between signs</li> <li>○ prohibit all advertising on Auckland Transport buses and at bus stops.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>That the requested changes in this table be <b>rejected</b>.</p> <p>Reasons include to recognise that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the proposal already limits number, area and separation distances in specific clauses for each sign type</li> <li>● most commercial advertisements on Auckland Transport infrastructure are billboards which are regulated by the Auckland Unitary Plan</li> <li>● a Building Consent may address public safety concerns in relation to construction, but cannot address other safety, nuisance, misuse, Auckland transport system and environmental concerns</li> <li>● the proposal in clauses 23, 24, 25 and 29 already requires all signs to not distract or obstruct the views of drivers or to obstruct safe movement, requires signs to be secure, structurally sound and maintained in a condition that does not endanger public safety, and requires signs to be removed from a business that has ceased to trade</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (allow alterations) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Allow alteration of signs that comply with other regulation, for example building consents, professional installation, health and safety laws.</li> </ul> <p><b>Local board views</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Hibiscus and Bays suggests allowing signs as long as they have building consent, for example building alterations must have building consent, so signs should be allowed if permitted as part of that consent.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Key changes sought (maintenance and sign removal) (2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Introduce further requirements for businesses (1) (for example to maintain signs / remove signs without causing damage to the building).</li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce maximum age and condition for signs (as can become old, tatty and unreadable which reduces visual amenity) (1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>damage to buildings from sign removal can be addressed as a civil matter or breach of other existing legislation where applicable</li> <li>older signs are not necessarily in poor condition</li> <li>the proposal in clause 6(1) and 6(3) already requires prior approval to display a sign on any street furniture, bridge, underpass, overpass, tree or other infrastructure on a council-controlled public place.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key changes sought (signs attached to public infrastructure)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Devonport-Takapuna suggest prohibiting signs attached to public infrastructure such as traffic signs, power poles, communications cabinets, or power transformers for purposes not related to the purpose of the infrastructure (including about house removals, real estate sales, vehicle sales, or advertising services).</li> </ul>	

Other Matters	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Key comments / changes recommended (Attachment E)</b></p> <p>Panel could if it wishes deliberate on any of the matters in Attachment E about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enforcement</li> <li>Fees and infringements</li> <li>Illumination limits</li> <li>Bylaw Review Process</li> <li>Complaints and public monitoring.</li> </ul>	<p>That in relation to the matters contained in Attachment E, the Panel recommend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that the council advocate to the relevant minister for the ability to impose infringement fines for breaches of all recently reviewed bylaws, including this new Signs Bylaw</li> <li>that the matters in Attachment E be referred to relevant council departments / council-controlled organisations for consideration.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Key comments / changes recommended (Any other matters)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Panel should deliberate on any matters contained in public feedback and local board views it considers has not been adequately addressed in this Attachment A.</li> </ul>	<p>The Panel consider that all matters raised in public feedback and local board views have been given adequate consideration.</p>

Other Matters	Panel recommendation
<p><b>Staff recommended amendments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correct drafting errors that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>create key changes to the intent of the current Bylaws not identified in the Proposal</li> <li>clarify the drafting of the proposed new Bylaw.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>That the proposal be <b>amended</b> to correct drafting errors and improve certainty within the intent of the proposal, including (but not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>adding clause 6(4) to retain the current authorization of signs (excluding freestanding signs) on roads under the Local Government Act 1974 (s357)</li> <li>amending clause 9 to better reflect the current rules for the display of wall mounted sign (for example correcting diagrams)</li> <li>further amending clause 11 to reflect the current prohibition of portable signs in shared zones</li> <li>further amending clause 13 to reflect the current anticipated maximum size of poster bollards</li> <li>amending clause 34(7) to better reflect the current exemption criteria</li> <li>amend clause 42 to reference penalties under the Land Transport Act 1998.</li> </ul> <p>A fuller outline of the changes can be viewed in Attachment B which compares the proposed Bylaw to the Panel-recommended Bylaw.</p>

