

**Before Independent Hearing Commissioners
In Porirua**

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('**RMA**')

In the matter of of a submission by NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)
(submitter 82, further submitter 36) on the Proposed Porirua
District Plan

Statement of evidence of Luke Braithwaite for Waka Kotahi – Planning

21 January 2022

1 Qualifications and experience

- 1.1 My full name is Luke Thomas Braithwaite. I am a Planner with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency where I have been employed since July 2020.
- 1.2 I hold a Bachelor of Environmental Planning (with a Specialisation in Terrestrial Environments) from the University of Waikato. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have five years planning experience within both the public and private sector.
- 1.3 My key responsibilities at Waka Kotahi include assessing land use development applications, some of which include signage and lighting aspects, consenting lead to capital works projects, and working with local councils on district plan reviews. In regard to my experience on signage and lighting matters, I am one of the lead authors in the development of the Digital Billboard Guidance addendum document to the Traffic Control Devices Manual – Part 3 Advertising Signs (TCDM-3), which has required significant research and understanding of the effects of signage and lighting on road users. I have also been the case manager on behalf of Waka Kotahi for the recent Environment Court case for a proposed digital billboard installation which Waka Kotahi opposed on safety grounds.¹
- 1.4 In relation to the Proposed Porirua District Plan ('PDP'), I am providing evidence on the light and sign chapters.
- 1.5 I have authority to give evidence on behalf of Waka Kotahi.

2 Code of conduct

- 2.1 While I acknowledge that I am an employee of Waka Kotahi, I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the current Environment Court Practice Note (2014). I have complied with it in the preparation of this statement of evidence. I also confirm that the matters addressed in this statement are within my area of expertise, except where I rely on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.

3 Scope of evidence

- 3.1 My evidence addresses the way in which the PDP manages the effects of lighting and signage on the state highway network.

¹ *Prime Property Group Ltd v Wellington City Council* [2021] NZEnvC 169.

- 3.2 This evidence is limited to those matters within my expertise and those matters within the scope of the submission lodged.
- 3.3 Where Waka Kotahi has accepted the recommendation of the s42A Report and this does not need further discussion, these points have been included within **Table 1** appended to this submission.
- 3.4 I have read the transportation evidence prepared by Robert Swears on behalf of Waka Kotahi and rely on that evidence insofar as it relates to transportation engineering matters. Planning issues relating to noise are contained in the evidence of Ms Heppelthwaite, and those relating to infrastructure are contained in the evidence of Ms Jones.

4 Summary of evidence

- 4.1 I have reviewed the s42A Sign and Light reports and largely agree with the recommendations in those reports. As noted above, I have included a table of submissions appended as **Attachment 1**, where either the s42A report has accepted the Waka Kotahi submission point or where I agree with the recommendation of the s42A Report.
- 4.2 My evidence focuses on matters where I wish to reiterate my support for the s42A recommendations due to their significance to the maintenance and operation of the state highway network, and those matters which I consider require further amendments.
- 4.3 The matters seeking further amendments in my evidence relate to SIGN-S6, SIGN-Table 1, SIGN-Table 3 and SIGN-S12 where I disagree or disagree in part with the position taken in the s42A Report. The issues predominantly relate to:
- a) placing adequate controls within the Signs Chapter to ensure higher risk signage is controlled where visible from state highways,
 - b) ensuring that where signage faces a state highway, the content can be safely read, and
 - c) ensuring sufficient separation distances between a proposed sign and other freestanding signage or locations requiring high level of driver concentration.
- 4.4 I request that the Hearing Panel give consideration to amending the Signs Chapter as outlined in my submission, and in all other respects retain the Light and Signs Chapters as proposed to be amended by the s42A Report.

5 LIGHT Chapter

- 5.1 **Other Submitters:** Kāinga Ora made a submission (81.497 and 81.939) opposing the LIGHT Chapter in its entirety due to a number of factors including reverse sensitivity controls and the method in determining compliance with the

rules. I agree with Kāinga Ora in regard to the reverse sensitivity provisions as mentioned in LIGHT-O2 & LIGHT-P3 below. However, I consider that the remaining controls as set out in the Light Chapter are appropriate and, subject to the matters outlined in my evidence below, align with AS/NZS4282.2019 being the New Zealand and Australian Standard outlining best practice in controlling the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. The remaining controls will ensure lighting is adequately controlled in regard to the effects on state highways.

- 5.2 **LIGHT-O1 & P1:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.145 & 82.147) in support in part of this objective and policy, but sought the replacement of the term “*road safety*” with “*transport network safety*” to adequately consider the effects on the whole transport network. The s42A Report in section 3.5 recommends acceptance in part of the Waka Kotahi submission, however alternative wording to a similar effect has been proposed. I accept the rationale behind the alternative wording.
- 5.3 **LIGHT-O2 & LIGHT-P3:** Waka Kotahi made submissions (82.145 & 82.149) in support of this objective and policy and sought an amendment to the wording to include the consideration of the transport network. The s42A Report recommends the deletion of this policy on the grounds outlined in the Kāinga Ora submission that relatively minor methods can be applied to mitigate lighting effects on sensitive receivers. In addition, it is noted that public street lighting is exempt from the LIGHT Chapter. Taking into consideration the new definition of street lighting and the requirement under INF-P5 to avoid remedy or mitigate the potential effects on state highways, I accept the rationale behind the deletion of this objective and policy.
- 5.4 **LIGHT-S1:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.151) in support of this standard and sought an amendment to the wording to clarify the intent of the standard to ensure no ambiguity in interpretation and application of the Australian and New Zealand Standard AS/NZS4282.2019. The s42A Report recommends that the standard LIGHT-S1 be retained as notified and does not accept the change proposed by Waka Kotahi as these zones have been considered in the drafting of the LIGHT Chapter. I accept this reasoning.
- 5.5 **LIGHT-S2:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.152) in support of this standard, but sought a state highway specific provision to assess state highways in accordance with AS/NZS4282.2019 as building setbacks do not apply to roads. Additionally, the vertical illuminance levels did not align with AS/NZS4282.2019, so alignment with this standard was sought. The s42A Report accepts this submission in part in relation to the lighting levels aligning with AS/NZS4282.2019. I LIGHT-S2 now aligns with AS/NZS4282.2019 and as outlined in the s42A Report consideration in regard to effects on state highways

are sufficient within LIGHT-S1 and LIGHT-S4 As such I accept the position of the s42A Report.

5.6 **LIGHT-S3:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.153) in support of this standard, but sought a state highway specific provision to assess state highways in accordance with AS/NZS4282.2019 as it was considered that LIGHT-S3 did not align with this standard. The s42A Report recommends rejection of this submission as it understood that the standard does in fact align with AS/NZS4282.2019. Upon re-review I agree that LIGHT-S3 does in fact align with AS/NZS4282.2019.

5.7 **LIGHT-S4:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.154) in support of this standard, but sought a state highway only provision to assess state highways in accordance with AS/NZS4282.2019 as the lighting threshold increments of this section did not align with AS/NZS4282.2019. Waka Kotahi also sought the alignment of this section with the threshold increments of AS/NZS4282.2019. The s42A Report accepted this submission in part in relation to the amendments to the threshold increments aligning with AS/NZS4282.2019, however does not agree with Waka Kotahi specific assessment. As this standard now aligns with AS/NZS4282.2019, I accept this reasoning.

6 **SIGN Chapter**

6.1 **Chapter Introduction:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.174) in support of this section, but sought the removal of reference to specific guidance that may be subject to change in the future and sought the inclusion of wording to make clear when Waka Kotahi affected party approval is required regarding signs. The s42A Report agreed with the removal of reference to specific guidance, however considered the addition of reference to affected party approval was too broad and consideration of this nature was more appropriate in the specific rules of the PDP. I accept this reasoning.

6.2 **SIGN-P2:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.178) in support of this standard, but sought an amendment of the wording "*traffic and road user safety*" to "*transport network and it's user's safety*". The s42A Report recommends an alternative amendment to the wording incorporating the term "transport network" into SIGN-P2. I accept this reasoning.

6.3 **SIGN-P4:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.180) in support of this standard and sought amendments in regard to ensuring signs:

- a. are not reflective;
- b. are not erected in locations that obscure road signage;
- c. avoiding signs that compromise public health and safety and the efficiency of the transport network; and
- d. avoid the use of off-site, illuminated, or digital signs that face or are adjacent to a state highway.

- 6.4 It is noted that Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (FS49.5) oppose the relief sought due to the proposed inclusion being overly restrictive of onsite digital signage. The s42A Report recommended acceptance in part of this submission. The discussion within the s42A Report notes that many of the additions sought are addressed by other policies and the wording sought is too broad. Minor wording changes in regard to reflectivity and obscuring traffic signs are proposed. I accept this reasoning.
- 6.5 **SIGN-R1:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.183) in support of this rule but sought that the term “Interpretation Sign” is defined. The s42A Report recommends acceptance in part of this submission and seeks the inclusion of the definition of “Interpretation Sign”. I accept the proposed definition provided in the s42A Report.
- 6.6 **SIGN-R12:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.194) in support of this standard. Signage not provided for by the PDP should be adequately controlled and a Discretionary Activity Status is an appropriate activity status for this signage. The s42A Report recommends retaining this rule.
- 6.7 **SIGN-S6:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.201) in support of this standard and sought amendments in regard to signage compliance and restrictions where signs are visible from a state highway. The s42A Report recommends acceptance in part in regard to reflectivity, however does not accept the other changes recommended by Waka Kotahi. I agree with the recommendations of the s42A Report in regard to reflectivity and I respond to the remaining points covered by the submission and in Mr Swears’ Evidence as follows:
- 6.8 **SIGN-S6.1:** The s42A Report does not support the Waka Kotahi position on this standard seeking the controls to apply to signs where these are ‘visible’ from a highway. The term “adjacent to any road” is not defined in the PDP. Theoretically, if a site had a segregation strip between the property and the road, this provision would not apply to the site as it would not technically be adjacent to the road. In addition, effects from signage are not only limited to sites adjacent to a road and can have similar effects when installed on nearby properties i.e., a hillside or nearby rooftop. To ensure that state highway road users have adequate protections from this type of signage, I seek the retention of my wording “*visible from a state highway*”.
- 6.9 In regard to the inclusion of the term “animation”, although animated signage is considered to result in poor road safety outcomes, Standard SIGN-S12 ensures that digital signs do not face state highways. As such, the inclusion of a restriction on animation is likely superfluous in regard to controlling effects on state highways. As such, I am neutral to this submission point, and do not seek this addition.

The wording now sought for SIGN-S6.1 would read as:

Signs must not have any flashing or revolving lights or lasers where visible from a state highway or located adjacent to any road.

- 6.10 **SIGN-S6.2 and SIGN-S6.3:** The s42A Report does not support the Waka Kotahi position on this standard for controlling signs where these are “visible from a state highway”. Waka Kotahi notes that the 10m distance is an arbitrary distance and does not provide adequate protection to state highway road users. Theoretically, there could be multiple signs adjacent to one another that have unrestricted content if setback 10m from the road, resulting in signage clutter and distraction. To ensure that these effects are adequately controlled, I continue to seek and support the wording as sought in the Waka Kotahi submission.
- 6.11 **SIGN-S6.4:** The s42A Report agrees in part to the changes sought, which supports the addition in regard to separation from pedestrian crossings and curves with chevron signs, however, does not agree to controlling signs where visible from a state highway.
- 6.12 The wording ‘right angles’ leaves this standard open to interpretation and theoretically any sign that has an angle greater or less than 90 degrees would not need to comply with this rule, therefore reference to 90 degree angles should be deleted. In addition, as outlined in SIGN-S6.1 of my evidence, I seek the more appropriate wording referencing signage “*visible from a state highway*”.
- 6.13 I also seek that the additions sought by Mr Swears in regard to defining how to undertake the longitudinal measurement and defining those traffic signs that require this separation are included. The wording now sought for SIGN-S6.4 would read as follows:
- Any sign visible from a state highway or located on a site adjoining the road or road reserve ~~and is at right angles to the road or state highway~~ must be located the minimum separation distance specified in SIGN-Table 3 (measured longitudinally along the centre-line of the road), from any existing ~~traffic sign~~ permanent regulatory, warning sign, pedestrian crossing, curve (with chevron signage), railway crossing or intersection.*
- 6.14 **New Provision Proposed (Minimum Visibility):** I agree with the position of the s42A Report in regard to the rejection of this new standard sought by Waka Kotahi.
- 6.15 **New Provision Proposed (Content Controls):** I understand the position of the s42A Report that the term ‘element’ is not defined in the PDP. This term was included to restrict content on signage where these signs face the state highway.

In line with Mr Swears' recommendation, I proposed that a new definition be included to define the term 'elements' as follows:

Sign Element

An element refers to each individual item on a sign which includes:

- a Each word used = 1;
- b An email address = 1;
- c A website URL = 1;
- d A phone number = 1;
- e An image = 4; and
- f A logo = 1.

6.16 **SIGN-Table 1 – Freestanding Sign Separation Distances:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.202) in support of this Table and sought changes to this table to align with the TCDM-3 Table 5.3. It is noted that Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (FS49.8) oppose the relief sought due to the proposed inclusion being excessive. The s42A Report recommends the addition of the term "*minimum*" is not necessary, and the change to the Table sought adds another speed zone when the rest of the plan is consistent with a divide between low and high speed limits below and above 70km/h.

6.17 However, I do not agree with the recommendation of the s42A Report in regard to the necessity of the term "*minimum*" and the speed zone separation distances. The separation distances in the TCDM-3 take into consideration the Perception, Intellection, Emotion and Volition (PIEV) approach as detailed in Mr Swears' evidence, thereby resulting in good road safety outcomes. SIGN-Table 1 does not provide the needed distance to allow drivers to 'recover' before seeing an additional sign and starting the PIEV reaction again which results in a higher road risk. As such, I seek an amended SIGN-Table 1 as follows:

Sign-Table 1, Freestanding sign minimum separation distances

<i>Speed limit of road (km/h)</i>	<i>Separation distance (m)</i>
0-70 <u>50</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>60</u>	<u>55</u>
<u>70</u>	<u>60</u>
71-80	<u>70</u>
<u>>80</u>	<u>80</u>

- 6.18 **SIGN-Table 3 – Separation Distances:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.204) in support of this Table and sought changes to this table to align with the TCDM-3 Section 5.5. It is noted that Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (FS49.9) oppose the relief sought due to the proposed inclusion being excessive. The s42A Report identifies that these distances would have significant implications in busy urban environments, and relevant controls are already included in SIGN-S6.
- 6.19 As outlined in Mr Swears' evidence, the Waka Kotahi position is based on safety considerations and it is important that adequate spacing between critical elements of the transport network and signs that may distract road users from the driving task are implemented. As such, I seek Table 3 (included below) to reflect the position as outlined in Mr Swears' evidence.

SIGN-Table 3, Separation Distances

<i>Speed limit of road (km/h)</i>	<i>Separation distance (m)</i>
0-50	50 100
51-60	110
71-80 61-70	120 120
71-80	140
81 >80	200 160

- 6.20 **SIGN-S12:** Waka Kotahi made a submission (82.211) in support of this standard and sought amendments to standard SIGN-S12.3 for all digital displays visible from a state highway, rather than only adjacent to a state highway. It is noted that Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd (FS49.7) oppose the relief sought due to the proposed inclusion being excessive. The s42A Report recommended rejection of the Waka Kotahi submission as this is ambiguous and an overreach.
- 6.21 I do not agree with the s42A Report in regard to the relief sought. As I have previously iterated, the term "adjacent to any road" is not defined in the PDP. Theoretically, if a site had a segregation strip between the property and the road, this provision would not apply to the site as it would not technically be adjacent to the road. In addition, effects from signage are not only limited to sites adjacent to a road, but can have similar effects if installed on nearby properties i.e., a hillside or a nearby rooftop where directed at state highways.
- 6.22 It is also unclear how the term "visible from sites located within a Residential Zone" can be applied to SIGN-S12.2, however the s42A Report suggests the term "visible from a state highway" cannot be applied to SIGN-S12.3, due to the term "visible" being ambiguous and a regulatory overreach. This appears to be an inconsistent approach being applied within a single standard. Irrespective of speed zones, the adverse effects from digital signage could result in greater

effects on state highway road users than on the Residential Zone as inappropriate digital signage can be a contributory factor in a crash, so arguably it is more important to include this terminology in this standard. Therefore, I seek consistency with the wording used within SIGN-S12.2 to also apply to SIGN-S12.3 and continue to seek the wording as sought in Waka Kotahi submission.

- 6.23 **SIGN-Figure 1 & SIGN-Figure 2:** Waka Kotahi made submissions (82.215 & 82.216) in support of these standards and sought an amendment to remove the Mixed Use Zone from SIGN-Figure 1 and move this to the requirements in SIGN-Figure 2. In addition, Waka Kotahi sought a correction to SIGN-Figure 2 Picture 3. The s42A Report recommended rejection of submission point 82.215 and accept in part in regard to submission point 82.216 relating to the correction to SIGN-Figure 2 Picture 3. I understand and can accept the rationale provided in the s42A Report.

7 Summary

- 7.1 I request that the Hearing Panel give further consideration to amending SIGN-S6, SIGN-Table 1, SIGN-Table 3 and SIGN-S12 as outlined above. Apart from those amendments, overall, the Light and Sign Chapters of the PDP (as proposed to be amended by the s42A Report) are considered to be appropriate in terms of managing the effects of lighting and signs on state highways.

Luke Thomas Braithwaite

21 January 2022

Attachment 1: Waka Kotahi position in regard to the Reporting Officer's recommendations not mentioned in the preceding evidence.

Submission Point	Waka Kotahi Submission	Officer's Recommendation	My Response
SIGN – Sign Chapter			
82.179	SIGN-P3 Waka Kotahi sought the replacement of the safety of “road users” to be amended to the safety of “ <i>the transport network and it’s user’s safety</i> ”.	Accept in part Accept in part, however alternative wording to a similar effect has been proposed.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.181	SIGN-P5 Waka Kotahi sought SIGN-P5 to encompass all off-site signage so that this would not be provided for where facing a state highway.	Reject Due to the small area of relevant zoning fronting the state highway and this provision being covered by other policies the changes are not accepted.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.195	New Rule Proposed Waka Kotahi sought a new rule specific to signage facing the state highway.	Reject This rule would be a duplication of other rules and be overly restrictive as such is rejected.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.188	SIGN-R6 Waka Kotahi sought the removal of the Mixed Use Zone from this rule.	Reject Due to the small area of relevant zoning fronting the state highway and sufficient controls on third party advertising, the changes are not accepted.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.

Submission Point	Waka Kotahi Submission	Officer's Recommendation	My Response
82.189 to 82.193	SIGN-R7 to SIGN-R11 Waka Kotahi sought to retain these rules as worded.	Accept in part Accept in part, however minor amendments for clarification purposes have been proposed.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.196 & 82.198	SIGN-S1 & SIGN-S3 Waka Kotahi sought an addition to the matters of discretion to include the adverse effects on the transport network and its users.	Reject This change sought is sufficiently covered by SIGN-S6 and this standard is primarily to control amenity.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.197 & 82.199	SIGN-S2 & SIGN-S4 Waka Kotahi sought an addition to the matters of discretion to include the adverse effects on the transport network and its users.	Reject This change sought is sufficiently covered by SIGN-S6 & SIGN-S15 and this standard is primarily to control amenity.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.201	SIGN S5 Waka Kotahi sought greater restrictions on the height of signage in the Mixed Use Zone. Additionally, Waka Kotahi sought an addition to the matters of discretion to include the adverse effects on the transport network and its users.	Accept in part Due to the small area of relevant zoning fronting the state highway and sufficient controls the reporting officer does not agree to reducing the Mixed Use Zone maximum height. In regard to the amendment to the matters of discretion sought alternative wording to a similar effect has been proposed.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.

Submission Point	Waka Kotahi Submission	Officer's Recommendation	My Response
	SIGN-S6.6 Waka Kotahi sought the amendment of the speed limit threshold for off-site, election or temporary signs to be reduced from 70km/h to 60km/h.	Reject Does not agree with the proposed amendment to the speed limit threshold for off-site, election or temporary signs.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
	SIGN-S6 - Matter of Discretion Number 5 Waka Kotahi sought the replacement of " <i>driver, cyclist and pedestrian safety</i> " with " <i>adverse effects on the transport network and its users</i> ".	Reject Does not agree with the amended wording sought.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.206	SIGN-S7 Waka Kotahi sought the replacement of adverse effects on " <i>traffic safety</i> " to the " <i>transport network and its user's safety</i> "	Accept in part Accept in part, however alternative wording to a similar effect has been proposed.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.

Submission Point	Waka Kotahi Submission	Officer's Recommendation	My Response
82.207	<p>SIGN-S8</p> <p>Waka Kotahi sought that temporary signage be removed within 48 hours of the conclusion of the activity or event to which it relates as opposed to the one week.</p> <p>Additionally, Waka Kotahi sought an addition to the matters of discretion to include the adverse effects on the transport network and its users.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p> <p>Council considers that this timeframe would be onerous and inconsistent with TEMP-R2.</p> <p>In regard to the amendment to the matters of discretion sought, alternative wording to a similar effect has been proposed.</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p>
82.212	<p>SIGN-S13</p> <p>Waka Kotahi sought the deletion of the term "light spill" from SIGN-S13 to open up signs to full assessment of the Light Chapter.</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>The deletion of the term "light spill" would be a duplication of controls.</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p>
82.213	<p>SIGN-S14</p> <p>Waka Kotahi sought the deletion of the term "official signs" to ensure this will not impact official signs.</p>	<p>Reject</p> <p>Does not agree to the deletion of "official signs" from this section as this provides adequate controls on signage.</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.</p>

Submission Point	Waka Kotahi Submission	Officer's Recommendation	My Response
82.214	SIGN-S15 Waka Kotahi sought the addition of controls restricting these signs not to face state highway and sought an amendment to the matters of discretion.	Reject There are sufficient provisions in the plan to limits off-site signage and associated effects. Additionally, the matters of discretion adequately consider transport network users.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
	New Provision: SIGN-Table 4 - Sign Minimum Visibility Waka Kotahi sought the inclusion of a new minimum visibility table in accordance with the TCDM-3 – Table 5.1.	Reject This table is ambiguous, overreaching and does not fit well within the plan.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
Definitions			
82.144	Definitions: Public Street Lighting Waka Kotahi sought this term to be defined.	Accept in part Has included a definition of 'Street Lighting', to be consistent with terminology used in the Infrastructure Chapter.	Supports I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.

Submission Point	Waka Kotahi Submission	Officer's Recommendation	My Response
82.18	Definitions: Off-site sign Waka Kotahi sought this definition to align with the advertising sign definition.	Accept in part Accept in part, however alternative wording to a similar effect has been proposed.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.24	Definitions: Temporary Sign Waka Kotahi sought a timeframe to be added to this definition.	Reject It is more appropriate to address this in a standard than the definition.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.
82.25	Definitions: Traffic Sign Waka Kotahi sought an amendment to the definition to align with the definition in the Traffic Controls Devices Manual.	Accept Has amended the definition as recommended.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation
82.08	Definitions: Flag Sign Waka Kotahi sought the removal of the definition of 'Flag Sign' as this is not mentioned throughout the district plan.	Reject The definition of 'Flag Sign' supports the interpretation and application of the provisions relating to freestanding signs.	Support I support the Reporting Officer's recommendation.