

## **PROPOSED PORIRUA CITY DISTRICT PLAN - HEARING 4 (LIGHT AND SIGNS CHAPTERS)**

### **SUMMARY OF STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE**

- 1.1 My name is Luke Thomas Braithwaite. I prepared a primary statement of evidence dated 21 January 2022 relating to lighting and signage issues. My qualifications and experience are set out in my primary statement. I reaffirm that I have read and continue to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses (2014) and that I am a Waka Kotahi employee.
- 1.2 I have read the supplementary planning evidence provided by Mr Smeaton (light) and Mr Rachlin (signs). Set out below is a summary of my primary evidence, updated to reflect my position following the review of those statements.

#### **Lighting Chapter**

- 1.3 With the changes outlined in the s42A report, I consider that the lighting chapter is appropriate as it aligns with the Australian and New Zealand Standard 4282 approved in 2019. This is the standard issued with the specific purpose to control the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting. The standard is considered to be best practice guidance in terms of ensuring that lighting effects do not compromise traffic safety.

#### **Signage Chapter**

- 1.4 I consider the signage chapter is generally appropriate to manage the potential effects of signage on road safety but I seek changes to SIGN-S6, SIGN-Table 1, SIGN-Table 3 and SIGN-S12 as set out below.

#### SIGN-S6

- 1.5 Various terminology is used in the Proposed District Plan to describe the location of signage in proximity to the state highway. For example, the Proposed District Plan uses wording such as “adjacent to any road”, “within 10 m of a road” or “at right angles to the road”. I have sought the replacement of these terms with the words “visible from a state highway” to ensure that the effects on road safety that the Proposed District Plan seeks to manage are appropriately addressed. The key issue is whether the sign can be seen from the state highway therefore have the potential to distract drivers causing a road safety issue. I note that the Rural Section of the Operative District Plan regulates signs that are “visible from the highway”.
- 1.6 The s42A report and the supplementary evidence of Mr Rachlin recommends retaining the wording “adjacent to” rather than referring to “visible from”. If the wording “adjacent to” is retained, then I consider that the term should be defined.
- 1.7 In addition, in Mr Rachlin’s supplementary evidence he agrees that the wording used within SIGN-S6.4 “at right angles to the road” is of concern, however, considers that since Waka Kotahi did not specifically seek the wording change in our original submission that we do not have scope. I have discussed this issue with Waka Kotahi Legal Counsel and

I disagree with Mr Rachlin's statement, as Waka Kotahi broadly sought for signs to be assessed where visible from the state highway and refers to safety and impacts on the transport network this wording change comes within the consequential relief sought.

- 1.8 I sought clarification in SIGN-S6.4 regarding how to measure the space between signs to ensure that separation distances are measured consistently along the transport network. I have also sought the removal of the wording "traffic sign". As drafted, the rule would apply to all traffic signage, for example parking time limit signage. I have suggested clearer wording to make it clear that the rule applies to permanent regulatory and warning signs being the signs that require the full attention of drivers and may require drivers to undertake a certain action.
- 1.9 Finally, I have sought that any sign visible from a state highway shall contain a maximum of six elements, ensuring that drivers are able to comprehend the sign without adversely distracting a driver from the task of safe driving. I have also included a definition to define the term "element" so this can be easily understood.

#### SIGN-Table 1 and SIGN-Table 3

- 1.10 In my opinion SIGN-Table 1 and SIGN-Table 3 require amendments to achieve sufficient distances between freestanding signage or transport network infrastructure. Sufficient spacing between critical elements of the transport network and signage or between two signs that may distract drivers from the driving task is important to ensure road safety.
- 1.11 I have sought that the separation distances in SIGN-Table 3 also apply to pedestrian crossings and curves that have chevron signage installed on them indicating tight cornering maneuvers, to avoid safety issues associated with distraction at locations where drivers need to be concentrating on the driving task. I note the s42A report supports this addition.

#### SIGN-S12.3

- 1.12 As with SIGN-S6, it is my view that SIGN-S12.3 requires amendments to ensure that digital billboards that are 'visible' from a state highway rather than those only adjacent to a highway are adequately controlled.

#### Section 22AB(1)(y) of the Land Transport Act 1998

- 1.13 Mr Rachlin's comments in his supplementary evidence in regard to controlling signage visible from the highway via a bylaw under the Land Transport Act 1998. Although there is the ability for Waka Kotahi to control signage through a bylaw, this is not an easily accessible option for many, whereas the district plan is much more accessible and includes all relevant rules in one location. As such, I consider that the district plan is the most appropriate location to control the effects of signage on the state highway transport network.

Luke Thomas Braithwaite

10 February 2022.