

BOOKS & TOYS (WANAKA) LIMITED (2510)

EVIDENCE SUMMARY OF ERIN QUIN (PLANNER AND URBAN DESIGNER)

- 1 The submission lodged by Books & Toys (Wanaka) Limited seek that changes be made to amend Table 31.5, specifically to state signage within an approved signage platform shall be a permitted activity, and in its current proposed form the rule is ambiguous. They also seek clarification to Rule 31.7.5(b) with respect to specifically excluding window product displays and deletion of part of Rule 31.6.5 which restricts the number of temporary sale signs to 1 sign per sale.
- 2 I have considered the views expressed by Ms Leith in her rebuttal evidence (dated 22 August 2018).
- 3 Ms. Leith considers in 4.1 of her evidence that s42A Rule 31.5.1 as amended is not ambiguous due to it excluding signage types listed as permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary within Tables 31.7-31.9. Ms. Leith stated in part 12.6 of her s42A report that to her knowledge the definition of signage was not used in enforcement to control shopfront displays. I have been advised that the matter has been raised with the submitter by QLDC.
- 4 The wording of 31.7.7 states that any sign or signage platform that does not comply with Rules 31.7.1 to 31.7.6 is discretionary. It remains unclear if signs replaced within an approved signage platform need to comply with Rule 31.7.7, which also means 31.7.1 to 31.7.6 in order to retain permitted status.
- 5 I maintain the view that the s42A Rule 31.5.1 as written is ambiguous and requires further clarification as outlined in the submission to aid practical interpretation of the rule by the general public. If a simple addition as outlined in paragraph 2.5 of my evidence can be made to clarify a rule for practical interpretation, it should therefore not be necessary to refer other sections of the plan.
- 6 Ms. Leith considers in paragraph 4.2 of her rebuttal (regarding Rule 31.7.5(b)) that posters should not be excluded from window and product displays as this would create confusion due to posters being included within the definition of signage. I note that the definition of signage is broad enough to include many items intended to attract attention and which are visible from a public place. The broad definition is not conducive to fairly assisting commercial establishments achieve Policy 31.2.1.6(a).
- 7 Ms. Leith also considers the potential effects of large posters within a shopfront display could be the same as a sign (being a two-dimensional static drawing) and should not be treated the same as a display of physical products. In my opinion this is a broad assumption that a two-dimensional static drawing will have the same environmental effect regardless of the poster's design when they are directly associated with product displays. This is a generic assumption. The rule is in my opinion overly restrictive by limiting the consideration of window displays to physical goods only. The reference to the 1 meter setback for signage as proposed does not appear to work or address the concerns raised by Ms Leith.
- 8 I concur that window displays do enhance the street environment, however, find that posters which complement these products or services within window displays can be placed and designed so as to also enrich and enliven the street environment and encourage customer patronage. The use of temporary posters in window displays are used to attract the attention of customers to a given product or service and are complementary in this regard.
- 9 The reasoning given by Ms. Leith that this will cause confusion in practical terms does not in my opinion warrant exclusion of the provision of posters in window displays. I maintain the opinion that temporary posters in window displays should be exempt from Rule 31.7.5(b), and should there be concerns with regard to amenity effects and the permanence of signage in window displays than this could be managed on a time allowance basis.
- 10 To conclude, with regard to Rule 31.6.5 noted by Ms. Robb as previously overlooked, the rationale between the restriction of sale signage to one sign has in my opinion not been sufficiently clarified. This is particularly relevant where there are instances of businesses having more than one public street elevation. I am of the opinion that a time allowance restriction on sale signage is sufficient in managing possible effects as the subject signage is purposefully informative and temporary only.