

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of hearing of a submission and further submission lodged by the **OUT OF HOME MEDIA ASSOCIATION OF NEW ZEALAND INC.** in respect of the 'Signs' Chapter and the 'Signs' Design Guide **Proposed Wellington City District Plan**

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF BRETT HARRIES FOR
OUT OF HOME MEDIA ASSOCIATION OF AOTEAROA ON THE
PROPOSED WELLINGTON DISTRICT PLAN – HEARING 7**

TRAFFIC

22 MARCH 2024

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 My name is Brett Harries. My qualifications and experience are set out in my primary statement of evidence on this topic, dated 5 March 2024. I confirm that I am continuing to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023, as applicable to this Independent Panel hearing.

1.2 I have read and considered the Statement of Supplementary Planning Evidence of Josh Patterson on behalf of Wellington City Council, dated 12 March 2024, which responds to my primary statement of evidence on behalf of the Out of Home Media Association Aotearoa (**OOHMAA**).

2. AREAS OF AGREEMENT AND DISAGREEMENT

2.1 Mr Patterson and I are now in agreement in respect of the following matters that were addressed in my primary evidence:

- (a) Standard SIGN-S8.1.e regarding the removal of the control on contact details within images.
- (b) Standard SIGN-S8.1.f regarding the removal of the control on the number of characters able to be displayed within images.
- (c) Standard SIGN-S7.7 regarding the minimum separation distances between signs.
- (d) Standard SIGN-S8.2.b regarding minimum dwell times for the display of digital images.

2.2 Mr Patterson and I appear to be essentially in agreement in respect of Standards SIGN-S8.2.c and SIGN-S8.2.d regarding the method of transition between digital images. In my opinion, however, the intent of the standard could be better achieved with a modification to its wording as I outline in Section 3 of my statement below.

2.3 The only area of disagreement between myself and Mr Patterson is in respect of standards SIGN-S1.1.f, SIGN-S5.4, and SIGN-S8.1.9 and their

respective references to signs that are oriented to be read from low-speed state highways. This is addressed in Section 4.

3. STANDARD SIGN-S8.2.c-d (TRANSITIONS BETWEEN DIGITAL IMAGES).

3.1 Mr. Patterson and I appear to agree that the most appropriate form of transition between digital images on a digital billboard is by way of 0.5 second dissolve transitions. However, in my opinion the wording as modified for the two applicable standards requires further modification to be more explicit about that intent.

3.2 The wording as currently recommended by Mr. Patterson for standards SIGN-S8.2.c and SIGN-S8.2.d. is as follows: ¹

2. Each image on a digital sign shall:

c. Transition to another image within ~~0.1 to~~ 0.5 seconds

d. Transition to another image without flashing, blinking, fading, or scrolling, ~~or dissolving~~.

3.3 The difficulty with the modified version of 2.c is that it now requires transition durations that are “*within 0.5 seconds*”, which implies that the transition could be instantaneous. However, an instantaneous transition has the potential to create a visual ‘flick’ that could catch the involuntary attention of a road user, especially if it occurred in peripheral vision. In my opinion, it is preferable to simply refer to 0.5 seconds, without any qualifier such as the word ‘*within*’.

3.4 Further, with the modified version of 2.d there is no specificity that dissolve transitions are preferred (noting that dissolve transitions ensure the least potential for catching the involuntary attention of a driver).

3.5 I presume that the intent of 2.c and 2.d (when read together), is that image transitions shall occur by way of 0.5 second dissolve transitions. However, as currently drafted that intent is not explicit. Accordingly, I

¹ I note that in the marked-up version of the Standards as appended to Mr Patterson’s Supplementary Evidence, the numbering of the two standards has got out of synch. In the PDP the two standards are SIGN-S8-2.c and SIGN-S8-2.d, whereas in the marked up version they are shown as SIGN-S8-2.g and SIGN-S8-2.h.

recommend that 2.c and 2.d are combined into one clearly stated, explicit standard that says:

2. Each image on a digital sign shall:

c. change from one image to the next by way of 0.5-second dissolve transitions.

4. STANDARDS SIGN-S1.1.f, SIGN-S5.4, AND SIGN-S8.1.9 (PROVISIONS RELATING TO SIGNS THAT ARE VISIBLE FROM A STATE HIGHWAY)

4.1 Mr Patterson disagrees with the changes that I have recommended² to remove specific constraints on signs that are visible from state highways with a speed limit of less than 80 km/h.

4.2 I have described in Section 8 of my primary evidence why I consider it justifiable and appropriate to make distinctions between high-speed state highways³ such as the Wellington Urban Motorway, and low-speed state highways⁴ such as Vivian Street and Karo Drive.

4.3 In my opinion, it would be illogical to attempt to apply the same standards to a 100km/h motorway that carries 87,000 vehicles per day⁵, to a 50km/h inner city street that carries less than a quarter of the motorway's volume. To do so would inevitably result in unnecessarily onerous controls being applied to the low-speed state highways.

4.4 Similarly, it is in my opinion illogical to suggest that streets such as Vivian Street and Karo Drive deserve a higher level of road safety management and control than any other surface street within the central city.

4.5 I note that NZTA's *Planning Policy Manual* essentially acknowledges this point with the distinctions it makes in relation to the various guidelines that apply to different speed environments. In this regard, I particularly note its statement that:⁶

² Paragraph 8.14 of my primary evidence.

³ Speed limits of 80km/h or more

⁴ Speed limits of less than 80km/h

⁵ Wellington Urban Motorway south of Ngauranga (source NZTA traffic count database)

⁶ NZTA "Third party signs on and visible from the state highway corridor – *Planning Policy Manual*" (28 November 2023), Section 4, paragraph 3, page 7

"In urban environments where the speed is less than 70km/hr, Waka Kotahi may defer to the local authority for the management of signs located outside the state highway corridor (i.e. for signs on private land) where the risk to the network is deemed to be low."

- 4.6 Given the substantial and obvious differences between motorways and central city surface streets, and given the almost identical operational and layout characteristics of inner-city state highways when compared to inner-city streets that are operated by Council, there is in my opinion a sound justification for treating low-speed state highways the same as any other comparable street within the city.
- 4.7 Put another way, there is no reason why the potential road safety effects of signs that are directed toward Council operated roads cannot also ensure the suitable and appropriate management of signs that are directed toward low-speed state highways.
- 4.8 I therefore affirm the recommended changes to SIGN-S1.1.f, SIGN-S5.4, and SIGN-S8.1.9 that I have detailed in paragraph 8.14 of my primary evidence.

Brett Harries

22 March 2024