

Attachment 2 – Views of local boards

This attachment contains the views of local boards on a draft proposal to make a new Signs Bylaw 2022 and changes made in response to those views.

Views of local boards that suggested changes to the draft proposal

The local boards in the table below supported the draft proposal and suggested changes.

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>Albert-Eden Local Board (AE/2021/111)</p> <p>a) support making a new bylaw which combines the current Signage Bylaw 2015 and Election Signs Bylaw 2013.</p> <p>b) support overall improvements in wording and structure as shown in the draft signage bylaw.</p> <p>c) support Clause 4 (2)(a) which provides the mechanism for community events be advertised with signage.</p> <p>d) request staff investigate any potential conflict between the Reserves Act 1977 and the wording in Clause 8(3)(d) of the draft bylaw which allows for up to 50 per cent of a verandah sign to display advertising in open space.</p> <p>e) request greater clarification is given on what the wording 'on any other site associated with that community' means as per Clause 16(2)(a) of the draft bylaw.</p> <p>f) request additional wording is added to Clause 21 of the draft bylaw noting that landowner permissions are required for signs in open space zones.</p> <p>g) support the removal of real estate signs as soon as practicable after the premises is sold, but within the time limits outlined in the Signage Bylaw.</p> <p>h) request that election sign site C-AE3 on Carrington Road as per Appendix C be re-instated for use, noting this site is still unavailable since 2015 following state highway 16/20 construction works and is the only public site in that area.</p> <p>i) request any new bylaw have adequate resourcing allocated for enforcement.</p> <p>j) request that staff resolve the issue about differentiation on decision-making for signage on parks which sit within the road corridor, noting the conflict between land held under the Local Government (Auckland Council) Act 2009 and Reserves Act 1977 where landowner approval status is held by Local Boards versus transport or any other signage that sits with the governance of Auckland Transport or Waka Kotahi NZTA.</p> <p>k) request that Clause 11 on portable signs make it clear that larger and/or taller signs must be stabilized to avoid them blowing over and injuring pedestrians.</p>	<p>No change made in relation to (d) because clause 6 of the proposed new Bylaw clarifies that compliance with all other applicable regulations is still necessary. This would include the Reserves Act 1977 in relation to Open Space Zones.</p> <p>No change made in response to (e) as term is broad to account for future circumstances.</p> <p>Changed proposal in response to (f) to add related information note about landowner approval for signs in Open Space Zones.</p> <p>No change made in response to (h) as the proposed Signs Bylaw Control already identifies this site as an election sign site. Any access issues may be raised by the local board as an operational matter with the appropriate operational units.</p> <p>Note in response to (i) that this is an operational matter that has been forwarded to relevant operational staff.</p> <p>No change made in response to (j) as landowner approval is a process separate to the proposed Bylaw.</p> <p>No change made in response to (k) as Subpart 3 of the proposed new Bylaw contains general rules for all signs, which address public safety risks.</p> <p>No change made in response to (l) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport agreed with the bylaw review findings which found that an increase in the maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone from 5m² to 6m² is appropriate, and the impact of this increase is small. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>No change made in response to (m) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. A preliminary analysis also indicates that</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>l) do not support increasing the maximum area for real estate signs in Heavy Industry Zones as proposed Clause 15(d).</p> <p>m) request that staff investigate the issue of Auckland Council's ability to prohibit the use of corflute and non-recyclable plastics due to their environmental impact and contribution to landfill.</p> <p>n) request that staff investigate how the bylaw can better minimise the nuisance of illuminated signs on residents including addressing the allowable luminescence, permitted operating times and cumulative effect as well as on their contribution to light pollution.</p>	<p>council may not have a mandate to use this bylaw to regulate sign materials.</p> <p>No change made in response to (n) as the bylaw review findings did not find sufficient evidence of issues from illumination of signs that would support more restrictive illumination rules. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p>
<p>Aotea / Great Barrier Local Board (GBI/2021/62)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation and provide the following feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) request that minimisation of light pollution to protect our nocturnal biodiversity be considered as part of the bylaw through methods such as directional lighting, timers on lighting and low-wattage lighting. ii) support the prevention of visual clutter and enabling the proactive removal of obsolete signage. 	<p>No change made in response to (a)(i) as the bylaw review findings did not find sufficient evidence of issues from illumination of signs that would support more restrictive illumination rules. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p>
<p>Devonport-Takapuna Local Board (DT/2021/108)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation, and provide the following feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) support the existing election sign locations ii) request clarification on whether the bylaw allows for election sign locations to be used by non-election signs outside of the election period. iii) request confirmation in the bylaw that the rules allowing property owners to place signs on fences that face the berm or road do not apply to fences that face a reserve or pocket park within the road corridor. iv) seek clarification on the rules around moving signs (for example digital signs) being moved from the Unitary Plan to the Signs Bylaw as part of a future plan change. v) request that main street signage for upstairs and backstreet businesses be allowed in the Signs Bylaw. 	<p>Note in response to (a)(ii) that the proposed Signs Bylaw Control allows for the election sign sites on council-controlled public places to also be used for event signs at any time.</p> <p>Changed proposal in response to (a)(iii) to clarify that election signs not on a council-controlled public place must not be directed at any council-controlled park, reserve or Open Space Zone in clause 17(5) and to clarify that an approval is required for a sign on a boundary fence facing an Open Space Zone in clause 21(2).</p> <p>Changed proposal in response to (a)(iv) to clarify that the 'changeable message signs' managed by the Bylaw relate to signs that transition between static images. These signs are already managed by the Bylaw rather than the Auckland Unitary Plan.</p> <p>No change made in response to (a)(v) as both the current and proposed bylaws allow for signs to be displayed by those businesses.</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>b) note that the local board reserves the right to provide views once the Draft Signs Bylaw has been consulted upon and the views and preferences of the local community are known.</p>	<p>Note in response to (b) that local boards will have the opportunity to consider public feedback received on the proposal and provide views on how a Bylaw Panel should address matters raised in the feedback.</p>
<p>Henderson Massey Local Board (HM/2021/114)</p> <p>a) support 4 of the 5 main draft proposals in the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A (of the agenda report) supporting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) combine the current Signage Bylaw 2015 and Election Signs Bylaw 2013 ii) increase the current portable sign prohibited area to cover the entire City Centre Zone iii) retain the intent of the rules in the current bylaws (unless otherwise stated) in a way that is up to date and more certain iv) use a bylaw structure, format and wording more aligned to the Auckland Unitary Plan and current council drafting standards. <p>b) do not support 1 of the 5 main draft proposals in the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A (of the agenda report) namely the increase to the maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone to 6m² (currently 2.88m² for sale of a property and 5m² for goods, services, or events).</p> <p>c) recommend the retention of the current maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone.</p> <p>d) agree that it would like the opportunity to review all public feedback on the proposed signs bylaw draft proposal before making a final decision.</p>	<p>No change made in response to (b) and (c) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport agreed with the bylaw review findings which found that an increase in the maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone from 5m² to 6m² is appropriate, and the impact of this increase is small. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>Note in response to (d) that local boards will have the opportunity to review public feedback received on the proposal and provide views on how a Bylaw Panel should address matters raised in the feedback.</p>
<p>Hibiscus and Bays Local Board (HB/2021/81)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation.</p> <p>b) support portable footpath signs ensuring paths are kept clear for pedestrians, mobility scooters and those with disabilities and suggest ladder signs be used where portable signs are not suitable in a particular area</p> <p>c) support signs for elections, polls and referendum purposes during an election period and encourage better spacing and scheduling of signage to reduce signs becoming a public nuisance by overcrowding in specific areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) seek stronger adherence and compliance for election signage and request stronger and timely enforcement for breaches of the bylaw 	<p>No change made in response to (b) because the proposal already allows for a prohibition on portable signs in certain areas to address clutter and requires premises above the ground floor to use portable ladder board signs.</p> <p>No change made in response to (c)(i) as these are operational matters that have been forwarded to relevant operational staff.</p> <p>No change made in response to (c)(ii) as this relates to the public consultation process. Note: online tools for public feedback will seek to support information gathering.</p> <p>No change made in response to (c)(iii) because the proposed bylaw manages signs for public meetings as event signs rather than election signs. This means that</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) request consideration be given to how the proposed Signs Bylaw 2022 information will be communicated to the public, including efficient online tools to support information gathering on signage rules for specific entities, sites, and activities iii) seek new provision that limit the number of times a political party can advertise a “public meeting” within any election period. <p>Note: the local board has serious concerns about continued breaches of the signage bylaws that not only create a public nuisance but are resource intensive for council staff. Changes to other legislation will be required for the new signs bylaw to have the desired effect and control.</p>	<p>limitations to the number of signs on a site and duration of display already apply.</p>
<p>Howick Local Board (HW/2021/110) (HW/2021/111) (HW/2021/112)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation and provides the following feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) request that Schedule 1, Interpretation, be included at the beginning of the proposed bylaw so as to reflect the layout of the current bylaw. ii) support the overall layout, particularly the definitions being included throughout the document alongside each sign type. iii) that there be consideration given to a cap to limit the number of election signs per candidate or party, included in the bylaw. iv) request support from the council for enforcement of current bylaw with regards to election signs. 	<p>Changes made in relation to (a)(i) to move the 'Interpretation' section to clause 5 at the beginning of the proposed new Bylaw.</p> <p>No changes made in response to (a)(iii) because the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw, which includes a limit on the number of party signs on a council-controlled public place but no other direct limits.</p> <p>The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>Note in response to (a)(iv) that this is an operational matter that has been forwarded to relevant operational staff.</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>Kaipātiki Local Board (KT/2021/110)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation, and provide the following feedback on the draft:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) support the existing election sign locations. ii) request clarification on whether the bylaw allows for election sign locations to be used by non-election signs outside of the election period, as appears to be the case in the Kaipātiki area. iii) request confirmation in the bylaw that the rules allowing property owners to place signs on fences that face the berm or road do not apply to fences that face a reserve or pocket park within the road corridor. iv) request that the rules around moving signs (for example slideshows) are moved from the Unitary Plan to the Signs Bylaw as part of a future plan change. 	<p>Note in response to (a)(ii) that the proposed Signs Bylaw Control allows for the election sign sites on council-controlled public places to also be used for event signs at any time.</p> <p>Changed proposal in response to (a)(iii) to clarify that election signs not on a council-controlled public place must not be directed at any council-controlled park, reserve or Open Space Zone in clause 17(5) and to clarify that an approval is required for a sign on a boundary fence facing an Open Space Zone in clause 21(2).</p> <p>Changed proposal in response to (a)(iv) to clarify that the ‘changeable message signs’ managed by the Bylaw relate to signs that transition between static images. These signs are already managed by the Bylaw rather than the Auckland Unitary Plan.</p>
<p>Manurewa Local Board (MR/2021/112)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation, subject to the following feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the board supports the proposal to combine the current Signage Bylaw 2015 and Election Signs Bylaw 2013 into a single bylaw ii) the board would prefer stronger restrictions on advertising signage displayed at off-licence alcohol outlets, on the basis that this would contribute to reduction of alcohol-related harm in our community iii) the board recommends that public consultation on the Signage Bylaw review actively seeks feedback from communities on alcohol outlet signage iv) the board notes the resolutions of the Regulatory Committee requesting that proactive enforcement through the Targeted Initiative team within the Regulatory Compliance Unit be prioritised and for other methods to reduce community exposure to alcohol marketing by off-licence outlets independent of the signage bylaw review to be explored (REG/2020/66 and REG/2021/20) v) the board notes the advice of staff to the Regulatory Committee that restrictions on advertising signage specific to off-licence alcohol 	<p>No change to the proposal made in response to (a)(ii), (iv), (v) and (vi) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport decided to further investigate options to regulate branding and advertising by off-licence alcohol stores independent of the signage bylaw review.</p> <p>No change to proposal made in response to (a)(iii) as this relates to the public consultation process. The Statement of Proposal will however invite views on the impact of alcohol signage on communities to support council’s separate investigation into other options to manage off-licence alcohol outlet signage.</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>outlets cannot be included using the bylaw under current legislation</p> <p>vi) the board supports Governing Body advocating to central government for tighter national restrictions on alcohol marketing and would like to be involved in any such discussions.</p>	
<p>Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Board (MT/2021/118)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland transport signs bylaw Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation and provide the following input:</p> <p>i) ensure the bylaws rules and regulations is consistent across the Auckland region:</p> <p>ii) ensure clause 23 of the new signs bylaw- a sign must not endanger public safety or cause a nuisance, is pre-emptively enforced as the health and safety of our community is paramount.</p>	<p>Note in response to (a)(i) that the Bylaw will apply consistently across the Auckland region.</p> <p>Note in response to (a)(ii) that this is an operational matter that has been forwarded to relevant operational staff.</p>
<p>Orakei Local Board (OR/2021/113)</p> <p>b) support the draft Statement of Proposal as shown on pages from 37 to 44 in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation with the following recommended change:</p> <p>c) express concern that the proposed changes to the Bylaw may allow signage (such as real estate signs) to use changeable messages (clause 26) and be illuminated by a static source (clause 27) in certain circumstances and request real estate signs be treated like election signs with the same additional conditions identified in clause 17 of the draft proposal as below:</p> <p>iii) must not be illuminated internally or externally by artificial lighting designed specifically to illuminate the sign</p> <p>iv) must not include any changeable message (for example any mechanical or electronic moving images or displays)</p> <p>v) must not include any moveable part or light that is intended to draw attention to the sign.</p> <p>d) request staff to amend the description for the Kepa Road election sign site as shown in Appendix C in the Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Signs Bylaw (locations, conditions and prohibitions) 2022 to read “Kepa Road (adjacent to Nehu Reserve)”.</p>	<p>No changes made in response to (b) because the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw, which allows illumination and use of changeable messages for real estate signs. The Statement of Proposal will however highlight this rule for public feedback and the Bylaw Panel may amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>Changed proposal as requested in (c) to clarify the description of the Kepa Road election sign site.</p>
<p>Ōtara-Papatoetoe Local Board (OP/2021/108)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga</p>	<p>Note in response to (a)(ii) that illustrations are still being finalised.</p> <p>Note in response to (vi) and (vii) that local boards will have the opportunity to review</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation and further gives the following feedback comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) support the overall format and sequence of content as this makes the Signage Bylaw more accessible for general users ii) note that diagrams and graphs in the draft help with readability but recommend use of real pictures of signs for general public to understand the bylaw iii) note the resolutions of the Regulatory Committee requesting that proactive enforcement through the Targeted Initiative team within the Regulatory Compliance Unit be prioritised and for other methods to reduce community exposure to alcohol marketing by off-licence outlets independent of the signage bylaw review be explored (REG/2020/66 and REG/2021/20) iv) note the advice of staff to the Regulatory Committee that restrictions on advertising signage specific to off-licence alcohol outlets cannot be included using the bylaw under current legislation v) support the Governing Body advocating to central government for tighter national restrictions on alcohol marketing, and request local board involvement in any such discussions vi) request the analysis and summary from public consultation, particularly feedback from the Ōtara-Papatoetoe area vii) look forward to the next phase for local board input prior to final decision being made on the Signs Bylaw 2022. 	<p>public feedback received on the proposal and provide views on how a Bylaw Panel should address matters raised in the feedback, before a final decision is made.</p>
<p>Puketāpapa Local Board (PKTPP/2021/135)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) note the importance of exposure to alcohol advertising including signage, in increasing alcohol harm, alongside price and availability b) note the Puketāpapa Local Board's continued advocacy around reducing the harm of alcohol, tobacco and other drugs (in alignment with the Healthy Puketāpapa Action Plan objective) which includes advocating for better enforcement of signage breaches under other legislation such as the Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act 2012 and more restrictive conditions in licensing processes. c) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls 	<p>No change in response to (d) and (e) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport decided to further investigate options to regulate branding and advertising by off-licence alcohol stores independent of the signage bylaw review.</p> <p>The Statement of Proposal will however invite views on the impact of alcohol signage on communities to support council's separate investigation into other options to manage off-licence alcohol outlet signage</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>for public consultation, with the inclusion of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) regulation of branding and onsite advertising of off licence outlets; and that ii) this be included as part of the proposed public consultation package. <p>d) support further Auckland Council work on regulating branding and onsite advertising of off licence outlets through other mechanisms including other bylaws.</p> <p>e) support Auckland Council advocating to central government for tighter national restrictions on alcohol marketing including signage.</p> <p>f) support prioritising proactive enforcement of off licence outlets' signage</p> <p>g) request an opportunity to speak to the Regulatory Committee on this matter.</p>	
<p>Rodney Local Board (RD/2021/292)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation b) do not support larger signs in the industrial zones as these are often located between rural and residential areas and so create visual pollution on entering our towns and villages c) request greater control over dimming of electronic signs at night including tighter restrictions on flashing d) request greater clarification in the bylaw around consenting requirements for larger billboards e) request greater clarification in the bylaw pertaining to the attachment of commercial signage to road signs f) requests the limitation to the number of sandwich boards or other portable signs outside businesses to prevent cluttering of the footpath g) express concern about continued breaches of the signage bylaws that not only create a public nuisance but are resource intensive for council staff. 	<p>No change made in response to (b) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport agreed with the bylaw review findings which found that an increase in the maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone from 5m² to 6m² is appropriate, and the impact of this increase is small. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>No change made in response to (c) as the bylaw review findings did not find sufficient evidence of issues from illumination of signs that would support more restrictive illumination rules. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>No change made in response to (d) as billboards are managed by the Auckland Unitary Plan rather than the Bylaw.</p> <p>Changed proposal in response to (e) to add a related information note under clause 24 about the management of commercial media on street signs.</p> <p>No change made in relation to (f) as the proposal already limits the number of portable signs on council-controlled public places (such as on a footpath). There are no restrictions on the number of portable signs on sites that are not council-controlled as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
	<p>similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>Note in response to (g) that this is an operational matter and has been forwarded to relevant operational staff.</p>
<p>Waiheke Local Board (WHK/2021/136)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation.</p> <p>b) seek a regionwide control over permitted levels of illumination in externally projected signage (e.g. light boxes, static illuminated signage, changeable message signs) that is in line with Dark Skies (IDA) prescribed levels, but that applies Auckland-wide for reasons of protection of our ecology and nocturnal biodiversity. This would also align with reducing Auckland's carbon footprint.</p>	<p>No change made in response to (b) as the bylaw review findings did not find sufficient evidence of issues from illumination of signs that would support more restrictive illumination rules. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p>
<p>Waitākere Ranges Local Board (WTK/2021/77)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation.</p> <p>b) note that the bylaw retains the same sites / locations for election signage as in previous elections and requests the inclusion of a number of these sites for ad-hoc community signs, along with specified conditions for removal.</p> <p>c) consider that the bylaw or similar should prohibit the erection of commercial signs on top of Auckland Transport wayfinding signs.</p> <p>d) consider that illuminated advertising signage on street signs are not billboards but should be included in the new signs bylaw.</p> <p>e) support the retention of existing restrictions relating to Real Estate signs.</p> <p>f) support inclusion of restrictions to mobile and trailer signs, where those vehicles are effectively functioning as signage.</p> <p>g) support a wider review of signage across Auckland which leads to a decrease of visual clutter.</p> <p>h) consider that illuminated signs should be clearly restricted, particularly in areas such as the Waitākere Ranges, where the principle of retaining dark sky is important.</p>	<p>No change made in response to (b) as the proposed new Bylaw already allows the display of community event signs on election sign sites subject to compliance with the conditions for those sign types, including duration and removal limits.</p> <p>No change made in response to (c) and (d) because the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. Signs on street signs are currently billboards and regulated under the Auckland Unitary Plan. This matter can however be investigated as part of a future Plan review.</p> <p>Note in response to (g) that Bylaw reviews are periodic and rules for signs managed by the Auckland Unitary Plan may be considered as part of a future Plan review.</p> <p>No change made in response to (h) as the bylaw review findings did not find sufficient evidence of issues from illumination of signs that would support more restrictive illumination rules. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>i) request that the bylaw specify in conservation zones and areas of identified ecological value that there are additional restrictions on signs, noting in particular provisions of the Unitary Plan relating to the Waitākere Ranges Heritage Area.</p>	<p>Changed proposal in response to (i) to refer to the Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area Act 2008 in the 'Summary' section of the Bylaw about the wider framework of rules relevant to signs.</p>
<p>Waitematā Local Board (WTM/2021/162)</p> <p>a) support the draft Statement of Proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to make a new Auckland Council and Auckland Transport Ture ā-Rohe mo nga Tohu 2022 / Signs Bylaw 2022 and associated controls for public consultation.</p> <p>i) support the proposal to combine the current Signage Bylaw 2015 and the Elections Signs Bylaw 2013 into a single bylaw.</p> <p>ii) support the intention to provide more opportunities to display election signs during pre-election periods.</p> <p>iii) support the proposal to increase the current portable sign prohibited area to cover the entire City Centre Zone because it will reduce safety risks, nuisance and clutter, improve accessibility for visitors and for vision-impaired people and those who are frail, disabled or otherwise mobility impaired, and prioritise place-making activities and events.</p> <p>iv) do not support increasing the maximum area for real estate signs in any type of locality even in the Heavy Industry Zone as proposed clause 24 as we do not support them becoming more omnipresent and pernicious than they are already.</p> <p>v) support the clarification in Clause 26 that “community events” signs permitted on sites associated with the community concerned may only be displayed if the event is provided by a not-for-profit group.</p> <p>vi) support the retention of the intent of the rules in the current bylaws but supports them being expressed in a way that is more up to date and certain.</p> <p>vii) support having the definition of each type of sign alongside the rules for that sign</p> <p>viii) request that staff investigate the issue of Auckland Council’s ability to prohibit the use of corflute and non-recyclable plastics</p> <p>ix) request staff to continue investigating international best practice to respond to the impacts on city centre residents to develop appropriate policies and regulations with regards to illuminated signs.</p>	<p>No change made in response to (a)(iv). The proposal to increase the size of real estate signs only applies to flat-wall mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport agreed with the bylaw review findings which found that an increase in the maximum area of flat wall-mounted signs in the Heavy Industry Zone is appropriate, and the impact of this increase is small. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>No change made in response to (a)(viii) as the Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. A preliminary analysis also indicates that council may not have a mandate to use this bylaw to regulate sign materials.</p> <p>No change made in response to (a)(ix), (x) and (xi) as the bylaw review findings did not find sufficient evidence of issues from illumination of signs that would support more restrictive illumination rules. The Regulatory Committee and Board of Auckland Transport resolved to retain rules similar in effect to the current bylaw. The Bylaw Panel may however amend this rule during deliberations if appropriate and justified.</p> <p>No change in response to (a)(xii). Appendix B1 (now Appendix A) lists locations with existing community board infrastructure. These sites can be added once the necessary commitments to install that infrastructure are made.</p> <p>No change in response to (a)(xiii) at this time. The matter has been referred to Auckland Transport for investigation and will be reported to the Bylaw Panel as a staff recommendation given the public safety concern.</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
<p>x) request staff to investigate how the bylaw can better minimise the nuisance of illuminated signs on city centre residents, including addressing the allowable brightness, permitted operating times and cumulative effect.</p> <p>xi) request staff to investigate the development of plans to provide clarity about the treatment of networks, sets or clusters of illuminated signs including cumulative impact, particularly those at street level, such as bus shelters, in the central city and elsewhere.</p> <p>xii) urge that the Ellen Melville Centre and possibly the Albert Park Cottage be added to the Grey Lynn Library Hall and the Freemans Bay Hall in Appendix B1 as locations for the display of community events signs on council controlled public spaces.</p> <p>xiii) support the current list in Appendix C of locations and conditions of use for the display of election signs on council controlled public spaces in the Waitemata Local Board area, except for Grafton Road which is steep, subject to subsidence and is a safety risk for those erecting and dismantling signs on it.</p> <p>xiv) request that in Appendix D "Freyburg Square" should be amended to read "Freyberg Place".</p> <p>b) note and supports the Regulatory Committee decision in REG/2020/66 (f) for staff to explore further options for regulating alcohol signage, independent of the Signage Bylaw review.</p> <p>c) support Governing Body advocating to central government for tighter national restrictions on alcohol marketing</p> <p>d) note the resolutions of the Regulatory Committee requesting that proactive enforcement through the Targeted Initiative team within the Regulatory Compliance Unit be prioritised and for other methods to reduce community exposure to alcohol marketing by off-licence outlets independent of the signage bylaw review to be explored (REG/2020/66 and REG/2021/20)</p> <p>e) recommend that Governing Body advocate to central government for tighter national restrictions on signage for and marketing of electronic gambling machine venues to prohibit advertising of the particular characteristics or attributes of the gambling machines in their venues and to prohibit the use of words or images likely to trigger problem gambling behaviour.</p> <p>f) note that the bylaw does not generally regulate signage content but does put extra limitations on signs related to sensitive places or activities including those for commercial sexual services premises.</p> <p>g) urge investigation of the possibility that some of the restrictions in the proposed and current bylaw in Clause</p>	<p>Changed proposal in response to (a)(xiv) to refer to "Freyberg Place" in Appendix D.</p> <p>Note in response to (e) that this matter has been forwarded to the relevant council unit.</p> <p>Note in response to (g) that this matter will in relation to alcohol be considered as part of a separate investigation. The investigation findings may provide an insight to the further regulation of gambling signs.</p>

View of local board	Changes included in proposal in response to views
22 that apply to signs for commercial sexual services premises should also, through appropriate regulatory change, be applied to premises providing alcohol or gambling, particularly limitations on sign size, content controls and a ban on flashing lights and changeable messages.	

Views of local boards that supported the draft proposal

The local boards in the table below supported the draft proposal in its entirety and suggested no changes with the resolution below.

“support the draft statement of proposal in Attachment A of this agenda report to amend the Signs Bylaw 2022 for public consultation”.

Local board	Resolution
Franklin Local board	FR/2021/107
Papakura Local Board	PPK/2021/134
Upper Harbour Local Board	UH/2021/86
Whau Local Board	WH/2021/70

Local boards who chose to defer comments on the proposal

The Māngere-Ōtāhuhu Local Board chose to defer comment until after public consultation.