

## Urban Design Advice

Relevant Provision	Submission Point	Matter	Urban Design Comment
8A.3.4	2.8	Activity status table – specific recognition of illuminated signs within Rural and Residential Zones as RDA or DA as per recommendation in UD report. Additionally, require resource consent for illuminated signs in Open Space, Business and Industrial zones less than 10m from residential zone.	<p>Ideally, illuminated signage would be restricted to a greater distance than 10m from residential areas.</p> <p>However, in the absence of any standards restricting the effects of illuminated signage on residential areas, the requested standard requiring resource consent for illuminated signs within 10m of a residential area is preferable to having no restrictions.</p>
	2.8	Clarity on the illumination effect of signs and relationship to residential & rural zones. UD Report states “Flashing, illuminated, reflective or animated signs should not adversely affect amenity values of neighbouring areas, especially residential areas...”	<p>Effects from flashing, illuminated, reflective or animated signs in more sensitive areas such as rural and residential areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nuisance and disruption at night - these zones predominantly comprise residential dwellings where there is a certain expectation for noise and light levels to be lower at the times when most people are sleeping;</li> <li>• Spill light from illuminated zones into neighbouring residential areas;</li> <li>• These types of signs can be visually dominant on the streetscape and detract from the residential and rural character. Illuminated signs are generally more recognised and appropriate in business and industrial areas.</li> </ul> <p>There is some recognition that externally illuminated signs could be appropriate for certain activities within the residential zone, for example schools, churches and community centres. However, they would require controls to ensure they do not create a nuisance, especially during night time hours.</p>
8A.3.4.9	2.10	Clarity on the intent regarding signs on buildings not ‘covering windows in Residential Zone’. Does this mean physical sign boards covering architectural features or any advertisement in windows which could prevent community notices?	<p>The intent of restricting signage in residential windows is to maintain the residential character, including architectural features. Windows in residential dwellings are also important for maintaining internal amenity such as sunlight, providing visual connections to the street and for passive surveillance. Community notices are generally small in size and therefore do not result in</p>

			large visual obstructions. Furthermore, they are generally designed to be read by pedestrians within close proximity of the notice. As such, they respond better to human scale which is characteristic of residential areas.
	2.10	“Visible in one direction” – concern this is confusing or a broad standard.	Visible in one direction allows for structures with a sign attached to both sides, i.e. signs that are perpendicular to the street can have signage on both sides of the signage structure.
	2.10	Propose 3 signs for sites in residential zone with non-residential activities.	This could reduce the character of a residential area through emphasizing the non-residential activities on the site through provision of a greater permitted scale of signage. Additionally, the appropriateness would depend on the given site and its context, where a larger site near the interface with a business zone might have better capacity to have more than one sign, but for most residential properties in a typical suburban area, three free standing signs may not be appropriate. It's better to assess the appropriateness for more than one sign via a resource consent.
8A3.4.10	1.4	Submissions oppose 7.5m <sup>2</sup> maximum permitted area for freestanding signs. Seeks permitted standard increased to 20m <sup>2</sup> (and width increased to 3m).	While this rule may be appropriate in a larger city (for example the Wellington CBD), the Upper Hutt CBD is characterised as a smaller scale commercial business area. There are also a number of industrial zone ‘pockets’ in close proximity to residential areas. As such, free standing signs of this size as a permitted activity could result in very signage dominated areas. By restricting their size, it allows Council planners to take into account the cumulative and dominance effects of signage and decide whether a larger sign is appropriate on a case by case basis.
	3.9	Freestanding signs – submission seeks increase to 16m <sup>2</sup> for Business Commercial Zone and 18m <sup>2</sup> for Business Industrial and Special Activity Zones.	Similar principals apply as above.
8A.3.4.11	2.12	Signs on commercial and special activity zones – number of matters raised by this submission, including; inconsistent standard with UD report (pg 12) recommendation. Wording of provision should be changed to “minimum” not “maximum” for provision (d).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of the term “façade” and its intention is explained in the response to submission point 1.5 below.</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the proliferation of signage on building elevations is addressed in the response to</li> </ul>

			<p>submission point 1.5 below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allowing 10m<sup>2</sup> on the façade of buildings in the Business Industrial zone is intended to the front elevation where it is visible for wayfinding purposes and acknowledging that buildings in these zones are generally larger.</li> <li>• Agreed, “maximum” is a typo and the signage should read “<b>minimum</b>”.</li> <li>• The attached diagram includes a maximum height of 0.6m on the fascia of a canopy. This is intended to promote visual consistency between adjoining buildings and restricting oversized fascia signs extending beyond the height of the fascia. Furthermore, the height between ground level and any signs attached beneath the fascia is recommended to be 2.5m to avoid potential conflict with parked trucks and buses.</li> <li>• Standards ‘a’ and ‘f’ conflict due to standard ‘a’ intending to restrict signs from extending beyond the elevation of a building in general. Standard ‘f’ is intended to restrict how signs protrude beyond the front elevation of a building. They should be read either exclusively or reworded to make this clearer.</li> </ul>
1.5		Signs on buildings – increase permitted sign area on a building to 15m <sup>2</sup> .	<p>15m<sup>2</sup> is a large signage area for a permitted standard and could result in adverse visual effects within the Upper Hutt context. In particular cumulative visual effects. Instead, such signs should be assessed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>With regard to the use of the term “façade”; elevation and façade are often used interchangeably. However, I acknowledge the fact that this could potentially be confusing, with facade sometimes being used in reference to the front elevation only. As such, using the terms “elevation” or “front elevation” may be appropriate to provide clarification.</p> <p>The urban design report recommends a maximum signage area of 5m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum site coverage of 30% on a building elevation. This is intended to</p>

			be used in conjunction with the minimum separation distance of 5m. When used together, it will prevent the proliferation of signs on the building elevation.
8A.3.4.12	1.6	Sign for direction of traffic. Seeks increase to from 1.0m high to 1.2m and from 0.5m <sup>2</sup> to 1m <sup>2</sup> area for traffic direction signs.	I'm comfortable with these requested changes. The requested increase in height and area is marginal. 1.2m in height is the general acceptable maximum height for structures and obstructions with regard to maintaining line of sight from vehicles.
	3.10	Sign for direction of traffic. Seeks increase to from 0.5m <sup>2</sup> to 1m <sup>2</sup> area for traffic direction signs.	
8A.4.3.16	2.16	Wants temporary signage effects to be extended beyond just residential amenity as a matter of discretion, to consider more broadly the impact on streetscene character and amenity.	I can concur with the submission point requesting consideration of temporary signage effects on streetscene character and amenity as well as residential amenity.
Appendix 1	1.7	Consequential amendments to diagram based on above.	The diagram has been updated.
Sign (definition)	3.5	Definition of "Sign". Submission seeks clarity that painting corporate colours on a building is not defined as a 'sign' which is then subject to area standards.	I'm comfortable with painted corporate colours to not be included within the definition of a sign. Once a logo or text is introduced into the painting, I would consider this to become signage.

Jaime Devereux  
Urban Edge Planning Ltd

