

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of a resource consent application by **BEKON MEDIA LIMITED** to **TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL** to install a single sided digital billboard at 332 Queen Street, Richmond

SECOND SUPPLEMENTARY SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE OF ANITA COLLIE – CONSENT CONDITIONS

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 My full name is Anita Collie. I am Principal Planner at Town Planning Group. I provide this supplementary statement in relation to the Bekon Media Limited (**Applicant**) proposal to install a digital billboard at 332 Queen Street, Richmond.
- 1.2 This statement provides a summary of discussions between the Applicant, Council and NZTA in regard to draft consent conditions.
- 1.3 My qualifications and expertise statements are set out in my brief of evidence dated 17 October 2024. I also reaffirm that I have read and agree to and abide by the Environment Court’s Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as specified in the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2023.

2. **CONDITIONS AGREED AND AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT**

- 2.1 **Attachment [A2]** to this statement is a set of conditions as agreed between the Council and the Applicant and identifying the only remaining areas of disagreement, which are narrow and only relate to Conditions 5 and 31. My comments are as follows.

Condition 5 – inclusion of definition of ‘height’

- 2.2 Ms Woodbridge would like to include a condition limiting the height of the parapet to 9.3m, which is the design height recorded in the DCM Plans,

Revision O. I consider the condition to be unnecessary as the plans are referenced by Condition 1.

- 2.3 Further, I consider this condition potentially creates compliance uncertainty if the building owner ever wanted to put a second storey on the building, which they could do as a permitted activity under the Tasman Resource Management Plan (**TRMP**). However, this is a minor matter.

Condition 31 – review condition

- 2.4 Ms Woodbridge prefers a broad approach to drafting clause (b) (relating to the review to address potential effects on traffic safety), as follows:

To review the dwell time or rate of transition of the image or the use of the screen to address potential traffic safety issues having regard to potential adverse effects on the safe and efficient use of the local road network by vehicular, pedestrian and cycle traffic.

- 2.5 I prefer a more specific approach to drafting as set out in consent set produced with my evidence as follows:

To review the dwell time or rate of transition of the image or the use of the screen to address potential traffic safety issues having regard to potential adverse effects on the safe and efficient use of the local road network by vehicular, pedestrian and cycle traffic.

- 2.6 I prefer this formulation for the following reasons:

- (a) The volume and thoroughness of evidence on traffic safety ensures that the effect is comprehensively assessed and there is a reasonable degree of certainty;
- (b) It is more consistent with the restricted discretionary activity status and matters of discretion;
- (c) That effects on traffic safety can most appropriately be adjusted through the matters listed in my preferred drafting of the review condition (i.e., dwell time or rate of transition of the image or the use of the screen); and
- (d) Conditions are proposed regarding monitoring of traffic safety, incorporating requirements for actions to be taken and further

monitoring to be undertaken, and these conditions are directive to the relevant issues.

3. **NZTA POSITION**

3.1 Mr Talbot has been provided with a set of the consent conditions and has advised via email dated 8 November 2024 that:

NZTA are happy with the conditions and do not have an interest in the final version of conditions 2, 5 and 7. We do not have a preference for either version of the review condition 31 and 32.

3.2 Mr Talbot's email is appended as **Attachment [B]** to this statement.

4. **CONCLUSION**

4.1 There is a high degree of alignment between Ms Woodbridge and I in respect of the proposed draft conditions. Two minor outstanding areas of disagreement are, in my view, minor matters and not fundamental to the substantive decision.

4.2 Mr Talbot on behalf of NZTA has confirmed that the proposed draft conditions attached are acceptable.

Anita Clare Collie

12 November 2024

Attachments

[A2] Proposed conditions.

[B] Jeremy Talbot email dated 8 November 2024.