

Closed		
Advertising Signs on Footpaths Public Places Bylaw	47 Contributors	52 Contributions

Contribution Summary

1. What are your views on the regulation of advertising signs on footpaths?

Long Text | Skipped: 0 | Answered: 52 (100%)

Sentiment

No sentiment data

Tags

Anti regulation

Signs on road side of footpath

More enforcement

Health and Safety Concerns

Pro regulation

Disability advocacy

Anti free standing signage

Guidance rather than regulation

Aesthetic concerns

Fairness for businesses

Signs on shop side of footpath

Tag	Percent	Count
Pro regulation	62%	32
Ensure unobstructed passage	56%	29
Disability advocacy	27%	14
Anti free standing signage	23%	12
Health and Safety Concerns	21%	11
Signs on road side of footpath	15%	8
Fairness for businesses	12%	6
More enforcement	12%	6
Aesthetic concerns	8%	4
Guidance rather than regulation	6%	3
Signs on shop side of footpath	6%	3
Anti regulation	6%	3

## Featured Contributions

Prioritise the purpose of the public space, which is movement rather than advertising. Prohibit signs on footpaths. Signage and flags are a hazard. Flag noise can be a sensory issue. Footpaths are already crowded, and more obstacles make it difficult not just for people with low vision or wheelchair users, but also for mothers with prams and people using mobility devices. This puts people off coming into town. Streets also look tidier and more appealing without signage on footpaths. A lot taken for granted by seeing, hearing and able-bodied community. This is a humanitarian issue. These signs can be a hazard for all, not just those who are sight impaired. It would be useful to see and understand statistics around how much additional revenue shops make by having a sign on the footpath. Furthermore, work may have been done in cities where these signs have been prohibited to understand what impact this may have had on businesses. Some franchises require a business to have a sign outside on the footpath, such as Specsavers. This could be an issue.

Contribution 13 of 13 | 7 December 2023

- Waka Kotahi's RTS14 – Guidelines for facilities for blind and vision impaired pedestrians should be used as a reference when planning in public places. "The continuous accessible path of travel defines the area where the pedestrian route is safe and convenient for everyone, especially people with impaired mobility, and people who are blind or have low vision." "In retail centres the continuous accessible path of travel is normally located next to the building line, which is likely to be the main orientation cue followed by people who are blind or have low vision. Street furniture such as parking metres and rubbish bins should be located near the kerb."

"Advertising signs on the footpath should be avoided if possible. Where advertising is permitted, signs shall be located away from the continuous accessible path of travel, i.e. on the kerb edge... and always placed consistently in the same location." - Richmond's placement of signs on the road side is in line with RTS14 guidelines whereas Nelson is not. While a consistent approach is appreciated, the preference would be for Nelson to change, not Richmond. With the absence of a curb on Queen street, making the line of passage closer to the road would not be safe. - We would prefer to have no advertising signs on footpaths, as is the case in parts of Auckland, Wellington and Melbourne. Signage can often create clutter and an obstacle which deters people from entering a shop. They are a cost to the business and are unlikely to bring in enough additional revenue to cover their own cost. When people with low vision have approach businesses and asked why they have a sign, they report that often the reason is simply that the neighbouring business does. - For safe and unobstructed passage there should be a 2-metre clear pathway so that canes can identify obstacles easily. - We value the tactile strip on Queen St, Richmond, where everything is placed. - We would like to see a ban on flags. Flags may have small footprint but a huge sign that flaps about, risking hitting passersby in the face. The small footprint means a person using a cane has less chance of making contact and identifying the obstacle. Wellington have banned flags and it would be great to see Richmond follow suit. - In Nelson signs are regularly audited by a member of Blind Citizens NZ. He finds that sign measurements are often compliant, but the bases are bigger than they are supposed to be. - If regulation of advertising signs on footpaths come into the bylaw more enforcement and education for businesses will be needed. Having a permit may enable this. If there aren't permits there will still need to be a way of monitoring. - We appreciate the consistency of the current approach. - Sales tables outside shops and real estate brochure stands are also obstacles.

Contribution 12 of 13 | 7 December 2023

sounds great! please include disability professionals, disabled/complex needs folk, families, and small businesses in this - all will have really great insight.

Contribution 11 of 13 | 2 December 2023

As a disabled person, wheelchair user and disability advocate I have some strong thoughts on this matter. I have lost count how many times I have seen these signs trip people over, get blown onto the road, blown down the footpath, block the walkway. If these signs are going to be used, then the TDC should then have tougher rules and even fines for people who do not follow the rules with these signs. ITS A HEALTH AND SAFETY MATTER. the footpath signs MUST have water / sand bases to stop them being blown on to the road causing car crash and them being blown down the footpath where they can knock bikers off or kids off their scooters, cause harm to wheelchair users and disabled and the elderly. THEY NEED TO NOT BE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PATHWAY!!!!!!!! IN my opinion, there is no need for these signs in Queen Street. as the whole street is pretty much under cover and therefore can have signs up high. Why do they need both? if they are going to be used then there needs to be tougher rules that are enforced!!!

Contribution 10 of 13 | 18 November 2023

I agree that the shop front signs should be of a consistent size and only allowed on a certain part of the path.

Contribution 9 of 13 | 16 November 2023

Sandwich boards are a nuisance, not very useful and clutter our footpaths. Maybe there's a way to prevent this way of "advertising"? Melbourne has in some areas outlawed sandwich boards - maybe Tasman could do the same?

Contribution 8 of 13 | 15 November 2023

NO..NO...NO... NO....NO.. WE WANT WHAT WE ALREADY GOT. NO CHANGES TO ANYTHING, ANYWHERE, ANYTIME.. LEAVE OUR TOWN ALONE..

Contribution 7 of 13 | 14 November 2023

So long as they are not blocking disabled access just keep out of it. Regulations and controls like you are proposing just stifle the life and creativity in a city.

Contribution 6 of 13 | 14 November 2023

I think people need to advertise their businesses

Contribution 5 of 13 | 14 November 2023

A spot for flags or those portable sign boards out of the way for walkers seems reasonable. They shouldn't be allowed to plop them in the middle or too close to the "walkzone".

Contribution 4 of 13 | 13 November 2023

Advertising on footpaths is essential for local businesses. Simple rules around size and placement are fine and should be based on common sense.

Contribution 3 of 13 | 13 November 2023

While I have rarely had a significant problem with these signs, I can see how they could be a hazard, especially to low vision, but also they sometimes form a chokepoint for foot traffic. I would not like to see a blanket ban, but obviously they cannot be unregulated (eg position, size, height range).

Contribution 2 of 13 | 13 November 2023

It is so hard for businesses to survive I think they should be able to have a small sign outside on the footpath as close to the road as possible leaving the wider footpath for others they should not be charged for this. I find it easier to find a shop this way

Contribution 1 of 13 | 13 November 2023