

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991
(RMA)

AND

IN THE MATTER of an application by New Zealand
Fruitgrowers' Charitable Trust to the
Wellington City Council for a resource
consent to reinstate a sign on the building
located at 2 Jervois Quay, Wellington (**the
Application**)

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF FRANCIS COSTELLO
ON BEHALF OF NEW ZEALAND FRUITGROWERS' CHARITABLE TRUST**

(Commercial Director - Go Media Ltd)

7 December 2022

1. SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

1.1 This statement is in response to the evidence supplied by the submitters from Boffa Miskell and The Intercontinental Hotel.

2. Evidence of Jos Coolen, on behalf of Boffa Miskell

2.1 The commentary and timelapse and video footage needs to be treated with caution, as it does not accurately represent the lighting of a digital billboard. The use of any form of camera at night will falsely represent and exaggerate the brightness.

2.2 Mr Coolen refers to brightness on a number of instances without any context. I consider Mr Kern's evidence provides a robust assessment of matters relating to lighting. In my experience, brightness of a digital sign is better controlled than that of a static sign or even the wall itself.

2.3 In 6.11 Mr Coolen comments on the depth of the billboard. It is possible to build the face to be as thin as 90mm.

2.4 In terms of Mr Coolen's paragraph 7.5 and the linked video, I refer to my comments above about the issues with relying on any form of camera to represent actual appearance of a sign. In my view, the video of another location does not assist in assessing the appearance of the proposed sign. A real world onsite assessment is required. Even though much of the other signage and lighting in the area is brighter than the billboard, the size of the billboard will focus the camera and misrepresent the images.

3. Evidence of Scott Hamilton, on behalf of Intercontinental Hotel

3.1 In paragraph 1.3, Mr Hamilton states he considers that the billboard will have significant effects. In my experience, the presence of digital signs is a normal part of the CBD environment. I concur with Mr Kern's evidence about the lighting effects of the sign. Based on my experience with digital signs, the sign will not light up the hotel or the suites adjacent to it.

3.2 The writer seeks to draw a comparison between this application and a sign at 21 Bealey Ave, Christchurch. Both Mr Kern and I were involved with this particular case so are aware of the details, and I would caution against reliance on the news article for an understanding of the facts of that situation. For example, Mr Kern and I conducted lighting tests in the relevant motel rooms and found that there was no effect on the unit identified. The findings were that the tv and onsite signage had a more significant effect on the light in the room than the sign did.

3.3 Pages 24-30 feature photos of a number of other Wellington sites. I would caution against relying on these photos for the same reasons as I outlined earlier.

3.4 On page 30 the billboard at 70 Featherston St opposite the Rydges is featured, with comments about the limited views. However, the site faces directly toward the hotel at around 20m away and features in the main views on up to 5 floors. I note that NZFCT is proposing a much lower night time brightness than is used by the operator of the Featherston St sign.

Francis (Frank) John Costello

7 December 2022