Supplementary submission on the *Local Government (Auckland Law Reform) Bill* To the Auckland Governance Legislation Committee

Name: SavePapakura.com

## **Election signs**

In our original submission we briefly discussed election sign provisions in Schedule 3 of the Bill.

Since then we have re-read the provisions and offer the following suggestions. The first issue on public sites was included in our oral submission hearing.

## Public sites required for election signs



## Appropriate permission required for election signs on private property



We agree that permission should be required for election signs on private property.

However, this Bill inappropriately identifies that permission must be obtained from the **landowner**, which disregards private property rights. The drafters of this Bill seem to assume that private property is only ever occupied by the landowner. For compliance with tenancy laws (and efficiency), consent should be obtained from the appropriate holder of the private property rights.

We suggest the Bill's provisions are reworded that consent must be obtained from the private property **occupier** (which includes tenants, lessee or owner-occupier). Where the land is not occupied, then permission should be obtained from the holder(s) of the private property use rights.

It is also the occupier (or those appropriately responsible for the land's management) that will solely need to grant permission to access the land — for sign erection, maintenance and removal. After all it will be the occupier that is inconvenienced by the signage, the enquiries from candidates for permission to locate a sign if they happen to be on a good vantage point, feel responsible for contacting the candidates should the sign be damaged or fall down, rectify any damage to lawns, garden beds etc and receive the comments (positive or negative about the sign).

Page 3 of 3

In the case of rental properties or leased land it is not the landowner that has their peace and quiet disturbed by the signage and candidate enquiries but the occupier and as such the Bill should be amended to recognise this.