

Re: Garmin don't want to know about bugs

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.satellite-nav/2006-03/msg00406.html>

- *From:* "peter" <prathman@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 12 Mar 2006 09:58:18 -0800
-

Vartan Narinian wrote:

Quest bug report:

In the Map Setup, you can select the 'Hide Above' size for most things.

However, for the "My Locations" category, if the "Hide Above" setting is set to "AUTO", the "My Locations" are never hidden, even when you zoom out to the maximum level.
(The 'Detail Level' is set to 'Normal')

Thus, the screen is cluttered even at a scale of 200 miles.

Response from Garmin:

Thank you for contacting Garmin Europe Support.

What "auto" means is that it will Automatically display the location at all zoom levels. if you want the location not to be displayed, you have to set the unit to a specified distance, This will then make the waypoint disappear at the zoom level..

If you have any further queries please don't hesitate to contact us again.

Need I say more?

I'd agree that the response is somewhat poorly worded, but this does look like a case where the behavior may well be exactly as intended by the firmware designer. In general, the 'Auto' setting is used when you're willing to let the firmware use its own predetermined rule for an appropriate scale where the specified type of item will show up based on the overall setting of the 'Detail' parameter.

Re: Garmin don't want to know about bugs

But unlike map features like POIs, highways, etc., the firmware has no idea how many 'My Location' items a user may have so it would be hard to devise any fixed rule for an appropriate scale when they should be hidden vs. displayed. In that circumstance I can see a reasonable firmware designer deciding to have them always be displayed unless the user manually sets the scale to a specific value. If the user has many such locations they can always choose to set a lower scale so the map doesn't get too cluttered.

It may not be the choice that you (or I) might have made, but it doesn't strike me as totally unreasonable so I wouldn't categorize it as a bug.

.