

# KCDC Speed Management Plan – 2023 to 2033

(9-08-2023)

---

**Submission Summary**  
**Do you agree with the Speed**  
**Management Plan?**  
**(Attachment 4)**

**Page left intentionally blank.**

## INTRODUCTION

### Part A: Do you agree with our proposed Speed Management Plan?

Stakeholders were requested to respond to the above question which resulted in the following:

- Yes 61
- No 136
- In part 20
- Not answered 9

**Total 226**

A sample of the comments submitted by stakeholders follow as outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1: Speed Management Plan – Agree (Yes/ No/ In part)**

Respondent	Do you agree with our proposed Speed Management Plan?	Comments
1	Yes	Yes
2	No	No. I am concerned that in all cases, there is an assumption that ALL speed limits under consideration are for reductions. For example, we now have a four-lane highway from Ōtaki through to Wellington where the limit is only 100 kmh. Consideration needs to be given to increase this to 110 or 120 km/h, so that the sensible reductions in town will be balanced for the safer highways. I do understand that the remit of the highways is with Waka Kotahi, but this definitely needs joined up thinking. I would also suggest some consideration is given to global comparisons of speed limits. I know that conditions in New Zealand, and in this case across the Kāpiti Coast in particular, may be different but it is useful to understand context in which we are operating and benchmarking.
3	-	
4	No	No! Part A should include Otaki beach
5	No	No
6	In part	To some - limited - extent
7	No	No, Waka Kotahi do not have realistic views on safety, they plan to reduce limits rather than address the real issue of making the road layout safer like all western countries and Europe
8	Yes	Yes
9	No	No, it needs to go further

10	No	This proposed speed management plan does not go far enough fast enough to address road safety issues and create a safer environment where more people feel safe and comfortable to walk and bike for shorter trips to reduce emissions from transport.
11	-	
12	No	No, because you are just making children and parents less responsible for their safety
13	-	I feel speed humps are better than speed signs. Not everyone takes note of speed signs. Please also include Early childhood centres in this proposal. I live opposite Grafton Kindergarten and quite often see parents with young children running across the road. Speed cameras after hours would also be effective.
14	In part	In general.
15	Yes	Yes
16	No	No, it's not what Kapiti needs
17	Yes	Yes
18	Yes	Yep - schools, town centres and marae are critical areas for safety.
19	No	No. This is a solution looking for a problem to solve. There is no need for any speed reduction anywhere. Even speeds around schools are already covered adequately by the road code.
20	No	No
21	No	No
22	No	No, I am sick of the speed limits getting lower and lower. Soon it will be quicker to get out and walk. It's so frustrating on roads like old SH1 between Raumati rd and Ihakara St there's no reason to be 50kmh. There's nothing on one side of the road and a handful of houses on the other. Where's the logic in 50?
23	No	No
24	No	<p>No! Absolutely not.</p> <p>Why would Mazengarb go to 40km???!! You are making it so hard to travel around Paraparaumu and now lowering the speed, so it takes even longer? This is so frustrating to read, you are making it so hard for residents to live here.</p> <p>We need more accessible streets to stop these traffic jams, please invest into this and stop lowering the speed, this is madness</p> <p>Stop this nonsense!!!</p> <p>We live two blocks away from a school and there is no need for our street to be 30km.</p>
25	Yes	Yes
26	In part	No in parts
27	No	No, too inclusive...no problems around schools but rest is overkill.
28	No	No

29	In part	Some parts of it
30	In part	I agree with the changes to 30km/h in school zones on a variable basis, but only agree partly to some of the permanent changes proposed.
31	No	No, you are kidding
32	No	No, I think it is overbearing and will impede traffic flow and business in the area
33	No	No
34	Yes	Overall, yes but feel it needs more at some areas
35	Yes	Yes
36	No	No
37	No	No- it's too widespread to include all the back roads around Paraparaumu
38	No	No, why are we spending money on schemes like this. Put a zebra crossing outside Paraparaumu College first and spend money on that.
39	No	No. For sure lower speed limits around schools absolutely but absolute not down Kapiti Road. You have already completely screwed the traffic flow around Kapiti with the main road "improvements" & there's now backed up traffic where there was no backed up traffic before don't lower speed limits & further hinder movement around the area.
40	No	I think the speed limits in general are too low and will cause traffic jams and driver frustration. I agree that speed limits around schools are too high. In Victoria, Australia, speed limits drop to 40km/h in the morning and afternoon when students are arriving and leaving school. Roads like Kapiti Rd are already congested and has multiple traffic lights so the speed limit is already 30-40km/h by default. Quiet suburban roads can be safely driven through at 50 km/h.
41	No	No, the speed limits are safe as is.
42	No	No
43	No	Absolutely not! The speed reductions will only continue to add to the existing problem of traffic congestion on the Kapiti Coast. 30km/h should be reserved for schools during pickup and drop-off times. Town Centres and neighbourhoods should remain 50km/h. Corridors should NOT be restricted to 7km/h.
44	Yes	Yes
45	Yes	Yes
46	No	No - Only around schools and childcare facilities.
47	In part	I agree that the plan has some very good proposals but there are some urgent issues that need to be addressed whether it be as part of that plan or extra to it.
48	No	No
49	No	No, Although I have no issue with changes around schools.
50	No	No
51	No	No, it's crazy
52	No	NO
53	No	No
54	No	Absolutely 100% not at all

55	No	No
56	No	No not at all, I fail to see how any of this helps with congestion and emissions let alone safely. I believe all this will do is cause frustration and increase the likelihood of accidents and poor driving behaviour. It is no great secret that there seems to be an agenda targeting motorists and this sort of thing simply adds fuel to the fire.
57	No	No, the traffic flow is already stuffed, stop trying to fix what isn't broken
58	No	NO I want 30kph within 500m around schools just as the law is now I want all other speed limits kept as they are in the Law now I do NOT want the speed limits changed
59	No	No, I do not
60	No	No, I don't.
61	No	Absolutely not, 30km for roads not near schools is absolutely ridiculous. It will achieve nothing, only more frustrated drivers.
62	No	No
63	No	No - there have been several reductions and changes which is negatively impacting the flow of traffic around Kapiti, especially around Paraparaumu and Waikanae. Changes need to improve the flow and speed management is not the answer.
64	No	NO, I think reducing the number of roads shown on your map in orange to 30 km is overkill and will make travel times and frustration levels too high.
65	Yes	Yes
66	Yes	Yes. Slower speeds = safer roads and fewer fatalities and injuries
67	No	No
68	No	No
69	No	No. Reduced speeds around schools may be appropriate, but only during school hours, and possibly in shopping areas such as Paraparaumu, Raumati and Waikanae. No other speed restrictions should be applied as it will create more problems than it will address.
70	In part	Broadly I agree, but in detail I have significant reservations. Te Moana Rd for example does not need a speed change. the schools do not need blanket X distance zones, but rather targeted zones.

71	No	<p>The plan is very vague and does not mention what he implication is for the district. Cars have improved of the years, I think you need to target the people not the cars and of course keep the roads safe no potholes.</p> <p>I think the extra money needs to go into the upgrade of the roads in the hard hit cyclone area's. Of course during schooltime the speed restriction needs to be adhere to. And it is logical to have a lower speed for Cul-Du-Sac streets but not for roads like Mazengarb road (which was 80km before), Kapiti road (= red light district), old SH1 etc. It looks more about control and getting to be able to fine more tickets.</p> <p>If KCDC would really want to be safe, get to the people and educate them to use their lights in the night and bad weather. Regularly check their engine, wipers etc. Get also the kids to learn how to bike/ride/walk in traffic. It is not only the cars it is everyone who is using the roads during peak time and how to address each other. Making the speed lower will just increase frustration. Possibly introduce for the car lovers one night at month the option to speed at the e.g., the airstrip or any other area. Plus, check more on the roads during night time. More teenagers will do that if there is nothing else to do for them!</p>
72	No	No
73	Yes	Yes
74	No	No
75	No	No.
76	Yes	Yes
77	No	No
78	No	Not at all.
79	Yes	In principle.
80	No	No, I find the whole exercise unnecessary. There doesn't appear to be any evidence that people simply driving the current speed limits are causing accidents. There are always other factors involved such as alcohol, phone distractions etc.
81	Yes	Yes, there are too many drivers who regularly speed and have very little regard for other road users within the Kapiti region. Lowering the speed limit particularly around school areas is important to prevent injuries and accidents.
82	-	Where do I find the pan for Reikorangi or is this still the forgotten valley?
83	No	No
84	Yes	Mostly yes
85	No	No
86	No	No, It's pretty much a large load of misrepresentation
87	Yes	Yes
88	Yes	Yes. Reducing speed in urban and residential areas saves lives, reduces noise, pollution and fuel emissions.
89	No	No

90	No	No - the current road speeds are safe and adequate. The council has recently spent a lot of rate payer \$\$ on traffic lights and crossings there is no requirement for speed restrictions. Not to mention there are not enough police in the district to police the restrictions so they wouldn't be policed or adhered to. Waste of rate payer money.
91	No	No. I agree with reducing speed around schools, however I believe the issue in other areas is speeding, not the underlying speed limit. More resource should go towards addressing the speeding!
92	No	No not at all, there certainly is not no evidence to show there needs to be a change, schools are well catered for and there are enough traffic lights down Kapiti Road to confuse people, adding to that you have now got a back log of traffic in Coastlands car park at 5 pm god knows what will happen when you have the next set of lights operating for pedestrians from the station. The slower you go the more accidents there will be, frustration sets in and people will start taking risks. Ban people using cell phones would be a good start not lowering the speed limit.
93	No	No
94	In part	Mostly
95	No	No absolutely not
96	No	No. I believe our roads are safe and we have suitable school zones set up, so drivers slow down.
97	No	No, option C at best buy slowing down traffic any more than the ridiculously slow old Kapiti drivers is ridiculous.
98	No	No
99	No	no
100	No	No
101	No	Not at all
102	No	No
103	No	No, I strongly object and I am not convinced of the need or of the rationale provided. The resulting plan amounts to micromanagement of all drivers who will have to cope with many speed transitions, doesn't target high-risk drivers who pay no attention to speed restrictions, and will diminish the quality of life due to increased journey times, increased visual pollution due to all the necessary signage, and speed compliance anxiety.
104	No	No. I already avoid the 30km speed limited roads if at all possible. I also avoid Rimu Road by the library as it is so congested from the traffic lights.
105	In part	Not entirely. I agree with reduced speed limits around schools but only at peak times when there are children and parents around at the beginning or end of school or when there are special events on. You want road users to buy into and respect the speed limits rather than be annoyed by them when they can't see the need for them. For example, a permanent 30 kmph limit at Te Ra School doesn't make sense and drivers will ignore it when there is no-one around.



106	-	
107	No	No
108	No	No
109	No	Overall NO. Some ideas are good, but blanket speed reductions based on no specific evidence of local risk factors is wrong.
110	No	No
111	Yes	<p>Yes, in principle. However I am a concerned resident of Walton Rd Paraparaumu Beach and don't believe that appreciate consideration has been made to connecting thoroughfares like my street.</p> <p>High acceleration is a persistent problem on a primary route between 3 high usage schools.</p> <p>The area is also primarily domiciled by young families and traffic management needs to be considered outside of school drop-off and pickup times.</p> <p>Particularly due to the corridor to sports fields, shopping centres and beach access</p>
112	Yes	Yes and no. It's hard to agree or disagree as page 25-26 have FOUR options. I agree with Option 3. Whatever is implement, it will become increasing difficult for drivers to comply with speed limits if they change from street to street, day to day (school days vs. weekends) and month to month (school terms vs. holidays). It needs to be consistent throughout, so drivers spend more time focused on driving, rather than figuring out what the speed limit of a particular street is as a particular time on a particular day.
113	Yes	Yes
114	Yes	Yes
115	No	No
116	No	No
117	Yes	Yes - Option 4: Reduce speed on all roads
118	No	No
119	No	No
120	Yes	Yes, but it probably doesn't go far enough for Paekakariki - especially around the school
121	No	No all you seem to want to do is slow everything down It already takes too long to get around due to the lack of direct roads
122	Yes	Agree with the prioritisation of high traffic areas such as schools for lower speed limits.
123	No	No not all of it
124	No	No

125	Yes	<p>In general, I agree with the need to look at speed limits across our urban areas and have a plan to address unsafe areas.</p> <p>I live in Paekākāriki, and with a small village, footpaths largely only on one side of the streets, and lots of children, holiday makers, increase in local and out of town cyclists, and animals around I feel in general speed management plan in general does need to be addressed. The recent change of lowering the speed limit in the core main village street has been very good, and largely agree that speed limits across the village should also be addressed.</p> <p>I do however think the plan does not offer options as such, more the one option to address speed management is lowering the overall speed. However, there are various way to address traffic flow and speeds.</p> <p>And as we know from experience in Paekākāriki some people are always going to speed regardless of the "limit", especially around our schools and popular areas. In regard to the school area, and other popular pedestrian areas in the village, by the beach, sports fields, I would like to see a separate plan to put in other safety measures. I would say the estimate speed of cars around the school during school hours etc. is already 30km, and the surrounding streets are so narrow that often cars would be going less than that already, so is not really any change, would question is it addressing the actual issue and making it safer for the children.</p>
126	No	No - ridiculous
127	No	No
128	Yes	Yes
129	No	<p>I think the lower speeds around the schools are a good idea. I think they need to be time orientated, between 7.30am - 5.00pm and only on school days - not weekends or school holidays. This is the case in many other countries I have visited. I think 2KM around the high schools should again be only time orientated on school days, not all the time. I do not think the option 4 of cutting speeds down on all roads is a good idea at all. It is difficult enough to get around Kapiti. So, I do not support it at all. I do not think we have a high accident rate to warrant that response. I think the creation of some dedicated crossings and pedestrian refuges are a good idea, I like the 2 suggested in Paraparaumu.</p>
130	-	
131	Yes	Yes, these seem like excellent plans. Slowing down the traffic calms things down, creates safer more people-friendly spaces, and helps reduce carbon dioxide emissions. Win, win, win!
132	Yes	Largely yes, but I would like to see implementation faster. Also, there needs to be a clear cycling/walking path plan to separate paths from the road so that people can feel safe using those modes of transport.
133	No	No

134	No	No
135	No	No, I don't
136	In part	Yes, as far as schools and shopping areas are concerned but think that a 70k limit on all road corridors (not sure what that means) is too restrictive.
137	No	I think reducing speed across the board is the wrong approach. It should be targeted to problem areas and supplemented by safe road design.
138	No	<p>No. The plan is misdirected insofar as it will:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Slow down commerce e.g. goods delivery</li> <li>b) Slow down council services, rubbish collection</li> <li>c) Slow down transport, i.e buses, taxis, private vehicles, plumbers, electricians etc</li> <li>d) Discourage tourism including day trippers from Wellington to Palmerston North and beyond</li> <li>e) Discourage immigration into the area and encourage emigration from the area</li> </ul> <p>As is obvious, each of a - e will create substantial increases in delivery costs, shop prices, council services provision, rates, business failures, falls in property values</p> <p>It should be appreciated that people have traditionally respected the law. A massive factor in that is that, by and large, laws have been reasonable, rational, and sensible. Respect has to be earned and anybody that introduces laws that are clearly unreasonable, irrational and nonsensical should have no expectation that such laws will be respected by that body's employers/financiers, in this case, Kapiti's ratepayers. I feel sure that any person that actually reads and considers this submission (and I have no confidence that this will occur), will be conscious that NZTA roadworks' cones/speed reductions has changed so that cones appear much earlier than necessary, much further in advance of the works occurring and remain too long after the work has been completed. It is common to encounter cones and limited speed requirements and reach to proper speed resumption sign with no roadworks being evident. As a consequence, and certainly in my observation, drivers are largely ignoring cones and speed limit signs until actual activity/loose metal/whatever is physically seen. In other words, they simply do what is common sense. NOBODY EVER RESPECTED STUPIDITY.</p> <p>Am I saying that I believe that speed reductions will be generally ignored and potentially cause accidents because of impatience? That is an unequivocal YES!</p> <p>Incidentally, introducing speed reductions around maraes and not other assembly places, i.e., Churches and the like, will clearly be racist and I doubt that any racist law would ever be enforceable in this day and age</p>
139	Yes	Yes

140	Yes	Totally!
141	No	No
142	Yes	Yes
143	Yes	Yes, anything to lower speeds around our roads is a good thing
144	No	Not at all! It's an absolute joke of an idea
145	No	No. 30kmh is too slow for many of the roads selected
146	No	No, it's a false focus by NZTA who cannot achieve Road to Zero and they admit it. NZ Police falsely note all unclear accidents as being speed related as that is their default meaning skewed data is being used and relied on
147	No	Not really
148	Yes	Yes. 30km/h speed limits around our local schools.
149	No	No
150	No	No. I have seen a combination of five different speeds proposed in the area. From 20km to 60im and this does not include roads such as expressway at 100km and old highway at 80km that still go through this area. More consistency in the speeds will help embed the change in speeds in resident's minds. I would like to see more pedestrian crossings in high school foot traffic areas such as Raumati Rd and poplar Ave.
151	Yes	Yes, although I think it needs a few additional places
152	Yes	Yes, I do. It will be much safer for all members of the community.
153	No	No
154	No	No
155	No	No not at all, dropping to 30 k's is far too small in long wide roads like Milne Drive
156	No	No
157	Yes	In general, Kenakena School supports the proposed changes to the speed management plan.
158	Yes	yes, except I think the Te Horo Road corridor should be extended to Pukenu Rd, which has a speed limit of 80kmph while connecting roads either end are 60kmph.
159	Yes	Yes. Raumati area needs to include speed mitigation and control at the corner of Matai Road and Raumati Road
160	No	No
161	Yes	Yes, although I think more areas could be covered by lower speed limits and traffic calming elements should be brought forward.
162	No	No
163	No	No, lowering speed limits will make travel far too slow and people more impatient
164	No	No, 30kmh is far too slow. 50kmh is a relatively safe speed for new and experienced drivers. There is no need for the speed to drop this far. This is outrageous!
165	No	No this is a terrible idea. It is outrageous to lower the speeds this low. I'm sick of already driving at 30 and you guys need to use your energy on something more productive.
166	Yes	Yes, I do. However, any such plan will fail to achieve the desired result if there is little or no monitoring of driver behaviour and adherence to the speed limits.

167	Yes	Yes, in general terms. I am more concerned with a specific area.
168	No	NO
169	In part	Around Schools daycare etc == Yes Proposed wide ranging = No Totally ridiculous
170	In part	Some areas yes, but others no.
171	Yes	Broadly yes
172	In part	In part
173	No	No
174	Yes	Yes
175	Yes	Yes
176	In part	I support the slower speeds around schools, but I'm not entirely convinced it is the whole answer, and I think you're moving too slowly. Part of the issue around schools now is lack of sensible/adequate planning that would have allowed for there to be space/safety for cyclists and people on foot, to handle the volume of cars needing to get in and out of school areas efficiently (lack of area for people to park cars when picking up from schools), and for through traffic (people just wanting to get past schools in peak traffic - which is around pick up/drop off). I am also in favour of more rapid change - our children and young people in particular need more safety now. What is the reason for the slowness of proposed change?
177	No	No, It makes me miss my train every time. I sit in traffic for 20 minutes.
178	No	No, it doesn't help students traveling to school commute easier.
179	No	No
180	yes	yes
181	No	no
182	No	No
183	yes	yes
184	Yes	Yes, as long as it is high risk areas and does not affect everyday movements
185	-	
186	Yes	Yes
187	No	Not entirely, the speed limits will be confusing as traffic moves through different maximum speeds in the same streets
188	No	no
189	-	
190	Yes	yes, in general
191	No	No, it should stay 50kmh
192	No	No. It's ridiculous. Roads, cars, technology, and policing are all at the most advanced and safest in modern history and this absolute cluster of a plan might as well get us back on horses. The changes made in the last 2 years make this district a frustrating place to drive and the moronic plan to drop more limits to 30-40 is just unbelievable. Local roads should be 60 with low-speed zones (40) around schools etc for designated times only.
193	No	No
194	No	No

195	Yes	Yes - it is clearly evident that there are areas where motorists do not take adequate care around schools
196	In part	Parts of it.
197	No	<p>Firstly, the proposals fail to identify the specific problem(s) they are supposed to be addressing. Secondly, they are somewhat vague and nebulous. For example, the term "road corridor" can be applied to any road, anywhere. It is meaningless in this context.</p> <p>When we look forward ahead to beyond 2027, we find a proposal to reduce ALL local roads to "safe and appropriate speed limits" What a nonsense term. Safe is a relative term. Appropriate is a completely subjective term. On what basis, exactly, is a 30kmh limit on Mazengarb road, for example, supposed to be "safe", and how, exactly, has the current 50kmh limit come to be deemed as "unsafe".</p>
198	No	No - While I understand that this is driven by central government legislation, I don't support the concept of reducing speed limits to 30 or 40kph where they are currently 50kph. I accept that around schools' entry "100 or 200 meter" it is reasonable to have lower speed limits but mainly variable based on school hours. Some of the corridor can be reviewed based on increase in housing density.
199	Yes	Mostly. But the 30kph area around schools must be carefully considered as it will slow traffic too much for most of the day, And it can be very slow moving around anyway with all the lights on Kapiti Road and the very slow bit and too many lights through the "town centre". The slow areas through each "village" is essential and should be consistent through each and same traffic controlling features for each, e.g. speed humps.
200	In part	In part.
201	No	Not at all
202	No	No
203	Yes	i agree with the plan
204	Yes	yes, its amazing in my opinion
205	yes	yes
206	Yes	Yes - I believe that streets in Kapiti are too fast and are unsafe for the community
207	No	No, all the speed limits around schools should be variable based on normal operating times - maybe extend these to be a bit earlier or later but fixing speed limits for well out of school hours is just a nuisance to road users.
208	No	No. There is no identified problem that this is trying to fix. Address specific areas of road where death or injury have occurred. Leave the rest alone.
209	In part	Partly.
210	Yes	Yes, we agree with reducing speed around our schools and improving safety.
211	-	I cannot give a "yes" or "no" to this question.
212	In part	Partially yes

213	Yes	Mostly
214	Yes	Yes
215	No	No, I think there are too many restrictions already.
216	No	No
217	In part	Only partially
218	No	No. More to do with Te Moana Road
219	No	No.
220	No	<p>No.</p> <p>I believe the speed management plan is ill-considered and lacks proclivity. It also lacks focus and is light on vision &amp; leadership in this extremely important area. It appears to be driven by overarching NZTA funding parameters by focussing reducing speed limits with limited focus on the management of speed &amp; traffic calming. It certainly does not focus on what is good / needed by the community and ignores many high benefit areas.</p> <p>The plan has completely ignored the area of Te Moana Road between Park Avenue &amp; Old SH1 which has one of, if not the highest concentration of active road users in Waikanae. Council monitoring over the past five years has identified an average of around 7500 each &amp; every day on that section of Te Moana Road, the vast majority (circa 80%) of which exceed the 50kph limit. Incidences of 70,80,90 speeds are common (up to once a minute) and occasionally exceeding 110 kph. Additional noise from this uncontrolled speed is at times well above acceptable levels (two to three times above the 50kph norm) with additional health risks from stress, anxiety, lack of sleep and loss of enjoyment from our gardens.</p> <p>As a residential road, with many pedestrians, children on way to school, early childhood centres, bowls club, retirement villages and the like, the road desperately needs effective speed management &amp; traffic calming measures, as well as normal pedestrian safety facilities ( there are no zebra crossings for example) and a considerably less vehicle - centric mindset than is currently being demonstrated by council officers and has been for many years.</p> <p>The risks of high speed are a constant theme in the Speed Management Plan. Statistics about 70% of injury crashes having speed as a factor, a death risk of 80% at 50kph are noted in the plan and yet completely ignored as regards this section of Te Moana Road where over two million vehicles are exceeding the speed limit each year. These vehicles include significant and regular numbers of large logging trucks, heavy construction vehicles and the like where the risk of death is considerably higher than cars. The road markings in the 420-470 Te Moana Road section are considerably adding to the risk, bringing these heavy vehicles very close to residents mowing berms and considerably enhancing opportunities for</p>



		<p>those who want to go fast.</p> <p>Likewise, Park Avenue has similarly been ignored in this speed management plan with similar safety issues.</p> <p>The benefit areas of Waikanae such as the noted areas of Te Moana Road and Park Road need urgent speed management/traffic calming focus and must be included in the 2024-2027 plan.</p> <p>To continue to exclude would go completely against the main rationale for what council is proposing. That is “Why Does Speed Management Matter”</p> <p>I would be more than happy to speak to Councillors on this submission if provided with that opportunity.</p>
221	No	no
222	No	<p>No.</p> <p>I believe the plan is simplistic and with a primary focus on one simple metric, speed limits, rather than the wider speed management area. No serious consideration appears to have taken in developing the plan of other NZTA metrics including volume of traffic, likelihood of injury in low versus high volume traffic areas. This is most dramatically brought into focus by council indicating that for example Ngapaki Street or Hona Street in Waikanae Beach is more deserving of Speed Management than Park Avenue the section of Te Moana east of Park Avenue to Old SH1. These roads have a high concentration of active road users which better fit the criteria of high benefit areas compared to Ngapaki Street.</p> <p>Additionally, NZTA have identified that the risk of pedestrian injury on roads such as Te Moana Road is significantly higher than that of small local roads such as Ngapaki or Hona. Additional NZTA advises that 75% of pedestrian injuries occur on roads with more than 2900 vehicles per day such as the section of road between 420 and 470 Te Moana Road, a similar length to Ngapaki Street. Daily volumes are intuitively 50 times greater on that section of Te Moana further confirming a significantly higher risk profile. Additionally, many of the traffic calming examples mentioned in the plan for future use appear at odds with current best practice.</p> <p>The plan certainly does not focus on what is good / needed by the community and ignores many high benefit areas.</p> <p>Council monitoring over the past five years has identified an average of around 7500 each &amp; every day on the 420 - 470 section of Te Moana Road, the vast majority (circa 80%) of which exceed the 50kph limit. Incidences of 70,80,90 speeds are common (up to once a minute) and occasionally exceeding 110kph. Additional noise approaching 100 dB from</p>



		<p>this above 50kph speeding is a major health risk</p> <p>As a residential road, with many pedestrians, children on way to school, early childhood centres, bowls club, retirement villages and the like, the road desperately needs effective speed management &amp; traffic calming measures, as well as normal pedestrian safety facilities ( there are no zebra crossings for example) and a considerably less vehicle - centric mindset than is currently being demonstrated by council officers and has been for many years.</p> <p>The risks of high speed are a constant theme in the Speed Management Plan. Statistics about 70% of injury crashes having speed as a factor, a death risk of 80% at 50kph are noted in the plan and yet completely ignored as regards this section of Te Moana Road where over 4000 vehicles passing each house EVERY day are exceeding the speed limit each year. Council officers have noted a high incidence of over 61 kph traffic which has an even higher above 90% death rate. These speeding vehicles include significant and regular numbers of large logging trucks, heavy construction vehicles and the like where the risk of death is considerably higher than cars. The road markings in the 420-470 Te Moana Road section are considerably adding to the risk, bringing these heavy vehicles very close to residents mowing berms and considerably enhancing opportunities for those who want to go fast.</p> <p>The high benefit areas of Waikanae such as the noted areas of Te Moana Road and Park Road need urgent “best practice” speed management/traffic calming focus and must be included in the 2024-2027 plan.</p> <p>To continue to exclude would go completely against the main rationale for what council is proposing. That is “Why Does Speed Management Matter”</p>
223	No	<p>No. The Speed Management Plan has completely ignored one of the highest risk areas in Waikanae, namely the section of Te Moana Road between the intersection of Park Avenue and Old SH1. This area of Te Moana Road is characterised by very high traffic volumes of around 7000 vehicles per day, excessive speeds as identified by council officers and yet had been specifically excluded. Council monitoring over the past 7 years has consistently recorded 75% to 80% of traffic exceeding 51kph with between 700 to 1000 vehicles per day travelling 60kph or above. Speeds of 70, 80, 90 are regularly recorded and occasionally in the range of 100 to 120 kph. It is without doubt a high benefit area with a high concentration of active road users. Council inaction to address multiple safety issues, some of which have been caused (according to advises our group have received from a TM expert) by using other than best practice in road marking design and not providing</p>

		<p>sufficient safe crossing points for pedestrians. Not including Te Moana Road in the Safety Management Plan significantly &amp; further compromises the risk to all on &amp; around Te Moana Road and ignores some of the key metrics on pedestrian safety published by NZTA. These include the fact that 75% of pedestrian accidents occur on roads with daily traffic volumes of above 2900 per day and the additional risk of this excessive speed. The speed management plan identifies the risk of death v impact speed of 70% at 50kph. With over 80% of traffic between 420 and 470 Te Moana Road (and similar to the West) travelling in excess of 50kph the risk to pedestrians, cyclists is above 70% risk of death and approaches 95% of death for the frequent traffic speeds in the 60 to 75 kph level.</p> <p>Te Moana Road contains early childhood centres, a retirement village, a good proportion of elderly, a Bowls club and is frequently used by primary and secondary school students to get to and from school. All these groups are defined as at risk by NZTA with above 65s having a similar risk profile to primary age children.</p> <p>Te Moana Road between Park Road and Old SH 1 must be included in the Speed Management Plan for urgent action between 2024 and 2027 if not sooner. To do otherwise would completely go against the core context of the Speed Management Plan to provide safe and appropriate speeds which is clearly not the case on this section of Te Moana Road currently.</p>
224	Yes	Yes; it will make the roads and footpaths safer for all users in the areas concerned
225	In part	While I support the proposals for variable 30km speed restrictions around schools immediately before and after schools, I do not agree with permanent restrictions, where a school is the driver for the reduction. The use of a school being the incentive to reduce speed limits, should not be used to just implement speed limits reductions across the wider Kapiti road network by stealth. Any speed limit reductions need to be aimed to address an actual issue and be imposed only when applicable. While variable restrictions (immediately before and after school) directly adjacent to schools makes sense, imposing permanent restrictions that is required 4.5% of the time does not (based on 396hrs per year, an hour before and after school for the 198 school days, out of the 8,760hrs in the year). An example is Te Rā Waldorf School and Te Rāwhiti Kindergarten proposal
226	No	No.