

**Submission by**

## **Hamilton City Council**

### **PROPOSED APPROACH TO SPEED MANAGEMENT - LAND TRANSPORT RULE: SETTING OF SPEED LIMITS - DRAFT FOR TARGETED ENGAGEMENT (JULY 2020)**

**30 September 2020**

#### **1.0 KEY SUBMISSION POINTS**

- 1.1 HCC supports the overall intent and direction of the Ministry of Transport's *Proposed Approach to Speed Management - Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits - Draft for Targeted Consultation (July 2020)*.
- 1.2 HCC had already made a lot of progress in the speed management arena and is very supportive of changes so long as they don't adversely impact on our ability to continue with the delivery of our Speed Management Plan.
- 1.3 Key outcomes that HCC wish to see achieved with this new approach are to:
  - Ensure the ability to continue to make speed limit changes in a timely and responsive manner.
  - Minimise costs associated with repetitive consultation.
  - Ensure a consistent approach is taken to speed limit changes nationally and regionally.
  - Enable ownership by the territorial authority RCAs while contributing to a regional approach.
  - Achieve a reduction in deaths and life-changing serious injuries on our roading network.
- 1.4 HCC has very experienced staff who are working in the speed management arena at a local, regional and national level. We would welcome opportunities for further involvement in the development and delivery of the national Speed Management activities which form part of the 'Tackling Unsafe Speeds' Action Plan and being on the Independent Speed Management Committee.

#### **2.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 2.1 Hamilton City Council (HCC) welcomes the opportunity to make a submission to the Ministry of Transport's (MOTs) discussion document ***Proposed Approach to Speed Management - Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits - Draft for Targeted Consultation (July 2020)***.
- 2.2 The Waikato Region has been at the forefront of speed management work over the past 6 years and was chosen as one of three regions to trial the New Zealand Speed Management Guide 2016.
- 2.3 HCC has been very supportive of speed management reform and has been actively progressing this work under the direction of the Waikato Regional Safe Network Programme Working Group.
- 2.4 HCC supports the general direction of the new approach to speed management and the desired outcome to achieve consistency of speed management setting between Road Controlling Authorities

(RCAs) within a region as well as between regions.

- 2.5 We support simplification of the process, the development of Regional Speed Management Plans and the removal of the bylaw requirement. However, HCC would like to see simplification of the processes (especially consultation) and greater alignment with the likes of Regional Land Transport Plan processes for all RCA's, including Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi).
- 2.6 HCC thanks the MOT for seeking early feedback from targeted stakeholders on the proposed new approach to speed management. We encourage the MOT to progress the proposal with haste to enable RCAs and Regional Transport Committees (RTCs) to progress speed management as a priority in cities and regions.
- 2.7 HCC looks forward to seeing the formal Rule when it is consulted on post the October 2020 central government general election.

### 3.0 SPECIFIC SUBMISSION POINTS

- 3.1 HCC's specific submission points are outlined in the table below.

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
<b>Section 2.1 (Page 8)</b> Summary of Overall Approach being Proposed by the MOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In general, HCC supports the proposed approach outlined in the discussion document, which aims for a more coordinated and transparent approach to speed management.</li> <li>HCC supports the approach to align the speed management process with the Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP) process to bring together decisions about infrastructure investment to better support positive speed management outcomes.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.1 (Page 9)</b> Diagram at top of Page 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The diagram at the top of Page 9 needs an arrow linking the State Highway Speed Management Plan (State Highway SMP) developed by Waka Kotahi to Regional Speed Management Plans (Regional SMPs) developed by RTCs to enable consultation to be completed in each region once - in the same way the RLTP development has one consultation process which reflects the programme of the territorial authority RCAs and Waka Kotahi as an RCA.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.1 (Pages 9 &amp;10)</b> Responsibilities of the Parties in the Table	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCC support the responsibilities of parties as set out in the table on Page 9, including the new role of RTCs.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.2 (Pages 10 &amp; 11)</b> What is being Proposed for Speed Management Plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCC generally supports the proposals for developing a Speed Management Plan (SMP) which would set out objectives, policies, and measures for speed management on relevant roads for at least 10 financial years from the start of the plan, but specifically notes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCC supports the 'at least' 10 financial years life of plan for policies etc and the three-year implementation programmes aligning with RLTP planning periods but notes that it is very hard to specify exactly which road will be done in each year recognising the changing landscape that we are working within in a high growth metro city.</li> <li>HCC requests clarification on the use of the reference to 'on relevant roads' and submits that this should change to 'on RCA roading networks' as the process applies to the whole RCA roading network. It is not clear what 'on relevant roads' is trying define.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ HCC supports the SMP, including changes to speed limits, safety camera locations and infrastructure on the relevant roads.</li> <li>● HCC submits that SMPs should also include education, engagement and any consultation required to support speed management proposals. This will enable the RTC to consider the full cycle of speed management planning and the implementation process.</li> <li>● HCC submits that SMPs should also include key principles within the planning framework. The implementation phase of speed management is an important aspect and if a newly developed road fits within the SMP principles and policies it should just be a matter of letting people know rather than having to work through a full consultation process again. However, in larger, safer speed areas, it is submitted that targeted consultation should be undertaken within the community to let them know what is happening at the time of delivery.</li> <li>● The SMP needs to be a simple and concise document that just sets out what is going to happen, when and by whom - it doesn't need to capture the technical workings.</li> <li>● In the bullet points, again reference 'on relevant roads'. On pages 10 and 11 there is a need to reference a map of speed limits of the whole regional network within a territorial authority and also across the whole region.</li> <li>● The last bullet point on page 11 raises the issue of misalignment between a proposed RCA speed limit change and Waka Kotahi's view. HCC suggests the Independent Speed Management Committee (ISMC) role could be widened to assist regional alignment. The ISMC could also be an independent arbiter where there are differences between RCAs and Regions. Waka Kotahi as the regulator could then be used to work through these issues prior to the SMP being released for public consultation.</li> <li>● HCC notes with concern the dual requirements for Waka Kotahi to develop a State Highway SMP and RTCs to develop Regional SMPs i.e. with two separate processes operating (including separate consultation) it will be difficult to align the timing for implementation of speed limit changes between state highways and local roads. The proposed process is not an integrated planning process between state highways and local roads and does not follow a One Network approach being adopted across the sector.</li> <li>● A recent example of Waka Kotahi consulting on state highway speed limit changes in Hamilton City has shown public confusion on the differences between state highways and local roads.</li> <li>● Submissions are being made to Waka Kotahi requesting them to investigate speed limit changes on local roads.</li> <li>● As a fundamental submission point, HCC submits that state highway speed limit changes should be addressed within Regional SMPs such that full integration can occur across the whole roading network. This will ensure that state highways are</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	<p>consulted through the Regional SMPs instead of having a separate State Highway SMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC therefore advocates for one single Regional SMP approach with Waka Kotahi in putting speed limit changes into a Regional SMP. This approach will mirror the existing RLTP approach where Waka Kotahi submits state highway projects for inclusion in one single regional planning process.</li> <li>• HCC believes that under the proposed approach the links between the State Highway SMP and Regional SMPs are tenuous and unclear and this will become an issue when consultation is completed.</li> <li>• If the State Highway SMP is prepared (without direct RTC engagement) and approved at a national level by the ISMC and is then incorporated into a Regional SMP and then subsequently consulted on, then the process becomes disjointed.</li> <li>• The state highway speed limits approved by the ISMC will, in many cases, drive the speed limit changes needed on surrounding roads managed by the territorial authority RCAs. In order to have logical implementation programmes, they need to be closely linked together in the early planning stages and the consultation stages so that the public can understand the full picture of changes and their timings within the region.</li> <li>• If the flow charts in Section 2.2.2 and Section 2.2.1 were done as one GANTT (or similar) chart, it would be possible to see how the two planning processes need to align. At the moment, Waka Kotahi needs to undertake Steps 1 and 2 before RCAs can start developing Regional SMPs. A GANTT (or similar) chart will clearly set out timings and interdependencies, which the current flow chart does not show.</li> <li>• The Speed Management Guide 2016 will need updating as it goes hand in hand with the regulation changes and therefore both need to be developed together. Both this document and the proposed changes to the Speed Limits Rule should be consulted on together so it is easy to understand the relationship between the two documents and the need for RCAs to not only consider schools, but also target the risk in achieving the necessary DSI reductions that are being targeted in Road to Zero.</li> <li>• The RTC supports the removal of the bylaw process but doesn't want the new process to be any longer or more onerous - for either the RCAs or key stakeholders and the public/community.</li> <li>• The Road to Zero Strategy Action Plan 2020-2030 referred to National SMPs rather than State Highway SMPs. It is not clear how the safety camera programme will be included in this process now as the focus seems to be on Waka Kotahi as an RCA and regulator and not as a manager of the Safety Camera programme.</li> <li>• The Road to Zero Strategy Action Plan 2020-2030 referred to also proposed that RCAs must consider safer speed limits in urban centres where there are high numbers of active road users. This is missing in the MOT's proposed approach and HCC submits that</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	<p>this must be referenced as it was a key component of the earlier Tackling Safe Speeds Programme proposals. The issue of speeds around urban shopping centre are interesting aspects of speed management, noting that in urban areas these can be considered areas with high numbers of active road users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC is also concerned that it appears that there is no mandatory requirement for a territorial authority RCA to provide input into a Regional SMP and submits that there should be a mandatory requirement for all RCAs to review their networks and submit proposals into Regional SMPs. This will ensure integrity of the process and also ensure progress is made with a consistent approach applied across a whole region i.e. no omitted areas. Page 19 of the discussion document notes an RCA can opt out of the process by following a bylaw approach and we question why this bylaw option would remain once the new Rule is enacted.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2.1 (Page 12)</b> Regional Speed Management Plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC supports the requirement for Regional SMPs.</li> <li>• HCC seeks clarification on how a RTC ensures consistency across RCA boundaries within its region (or inter-regionally). Does the process require one RCA to make changes to a speed limit to align with the neighbouring RCA?</li> <li>• In the Regional SMP process there is a need for a technical overview between Step 1 and Step 2 to sort out boundary mismatches. The ISMC could be used to assist regions in sorting out technical mismatches or situations where agreement cannot be achieved between the RTCs.</li> <li>• Step 1 talks about RCAs providing input into Regional SMPs. HCC does not envisage RCAs having early engagement with their communities before they put a proposal into a RSMP as the desired outcome should be to simplify the process and reduce costs and time.</li> <li>• Step 3 of the process for preparing a Regional SMP refers to consultation using Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002. However, it is unclear about whether hearings and deliberations should be held. Section 82 states that the principles must be followed but clearer guidance is required on how RTCs would run the full consultation process e.g. Questions arise as to whether hearings and deliberations would be held at a regional level to hear and deliberate on submissions. HCC would like more clarity on this as the overall aim is to simplify the process. It is also expected that there is likely to be an additional step in the process where the RCAs need to consider the results of the consultation and potentially change their plans before being finalised for submission for certification.</li> <li>• Publication of Regional SMPs should be included on Waka Kotahi's website as well as individual RCA and regional websites in same way as RLTPs and LTPs.</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
<p><b>Section 2.2.2 (Page 14)</b> State Highway Speed Management Plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC does not support the State Highway SMPs process outlined in Section 2.2.2.</li> <li>• A two-tiered SMP process would be confusing to the public and as suggested above, state highway speed limits changes should be done through the Regional SMP process to achieve a whole of network consistency.</li> <li>• If State Highway SMPs were to be required, then regions should have a greater and earlier role in identifying speed limit changes on state highways rather than be given the first draft at the start of the state highway SMP process.</li> <li>• If this is run in a similar way as the Waka Kotahi Investment Programme (WKIP) which flows into RLTPs, then speed management on state highways could follow a similar approach into the Regional SMPs. Waka Kotahi would prepare proposals, but there would be engagement through Regional SMPs as the state highway changes would affect local road speed limit changes.</li> <li>• The proposals are unclear on how safety cameras are addressed through State Highway SMPs.</li> <li>• There is also a need to publish State Highway SMPs on regional websites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2.3 (Page 15)</b> Consultation on Plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further to the comments above in regard to having the Speed Management Plan process run in a similar way to RTLP, HCC submit that there is a need to change 'could' to 'should' in first paragraph in relation to consultation of the Regional and Waka Kotahi SMPs together.</li> <li>• There is a need to have greater clarity about the full requirements of the consultation process, including reference to hearings etc (if required), even if it is specified in a Speed Management Guide (SMG) updated document.</li> <li>• It is not clear as to how issues raised through the submission process are negotiated between the RTC and the relevant territorial authority. Some guidance developed in consultation with the LGNZ membership as to how that part of the process will work would provide clarification of the roles of all parties and would also reduce confusion and enable a robust process.</li> <li>• It is important that those involved in the hearings process have a good understanding of the speed management requirements and a diversity of skills and backgrounds on the Hearings Panel is encouraged. The individual RCAs must still have the ability to hear and respond to submissions and to make the decision on speed management for their authority. The role of the RTC is to coordinate and sign off the RSMPs – not to decide case by case changes of speed limits.</li> <li>• Section 2.2.3 should only refer to Treaty obligations if this is not adequately covered by Section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002, noting that Clause 2 in Section 82 specifically refers to consultation with Maori.</li> <li>• The second bullet point in Section 2.2.3 appears to be limiting – discussions with Iwi and Tangata Whenua are often not just</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	<p>about Maori land - the focus is too narrow and limits the scope of consultation with Maori and should be removed.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.2.4 (Page 15)</b> Certification of Plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the certification process outlined in Section 2.2.4, Waka Kotahi (as regulator) will certify Regional SMPs.</li> <li>• HCC supports this process but suggest that where there are points of difference between Waka Kotahi (as the certifier) and RTCs then these should be referred to the ISMC for resolution.</li> <li>• Waka Kotahi should not be required to certify the whole SMP if they disagree on some proposals and instead could give 'qualified' certification if the option of having the NSMC provide an independent moderator role is not progressed.</li> <li>• Under the proposals Waka Kotahi must certify RSMPs even if they have not approved speed limit changes proposed by RCAs (as the regulator). Their recommendations would be provided to the RTC. This may lead to unsafe outcomes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.2.5 (Page 16)</b> Out of Cycle Process for Setting Speed Limits thus Creating extra Workload for Waka Kotahi</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC has some serious concerns with the 'out of cycle' process outlined in Section 2.2.5.</li> <li>• This process could lead/enable some RCAs opting out of the Regional SMP requirements.</li> <li>• With the 'out of cycle' process RCAs could circumvent having to do speed limit changes - they could say their input into a RSMP is zero input, which is a legitimate response.</li> <li>• Problems could occur if RCAs opt to do 'out of cycle' changes and then can go straight to Waka Kotahi for approvals - this is an allowable process but makes a mockery of the Regional SMP process as well as placing an additional burden to Waka Kotahi to process and approve 'out of cycle' applications. The third paragraph in Section 2.4.1 Bylaws also enables this alternative approach to be taken.</li> <li>• High growth metros such as Hamilton City have a large number of new roads added to their networks every year and these should not require the RCA to go through an out of cycle process.</li> <li>• If the roads are in accordance with the principles and policies within the SMP - then they should be processed in the same way as other speed limit changes. The same applies for new schools being established - because these can happen within a 1-2-year period and are often not shared by the MOE early enough to put into a document like the SMP. This approach is already being used successfully within Hamilton City following the adoption of the Hamilton City Speed Management Plan in July 2019. We have developed the plan in conjunction with key stakeholders as set out in the Speed Limits Rule and have found this process to be simple and effective.</li> <li>• HCC suggests that an out of cycle process should only be available to those RCAs who have contributed to a Regional SMP and these 'out of cycle' changes could be done in the same way as a RLTP variation, perhaps with some delegation to Regional Advisory Groups (RAGs).</li> <li>• The speed management variation process could follow a similar process to the RLTP variation process with RAGs having overview</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	and recommendation to RTCs. <b>Only significant changes</b> would come before RTCs.
<b>Section 2.3 (Page 17)</b> Independent Speed Management Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The role of the proposed Independent Speed Management Committee could be expanded to deal with more than just approval of the State Highway SMP and could provide an avenue for providing technical advice on Regional SMPs, including resolving points of difference between RCA's, RTC's and Waka Kotahi.</li> <li>• We note the recent legislation changes have introduced a Director of Land Transport who reports independently to the Waka Kotahi Board - HCC seeks clarification on how this role fits into the speed management process.</li> <li>• We are happy to offer the assistance our highly experienced staff to sit on the ISMC and would seek information on the proposed membership of this Committee to ensure that there is good representation from all parties involved in Speed Management planning and delivery.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.4 (Page 18)</b> Register of Land Transport Records	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC generally supports the Register of Land Transport Records proposals.</li> <li>• HCC has concerns with the proposal for temporary and emergency speed limits coming into the Register in the longer term. This process will include a lot of work for very short-term changes - there are hundreds of them in terms of temporary traffic management sites each year. More thinking is required on how temporary speed limits would come into the register because of the large numbers involved.</li> <li>• As noted previously, we question the ongoing use of a bylaw process (Section 2.4.1) as the whole speed management changes are moving away from this.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 2.5 (Page 20)</b> Mandatory Speed Limits around Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC strongly supports mandatory speed limits around urban and rural schools, noting that we have already installed 40km/h speed limits in place for all schools in the city (via either variable or permanent speed limits).</li> <li>• Section 2.5.1 Urban Schools states 'under certain conditions' that 40km/h speed limits are permitted. We need a better understanding of what these certain conditions are so that we are able to work through the planning needed to potentially progress these our schools to 30km/h. Further guidance is sought on dealing with schools and approaches to schools that are included within permanent 40km/h safer speed areas - in order to make it 30 km/h infrastructure changes are needed which could be expensive and at the expense of limited funding being instead spent on speed management in other areas which would have a higher DSI saving per \$ spent. We need to see the Rule and the Speed Management Guide at the same time.</li> <li>• The Rule also needs to state which roads need to be addressed around schools. For example, only roads with direct access to the school should be addressed. Adjoining roads with no direct access to the school should not be required to have speed limit changes. An example of a worst-case scenario would be Auckland</li> </ul>



SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	<p>Grammar School adjacent to State Highway 1 - under this rule would this 'urban school' require the speed on State Highway 1 motorway to be dropped to 30km or 40 km/h?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an issue on the definition of a rural school. Previously a rural school was defined as not being in 70km speed zone or lower - the new process is saying 'not in a speed limit of 50km/h or lower'.</li> <li>• It is noted that the process says rural schools must have a 60 km/h speed limit - we question what happens if a school is already in a 60 km/h zone - is there no change?</li> <li>• We also question the situation of schools in an urban environment at 60km/h located on a state highway - this school will be designated as a rural school because of the definition - in these situations you may still have large number of people cycling and walking in the area but be required to do nothing because it is a 'rural school'.</li> <li>• As a result, we suggest the definition of a rural school should be aligned to the definition that is being used in the Mega Maps tool and Speed Management Guide to ensure consistency.</li> <li>• As noted previously, the proposals have omitted the focus in the Road to Zero Action Plan on areas with high pedestrian and active modes.</li> <li>• HCC believes that the territorial RCAs need to address immediate areas around school i.e. say 500m each side from school gate to get immediate changes underway and then do longer-term planning for the surrounding area if this needs significant investment. Refer Speed Management Guide on variable speeds. (Traffic Note on variable speeds).</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.1 Summary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3.1 notes that the 2017 Rule established a new speed limit setting mechanism to focus on safe and appropriate speed limits.</li> <li>• HCC submits that it is important that the focus on high risk areas and high benefit areas is not lost in the new process and Rule. It appears that the focus is very much directed at school speed limits, but in order to achieve the DSI savings set out in Road to Zero, an increased focus and funding will also be required on the wider roading network.</li> <li>• Funding the speed limit changes around schools will be challenging and if changes are funded out of the Road to Zero activity class they will potentially end up having to delay projects with a reduction in deaths and serious injuries (DSI) benefiting in favour of spending money on the school speed limit changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.2.1 (Page 22)</b> 70 km/h, 90 km/h and 110 km/h Speed Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC does not support the proposed changes set out in this section and supports the ongoing use of 70 km/h and 90 km/h speed limits being subject to approval from Waka Kotahi.</li> <li>• There is potential to use the ISMG for situations where the regulator says no to say a 70 or 90km/h proposal, but the RCA believes that they have a strong case for use of the limit as part of a transitional plan.</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK																		
<p><b>Section 3.2.2 (Page 23)</b> Variable Speed Limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCC support the proposal to allow RCAs to set variable speed limits without approval from Waka Kotahi as long as there is good guidance developed e.g. Traffic Note around variable speeds. There is a need to ensure consistency on how variable speed limits are applied and managed both regionally and nationally.</li> </ul>																		
<p><b>Section 3.2.3 (Page 24)</b> Mean Operating Speed 19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HCC does not support the proposal to remove the requirement to achieve a mean operating speed limit less than 10 percent above the speed limit.</li> <li>HCC notes that removing this requirement will 'make life easier' for RCAs, but ethically the existing system helps achieve a safe and appropriate operating speed and a self-explaining environment.</li> <li>By removing this requirement there is real potential for an increase in deaths and serious injuries - as an example a driver may pull out of an intersection expecting the traffic to be operating at a certain speed (close to the posted speed limit) but the actual operating speed may be very different.</li> <li>The <b><i>Setting of Speed Limits 2003: Rule 54001 - Schedule 1 Setting of Speed Limits</i></b> stated the following: <p><b>3.4 Operating speeds</b></p> <p>The mean speed and the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed on a road should not be significantly greater than the speeds specified in <i>Table SLNZ3</i>. On medium- to high-volume roads the standard deviation becomes important, as a road with a narrow distribution of speeds is less hazardous than one with a wide distribution. If operating speeds exceed the values specified in the table, it is likely that additional measures such as engineering, enforcement, education and publicity will be necessary to reduce speeds.</p> <p><b>Table SLNZ3 Mean and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile operating speeds</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="778 1373 1334 1610"> <thead> <tr> <th>Speed limit</th> <th>Mean speed (km/h)</th> <th>85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed (km/h)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>50 km/h</td> <td>50</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60 km/h</td> <td>60</td> <td>70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>70 km/h</td> <td>70</td> <td>80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>80 km/h</td> <td>80</td> <td>90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100 km/h</td> <td>100</td> <td>110</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Therefore, the requirements in the 2017 Speed Limits Rule were already an easing of the requirements previously in place.</p> </li> </ul>	Speed limit	Mean speed (km/h)	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed (km/h)	50 km/h	50	60	60 km/h	60	70	70 km/h	70	80	80 km/h	80	90	100 km/h	100	110
Speed limit	Mean speed (km/h)	85 <sup>th</sup> percentile speed (km/h)																	
50 km/h	50	60																	
60 km/h	60	70																	
70 km/h	70	80																	
80 km/h	80	90																	
100 km/h	100	110																	

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC submits that this regulatory requirement is still best practice and without it, the achievement of self-explaining roads and the desired reduction in DSIs as set out in Road to Zero will not be possible.</li> <li>• If a compromise is really needed, perhaps consideration for a 5km/h tolerance could be given for a speed limit of 50km/h and below, and then apply the 10 percent to speed limits greater than 50km/h.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.2.4 (Page 24)</b> Urban Traffic Areas 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC supports the proposal to replace 'urban traffic areas' with 'speed limit areas' to give RCAs more flexibility.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.2.5</b> Waka Kotahi's Role as Regulator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC notes the proposed changes to Waka Kotahi's role as regulator.</li> <li>• HCC believes that there needs to be some distinction between the Waka Kotahi functions i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The regulator role;</li> <li>○ Its role as technical advisor; and</li> <li>○ As owner of the State Highway SMP (RCA).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The role of Waka Kotahi as regulator is muddled - it is hard for Waka Kotahi as regulator to also provide guidance to RCAs on speed management. It would be best for the regulatory role of Waka Kotahi to be separate from the other technical advisory services as has been established recently via the role of 'Director for Land Transport'.</li> <li>• HCC notes that RCAs sometimes get frustrated with Waka Kotahi pushback on proposals and see it somewhat as a handbrake. Providing clarity in the various roles undertaken by Waka Kotahi and widening the proposed role of the ISMC would provide an ability to reduce these tensions but also enable a consistent approach to be taken nationally.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.3.3 (Page 26)</b> Default Speed Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC note the proposal to retain 100 km/h as the default speed limit in rural areas and note that the Waikato RTC has previously advocated for 80 or 90km/hr to become the default on rural roads in the Waikato.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.3.2 (Page 26)</b> Temporary and Emergency Speed Limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We note that the process for setting temporary and emergency speed limits would be the same as the process under the 2017 Rule. These do not have to be included in a SMP and would not be entered into the register.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.3.3 (Page 26)</b> Signs and Road Markings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC notes that all signs and road marking requirements would remain the same as in the 2017 Rule.</li> <li>• This is supported, but we note that the increased priority of speed limit setting around schools may need further work on signs and markings.</li> </ul>
<b>Section 3.3.4 (Page 26)</b> Speed Limits in Designated Locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC supports the proposal for RCAs (other than territorial authorities and Waka Kotahi) to be able to set a speed limit for roads in designated locations such as car parks, airports or beaches. We assume this applies mainly to DOC.</li> <li>• HCC would support these RCAs being allowed to operate under a bylaw regime - but would not support this option being available for territorial authority RCAs.</li> </ul>

SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER	HCC'S FEEDBACK
<p><b>Section 4.2 (Page 28)</b> Transitional Speed Management Plans</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HCC notes that the timeframe for the new Rule does not allow enough time to prepare SMPs in the 2021 RLTP and NLTP cycle.</li> <li>• HCC also notes that the proposals state that in 2021 and 2022 RCAs and RTCs would work with Waka Kotahi to prepare transitional Speed Management Plans (we assume that this would cover SH SMPs and RSMPs?). The alternative is that in this period RCAs could consult on and set speed limits - this dual process could cause confusion.</li> <li>• From 2023 the new SMP framework will be in place and RCAs would be required to prepare, consult on and finalise SMPs alongside GPS 2024 and RLTP 2024 processes.</li> <li>• HCC seeks further clarity on what the transition would be as the process is unclear.</li> <li>• HCC supports early implementation of the proposal, but more detailed guidance is required in this respect to ensure that those territorial authority RCAs who are already making good progress (e.g. Hamilton City) in the speed management space are not hindered in any way.</li> </ul>

#### 4.0 FURTHER INFORMATION AND OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS SUBMISSION

- 4.1 Should the Ministry of Transport require clarification of Hamilton City Council's submission, or additional information, please contact Robyn Denton (Network Operations and Use Team Leader, City Transportation) on 07 838 6910 or 021 971 127, email [robyn.denton@hcc.govt.nz](mailto:robyn.denton@hcc.govt.nz) in the first instance.
- 4.2 Hamilton City Council would welcome the opportunity to meet with representatives of the Ministry of Transport to discuss the content of this submission in more detail.

Yours faithfully



**Lance Vervoort**  
**ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE**