

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL  
INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES COMMITTEE  
FOR MEETING OF 20 MARCH 2012**

**REPORT FOR AGENDA ITEM: 3**

**SUBMITTED BY: Andrew Edgar - Asset Management Engineer**

**REPORT DATED: 1 March 2011**

**SPEED LIMIT REVIEW - UPDATE**

**PURPOSE**

To update the Infrastructure Services Committee on the previous speed limit review.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF DECISION**

The decision sought by this report is not significant in terms of the Council's significance policy.

**BACKGROUND**

Proposed amendments to the Speed Limits Bylaw 2009 were approved to go to consultation by full Council at its November 2011 meeting. These amendments affected:

- Arrowtown township
- Old Racecourse Road and Ewing Place
- The Hawea Esplanade Road
- Camphill Road, Hawea, and
- Cardrona Valley Road

Consultation commenced in December 2011. 34 submissions were received. Several submissions noted errors in the consultation process required in the LGA 2002 (an incorrect end date for consultation in some consultation material), and an error in the process used to determine the 40 km/h speed limits for Arrowtown as required by the Rule. The consultation on the proposed speed limit changes was therefore stopped.

This report is being brought to Infrastructure Services Committee in order to obtain direction for the proposals.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Summary of the Arrowtown proposal for the 40km/h speed limit.

**CONSULTATION - INTERESTED OR AFFECTED PERSONS**

As stated above, this report follows a consultation process over proposals for speed limit changes within the district. The results of the consultation are discussed in this report.

## **RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICIES**

The following policy documents have been considered in the preparation of this report:

- The Council's "policy on significance"

## **DISCUSSION**

The process of setting speed limits must follow the requirements of Land Transport Rule: Setting of Speed Limits 2003 (Rule 54001) ("the Rule") including amendments. This includes setting speed limits by bylaw and following the special consultative procedure - and the Local Government Act 2002 ("LGA 2002") There are some other regulations that need to be considered but are not relevant to this discussion.

The errors in the consultation process related to

- The publication of an incorrect date for the closing of submissions – this affected all of the speed limit proposals
- The reference to the posted rather than calculated speed limit for the Arrowtown 40 kph proposal. This affected only the Arrowtown proposal

Although no longer official submissions for the special consultative process, the submissions have been reviewed by Council as feedback on the proposed speed limit changes.

### Arrowtown 40km/h Speed limit

The majority of the submissions were regarding the proposed Arrowtown wide speed limit change to 40km/h. A review of these specific submissions found the majority opposing the speed limit change in Arrowtown, with the view that there was no safety problem, or that the safety problem of pedestrians, particularly children and parents, walking on the roads of Arrowtown could be better solved by the construction of more pedestrian paths.

This feedback from the submissions was in contrast to the previous feedback on speed issues in Arrowtown.

Initially, specific submissions to the 2011/12 Annual Plan process by the Arrowtown School and the Arrowtown Village Association requested a review of speed limits in Arrowtown with the view to reducing them to 40km/h. Follow-up community consultation also indicated a speed limit change could be proposed as a solution to speed issues associated with pedestrians having to walk on roads.

To work, any regulation does require the broad support of the community. The 40km/h speed limit proposal does not appear to have this broad support, and accordingly rather than re-consult and get that same response, it is proposed that at this stage the proposal should not proceed to re-consultation.

It is proposed to continue work on the cycling and walking infrastructure that was already proposed as part of the speed limit proposal. This will be discussed further with the Arrowtown Village Association and the Arrowtown School, who have been instrumental the priorities for footpath and crossing improvements.

### Other changes

The other four changes received far fewer submissions (8 in total). It is proposed that these be re-consulted on as part of the second series of speed limit changes that are being investigated. These are expected to come to the Infrastructure Services Committee for consideration at its meeting on the 1 May 2012.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1. That the Speed Limit Review Update report be received by the Infrastructure Services Committee; and***
- 2. That the proposal for a reduction in speed limit with Arrowtown be discontinued.***

## Attachment 1: Arrowtown Speed Limit Proposal - Summary of Submissions Received

Sub No	Support / Oppose	Key Points
1	Oppose	Change of speed limit wouldn't change behaviour Money would be better spent on new footpaths
2	Oppose	Does not believe a good case has been made for reduction in speeds
3	Oppose	Arrowtown already over-regulated. If speed is a problem, police should enforce current speed limit More evidence needed before this proposal to change the status quo should have gone to consultation
4	Oppose	Supports some extension of the 50kph speed limit on Centennial and McDonnell. Proposed change is not supported by evidence. No good reason to change.
5	Oppose	No good reason to change.
6	Oppose	Proposal is short-sighted and contrary to wishes of majority of community. Council should focus on footpaths and lighting.
7	Oppose	Proposal has procedural errors. Proposal will adversely affect law abiding citizens without affecting pedestrian safety. Focus on footpaths, maintenance.
8	Support	Inner part of Arrowtown would benefit from lower speed limit.
9	Oppose	Does not support reduction in speed limit.
10	Oppose	Supports current 50kph (and 40kph) outside the school.
11	Oppose	Does not support reduction in speed limit.
12	Oppose	Does not support reduction in speed limit.
13	Oppose	Proposal is unjustifiable. Speed is not a problem; proposal is not supported; already too many different speed limits; many of the vehicles speeding are parents of school children.
14	Support	Many parents/ children have to walk on Arrowtown streets.
15	Oppose	Supports some extension of the 50kph speed limit on Centennial and McDonnell. Proposed change is not supported by evidence. No good reason to change. Concerned that AVA has not represented the views of Arrowtown residents on this issue.
16	Oppose	No reason to lower speed limit. Arrowtown should stay with national standard.
17	Support	Arrowtown does have a problem with speeding drivers on narrow streets. Police do not enforce enough.
18	Support	Arrowtown has increasing vehicular / pedestrian traffic. Speed reduction would reduce risk of crossing the road.
19	Support	-
20	Support	Would lead to more appropriate speeds in Arrowtown; improve sense of community; reduce perceive risk to children walking on streets; reduce fuel consumption.
21	Oppose	No speeding problem in Arrowtown. Place is safe to walk.
22	Oppose	Supports current 40kph speed limit outside the school. No reason to change. People drive to the conditions.
23	Oppose	Supports current speed limits. Spend money on footpaths.
24	Oppose	No need for different speed limit that rest of NZ towns. Spend money on footpaths.

25	Oppose	No need for reduced speed limit. Focus on traffic calming at Lake Hayes / Berkshire Streets end of town and more policing of existing speed limits.
26	Oppose	People already drive to conditions. Proposal is overkill – not appropriate to areas of Arrowtown that do have footpaths, Arrowtown does not need to be over-regulated. Not a museum piece. Speed limit change won't affect people's behaviour. Tourist will get entrapped – not expecting lower speed limit.