

Have Your Say | Kāpiti Coast

CLOSED: Share your feedback on our draft Speed Management Plan 2026-36 (Waikanae to Ōtaki) Results

Aug 03, 2026 - Sep 16, 2026

Project: A new Speed Management Plan for Kāpiti 2026-36

Form: CLOSED: Share your feedback on our draft Speed Management Plan 2026-36 (Waikanae to Ōtaki)

Tool Type: Form

Activity ID: 308

Exported: 2026-10-01 16:57:02

Filtering by 'Select a suburb where you'd like to give feedback':

All Of The Following Must Be True

* Select a suburb where you'd like to give feedback Contains 'Peka Peka'

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

I think the recommendations are very logical and sensible especially with the growth and general increase in traffic moving faster.

Additional recommendation for the future. With the increase in size of Summerset Waikanae, Ferndale Drive is not a 50km/h capable road, and it should be reduced to 40km/h. Future traffic calming measures should also be investigated. Also, current traffic travels too fast past the cemetery on Ngarara Road above the 50km/h speed limit. Calming measures should be considered. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

80-84

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Waikanae

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

I do not support changing the speed limit at Peka Peka. The proposal should be withdrawn unless Council can demonstrate a specific, documented safety problem supported by crash data, measured vehicle speeds, road-user volumes and a transparent cost-benefit assessment. A general policy objective should not be sufficient justification for changing the limit on a rural road that does not have continuous pedestrian activity, shops, pedestrian crossings or a comparable town-centre environment.

Council should not waste public money designing, consulting on or implementing traffic-calming measures that are not evidence-based. Please stop wasting money designing and implementing things that are not needed. Public funds should be directed to locations with a demonstrated record of deaths, serious injuries or genuine conflicts between vehicles and vulnerable road users. Please do not do work that is not needed and cannot demonstrate a clear, measurable and proportionate safety benefit.

The lack of a direct interchange on the Expressway at Peka Peka and Te Horo is also an important consideration here. There is no northbound offramp or southbound onramp serving these communities. Consequently, residents and local businesses already face additional travel distances and delays when accessing the expressway. Further speed reductions would increase those disadvantages by making the local route slower without providing residents with a more convenient expressway connection.

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

There was no feedback radio button to feedback on Te Horo Beach speed limit changes and speed humps that I could find. My feedback is as follows:

I support practical, evidence-based safety improvements around schools, town centres, villages, marae and other locations where there is a demonstrated history of deaths or serious injuries. However, I oppose reducing an existing 50 km/h limit to a permanent 30 km/h limit merely as a generalised treatment where the road environment, traffic function and actual operating speeds do not support that change.

A permanent 30 km/h limit may be appropriate in locations with a genuine concentration of pedestrians, shops, pedestrian crossings, transport hubs, car parks or other activity that creates an ongoing conflict between vehicles and vulnerable road users. That reasoning should not automatically be applied to rural or semi-rural areas without those characteristics. In such locations, pedestrians can generally walk off the carriageway, and the absence of shops, crossings and continuous pedestrian activity should be recognised in the assessment.

The Council should avoid spending money on signs, consultation, enforcement and administration for 30 km/h limits that drivers are unlikely to understand or consistently observe. Before adopting each proposed reduction, Council should publish the road-specific evidence, including:

- Crash history.
- Measured operating speeds.
- Traffic volumes.
- Pedestrian and cyclist volumes.
- Road geometry and visibility.
- The expected reduction in deaths and serious injuries.
- Travel-time effects.
- Full implementation, maintenance and enforcement costs.
- The benefit-cost assessment.

Where a safety concern is concentrated at particular times or locations, the Council should use the least-cost effective treatment. Depending on the evidence, this could include variable 30 km/h school-zone limits, improved lighting, footpath maintenance, vegetation clearance, sightline improvements, road markings, targeted enforcement or a safer crossing arrangement. A permanent 30 km/h limit should be reserved for streets whose physical design, adjacent land use and level of pedestrian activity genuinely support that speed.

I specifically oppose the proposed speed reductions and speed humps at Te Horo Beach. No crash evidence has been provided to support either proposal, and I understand that no accidents have been reported there that would justify such an intervention. Council should publish the relevant crash history, measured vehicle speeds, traffic volumes, pedestrian and cyclist activity and the predicted safety benefit before proceeding.

In the absence of evidence demonstrating a significant safety problem, these works should not proceed. Speed humps would add cost, noise and inconvenience for residents and road users, while potentially delaying emergency services, buses and other legitimate traffic. They should not be designed or installed simply because they are

included in a general speed-management programme.

Council should not waste public money designing, consulting on or implementing traffic-calming measures that are not evidence-based. Please stop wasting money designing and implementing things that are not needed. Public funds should be directed to locations with a demonstrated record of deaths, serious injuries or genuine conflicts between vehicles and vulnerable road users. Please do not do work that is not needed and cannot demonstrate a clear, measurable and proportionate safety benefit.

I also oppose reducing the speed limit from 80 km/h to 60 km/h on rural roads in the Te Horo area, including Gear Road and Old Hautere Road. These roads are rural in character and do not have the continuous pedestrian activity, shops, pedestrian crossings or other features that would justify applying a lower urban-style speed limit. A reduction would increase travel times for residents, farmers, service vehicles and through traffic without clear evidence that it would materially improve safety.

Before making any change, Council should publish the crash record, measured operating speeds, road-user volumes, road geometry, proposed safety benefit and full implementation cost for each individual road section. Unless there is a documented and substantial safety problem, the existing 80 km/h limit should be retained.

I also do not support changing the speed limit at Peka Peka. The proposal should be withdrawn unless Council can demonstrate a specific, documented safety problem supported by crash data, measured vehicle speeds, road-user volumes and a transparent cost-benefit assessment. A general policy objective should not be sufficient justification for changing the limit on a rural road that does not have continuous pedestrian activity, shops, pedestrian crossings or a comparable town-centre environment.

I also request that the former State Highway 1 between Waikanae and Ōtaki be returned to a 100 km/h speed limit outside the built-up town-centre areas. This route has minimal traffic compared with its former role as the main highway, and there is no significant pedestrian activity outside the town centres. Pedestrians in the rural sections can generally walk clear of the traffic lane. There is no evidence presented to justify any further reduction in these rural sections, and Council or NZTA should not impose lower limits simply because the road has been bypassed by the expressway.

Any proposal to reduce the speed limit further should be supported by road-specific evidence, including crash history, measured operating speeds, traffic volumes, pedestrian and cyclist activity, road geometry and a transparent cost-benefit assessment. In the absence of such evidence, the speed limit should not be reduced further, and the rural sections between the built-up areas should be considered for restoration to 100 km/h. The lack of a direct interchange at Peka Peka and Te Horo is also important. There is no northbound offramp or southbound onramp serving these communities. Consequently, residents and local businesses already face additional travel distances and delays when accessing the expressway. Further speed reductions on the former highway would increase those disadvantages by making the local route slower without providing residents with a more convenient expressway connection.

If further speed reductions are nevertheless proposed for the Peka Peka or Te Horo area, they should be considered alongside a proper access solution. At a minimum, this should include investigating a northbound offramp and a southbound onramp at Peka Peka. It would be inequitable to impose both longer access journeys and slower speeds on local residents without assessing whether improved interchange access could provide a better overall transport outcome.

I therefore request that:

- The former State Highway 1 between Waikanae and Ōtaki be returned to 100 km/h outside built-up town-centre areas.
- No further rural speed reductions be introduced without published, road-specific safety evidence.
- The existing 80 km/h limit on rural sections be retained if a return to 100 km/h is not accepted.
- The proposed speed reductions and speed humps at Te Horo Beach be removed.
- No speed humps be installed at Te Horo Beach unless clear, road-specific evidence demonstrates that they are necessary.
- The speed limit at Peka Peka not be changed without compelling road-specific evidence.
- Peka Peka and Te Horo not be subjected to further speed reductions without assessing the access disadvantage created by the absence of a direct interchange.
- NZTA investigate a northbound offramp and a southbound onramp at Peka Peka before imposing additional restrictions on the existing local route.
- Town-centre and pedestrian-focused 30 km/h reasoning not be applied to rural areas without shops, crossings or continuous pedestrian activity.
- Variable school-zone limits be used where the risk is concentrated around school arrival and departure times.
- Council publish the evidence, predicted safety improvement, travel-time effect and full implementation cost for every proposed speed-limit change.
- Actual speeds and safety outcomes be measured after implementation before the programme is extended to further roads.

The Council's draft plan contains 14 proposed speed changes and 49 infrastructure safety improvements. That overall programme description does not itself establish a crash-based case for Te Horo Beach, Gear Road, Old Hautere Road, Peka Peka or any other individual road. Each proposal must be justified on its own evidence and merits.

The Council's consultation material distinguishes between permanent 30 km/h limits in places with continuously high activity, such as shops, transport hubs and car parks, and variable limits intended for school-period risks. That distinction should be maintained rather than applying the same treatment to rural roads.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box 50-54

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box Te Horo

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

I'd like to see a move to extend the current 30 km/h speed limit zones beyond all primary schools into the catchment areas, to permit an increase in cycling to school to be performed safely. Say at least 500 m from every school.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

On behalf of an organisation

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Kapiti Cycling Action

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

80-84

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

No

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Paetawa Road in Peka Peka has a 50kph speed limit, but this is frequently ignored. A significant proportion of traffic travels faster than this (I am often "hassled" when I drive on or just below 50kph). Moreover, there are many times when motorcycles and some cars travel at extremely high speeds (estimated 80-100kph or more), accelerating as they pass, often late in the night. This is incredibly dangerous. I think the problem is partly that the speed signage along the coastal route is unclear - there are no 50kph repeater signs at all between leaving Peka Peka and getting to Waikanae Beach. Also the lack of a pedestrian footway and raised kerbs, and the infrequent street lights, make the road feel more rural than urban, even though it is a 50kph zone. I would like to request a range of measures including: monitoring of speeds to quantify the problem; better speed signage; the installation of raised kerbs and a pedestrian footway on the west side of the road at least as far south as 146 Paetawa Road; and an electronic speed indicator sign as you enter Peka Peka from the south. If these fail to slow traffic, I think speed humps should be installed at 2-3 locations between the Peka Peka Road intersection and 146 Paetawa Road. Finally, I note that traffic along this section of road will quadruple if the Waikanae North development is approved, making the problem much worse. The road is already an accident waiting to happen.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

60-64

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Peka Peka

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

65-69

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Ōtaki

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

It is all very well changing maximum road speeds on Kapiti's roads if those changes are actually enforced. They are not. For example, since the speed limit on Peka Peka Road was reduced from 80 km/h to 60 km/h, virtually no-one adheres to the 60 km/h limit and there is next to no enforcement of it. Ditto the supposed 30 km/h speed limit through the appallingly planned 'Waikanae Roundabout' that has been the subject of many a complaint on social media lately. The speed limit and adherence to the traffic signals are ignored by some with no consequences. The Speed Management Plan looks good on paper but will be largely a paper exercise if changes are not monitored and enforced.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

65-69

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Peka Peka

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

The entire length of Pekapeka Road should be 50kph.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

55-59

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Peka Peka

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

As above

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Currently tbe limit is fine

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Fix the real issue in kapiti and stop wasting money

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

60-64

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Waikanae

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

45-49

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Peka Peka

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Thames Pacific requests that Council:

- record this submission as a request for a 50km/h or 60km/h speed limit across the Grange frontage on Old State Highway 1, to be introduced progressively as titles issue and dwellings are occupied, and to be assessed for inclusion in the next review of the Speed Management Plan: and
- provide for the frontage treatments this environment will require as it becomes urban - a gateway or threshold treatment at the northern and southern extents of the developed frontage, appropriate approach treatment, signage and lighting on the roundabout approaches, street lighting along the frontage, and safe crossing points near the early childhood centre and the reserve entrances.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

On behalf of an organisation

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Thames Pacific

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

50-54

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

No

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

-

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Teach more personal awareness, especially with children

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

70-74

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Paraparaumu

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

The driveway parallel to Kapiti Road from the BP station to Te Roto Drive should be one way with the entrance at Te Roto Drive and exiting via Te Roto Drive and trying to turn right all Te Roto Drive put their life in their hands judging the traffic signal phase.

Could the Council change the speed limit from the traffic lights at Amohia Street and SH1 until after Kapiti Primary School. Also, a roundabout and give way signs entrance to Epiha Street would slow traffic making the turn into Epiha Street railway carparking safer. It is currently a blind spot.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

70-74

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Paraparaumu

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Yes. Too many drivers go through red lights!! and from Kapiti Road to Arawhata the lights only let 3 cars turning right.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

80-84

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Paraparaumu

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Drivers won't obey.

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Yes. A solar speed sign both north and south on Kohekohe Road. It's become a main th and most motorists travel between 50km/h and 70km/h, including Council Contractors.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

70-74

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Waikanae

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

n/a

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

80-84

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Waikanae

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Proposal un-necessary. No serious injury crashes in last five years. Save \$13,590.

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Already agreed on earlier pages.

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Please do not persist with this nasty fad for speed humps and raised pedestrian crossings. They are of no benefit to pedestrians and serve only to annoy motorists. Creating droves of angry motorists is not conducive to road safety. I would prefer to see many thousands of dollars saved by not pursuing these un-necessary projects spent on reducing the council's debt.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

70-74

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Raumati

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

70-74

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Waikanae

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

I do not support this reduction. Council's own concept plan records no reported injury crashes at this site between 1 February 2021 and 30 April 2026. A speed limit should be lowered where there is demonstrated, unacceptable risk to life, not as a default position and not to align the posted limit with the speeds drivers already choose. Reducing the limit in the absence of a crash problem imposes a travel time cost on every road user for no measurable safety gain, and no benefit-cost ratio has been published for this proposal. The stated justification is increased roadside development. Development adjacent to a road is not by itself evidence of unacceptable risk, and Council's own concept plan records no reported injury crashes at this site between 1 February 2021 and 30 April 2026.

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

I support this. A new subdivision road defaulting to 100 km/h is plainly wrong, and setting a 50 km/h default across the growth area is sensible forward planning at negligible cost. This should not, however, be treated as endorsement of any further reduction below 50 km/h within the extended area without site-specific justification.

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Traffic survey methodology
Every recreational zone proposal that cites data does so as a single pair of figures for an entire road — a seven-day travel volume, and a count of vehicles per day exceeding 60 km/h. Nothing is disclosed about where on the road the survey was taken, over what dates, or how the recorded exceedances are distributed across the day. That omission is decisive, not technical. These treatments are justified as protecting people using reserves, parks, beaches and cemeteries — activity that occurs in daylight and, for reserves and parks, largely at weekends and after school. If the recorded speeding is concentrated in evening and overnight hours, when the road is empty and drivers face no opposing traffic, then the speeding and the pedestrian exposure do not coincide in time, and permanent physical treatment addresses a risk that is not present when people are actually there. Council holds this information. Pneumatic tube counters record a time stamp for every vehicle as a matter of course, and the hourly distribution is a standard output, not an additional survey. It has not been published, and without it no ratepayer can assess whether any of these proposals is warranted. I ask that the final plan publish, for every site where speed data is cited: the survey location on the road, the survey dates, and the distribution of recorded exceedances by hour of day and by day of week. Where the recorded speeding does not coincide in time and place with the activity the treatment is intended to protect, the proposal should be withdrawn. The same point applies to survey location. A single figure quoted for a whole road tells the reader nothing about whether the speeds were recorded at the point being treated. Where a count taken on a long open straight is used to justify humps several hundred metres away in front of a reserve, the data does not support the proposal — it merely accompanies it. I also note that several proposals carry no published speed or volume data whatsoever, including Park Avenue, Takitimu Road, both Raumati Village locations, Beachwater Grove, Tutanekai Street, Lancelot Grove, Ōtaki Cemetery and Awa Tapu Cemetery. Council is asking ratepayers to fund permanent physical works at these sites on no published evidence at all. Cost transparency
The plan asks ratepayers to endorse 14 speed limit changes and 49 infrastructure improvements without publishing the cost of a single one of them. Table 16 gives five programme-level totals and nothing more. At the stated accuracy band of minus 30 per cent to plus 50 per cent, the \$4.745m programme could land at \$7.1m. That range is acknowledged in a footnote and then not addressed anywhere in the document. I ask that the final plan publish, for every proposal, an individual rough-order cost and a benefit-cost ratio, or a stated reason why a BCR cannot be calculated. At present benefit-cost ratios exist for two projects out of 63. One of those two returns a BCR of 1.5 on an assumption of five pedestrians a day. That is a thin basis on which to commit public money, and it is the best-evidenced project in the document. Three proposals — Lancelot Grove, Ōtaki Cemetery and Awa Tapu Cemetery — are marked unsubsidised, meaning they fall entirely on ratepayers with no NZTA funding assistance. These should be individually costed and justified before adoption, not bundled into a programme total. All three were also excluded from the resident pre-consultation recorded at Table 11. I also note that Table 16 is headed "Total Cost (\$000)". Read literally, the programme total is \$4.745 billion. It is presumably a labelling error, but it is the central financial table in a consultation document and it has not been checked.

Budget discipline

The plan states that if new projects emerge, the programme will be reprioritised to stay within the approved budget, with approval from the Group Manager Infrastructure and Assets. There is no equivalent commitment for cost escalation on the projects already listed.

I ask that the final plan commit to: reporting actual against estimated cost for each completed project; referring any project exceeding its estimate by more than 20 per cent back to Council before proceeding; and publishing post-construction speed and crash data so the benefit actually delivered can be compared against the benefit claimed.

Speed limit reductions without demonstrated risk

Several proposed reductions sit on sections with no reported injury crashes across the five-year assessment period from 1 February 2021 to 30 April 2026 — Marine Parade and Howell Road, Peka Peka Road, the Mill Road extension, Gear Road and Taylors Road.

Roads exist to move people and goods. A speed limit should be reduced where there is demonstrated, unacceptable risk to life, not as a default position and not to match the speeds drivers already choose. Matching a posted limit down to observed mean speed does not improve safety; it removes headroom and criminalises behaviour that the plan itself describes as normal for the road.

Old Hautere Road illustrates the problem. Council's own Cost Benefit Disclosure Statement projects a reduction of 0.02 expected injury crashes per year against an increase of 1,009 travel hours per year across all road users. On the plan's own figures, the travel time cost is of the same order as the monetised safety benefit. That calculation is not shown. It should be, for every proposed reduction.

Infrastructure: proportionality

The school zone programme extends treatment to a 1km buffer around every school in the district on the basis that this is the distance students will walk or cycle. The risk it addresses is concentrated in two short periods on school days — around 190 days a year. The mitigation is permanent, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

Council's own monitoring records a 15 km/h mean speed reduction already achieved from the variable 30 km/h limits and existing treatments. That is a substantial result from measures targeted at the actual risk window. The case for adding permanent vertical deflection and permanent carriageway narrowing on top of it has not been made.

I do not support the widespread use of speed humps and raised platforms. They impose a whole-of-day penalty, are uncomfortable and in some cases painful for older drivers and passengers, slow emergency and service vehicles, add ongoing maintenance liability, and displace speeding to adjacent streets. Kāpiti has an older-than-average driving population. Narrower carriageways and tighter intersection geometry make the network harder for them, not safer.

I do not support widening footpaths and kerbs into the carriageway where the existing footpath is already generously wide. Where more pedestrian space is genuinely needed, take it from the reserve or the existing path, not from the road.

What I do support

Lighting upgrades — low cost, no penalty to any road user, and directly effective on night-time risk. New footpaths closing genuine gaps in the walking network. Kerb ramps for accessibility. Pedestrian refuge islands on genuinely wide arterial corridors, where a central island can be installed without narrowing traffic lanes; the wait-time argument at Table 9 is sound. Formalising posted limits on the new Peka Peka to Ōtaki Expressway side roads, which is legal housekeeping at negligible cost.

Taken as a whole, however, the programme reads as an accumulation of physical devices rather than a network designed for the efficient movement of both vehicles and pedestrians. I ask Council to fund the low-cost, high-value elements first — lighting, footpath gaps, refuges on wide corridors — publish the cost of each remaining item, publish the underlying survey data, and bring the vertical deflection and carriageway narrowing proposals back for separate consideration on their individual merits.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box 55-59

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box Waikanae

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

RC11 - GWRC/Metlink support Moana Street/ Tasman Road intersection improvements – this is a bus route for route 290 – bus turns right onto Tasman Road. Please ensure bus tracking is complete on any concept designs for improvements to ensure bus clearance.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

On behalf of an organisation

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Greater Wellington Regional Council

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

25-29

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

No

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Lower Hutt

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

The roadside development has been minimal - spending is not justified

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Consider the cost to ratepayers of this continual change with minimal justification

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

65-69

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Te Horo

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Yes, I agree

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

I'm feeling really positive about the proposed plans, and putting the wellbeing of our people first. Thank you.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

45-49

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Te Horo

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text

Q27 Do you agree with proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road?

Multi Choice

No, I disagree

Q28 Please explain why you disagree with the proposed change for SL4 Peka Peka Road.

Long Text

This is a rural road with excellent vision and light traffic. Put it back to 80 or 100 kph. 50 or 60 is totally unnecessary

Q37 Do you agree with proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA?

Multi Choice

Q38 Please explain why you disagree with this proposed change for SL13 Paraparaumu/Raumati UTA.

Long Text

Q80 Is there anything else you'd like us to consider for future Speed Management Plans?

Long Text

Quit the "woke nonsense" over reducing speed limits, its totally unnecessary except around schools and built up areas, that's fine but in rural areas 60-80kph is totally unnecessary, keep traffic moving and put back to 100kph.

Q81 Are you providing feedback as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Multi Choice

As an individual

Q82 Name of organisation

Short Text

Q83 Age Group

Select Box

65-69

Q84 Do you live in or own a property in Kāpiti

Multi Choice

Yes

Q85 If yes, which suburb?

Select Box

Peka Peka

Q86 Where do you live?

Short Text